

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO  
**THE GOVERNING COUNCIL**

**Monday, May 31, 2004**

MINUTES OF THE GOVERNING COUNCIL meeting held on Monday, May 31, 2004  
at 4:30 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall.

Present:

Dr. Thomas H. Simpson (In the Chair)  
Ms Rose M. Patten, Vice-Chair  
Professor Robert J. Birgeneau, President  
Mr. Muhammad Basil Ahmad  
Professor Mary Beattie  
Dr. Robert M. Bennett  
Ms Murphy Browne  
Professor Philip G. Byer  
Mr. Bruce G. Cameron  
Professor John R. G. Challis  
Professor W. Raymond Cummins  
Mr. Brian Davis  
Dr. Claude S. Davis  
The Honourable William G. Davis  
Dr. Alice Dong  
Dr. Inez N. Elliston  
Ms Susan Eng  
Mr. Mike Foderick  
Dr. Shari Graham Fell  
Dr. Paul Godfrey  
Professor Vivek Goel<sup>1</sup>

Dr. Gerald Halbert  
Professor David J. A. Jenkins  
Ms Françoise D. E. Ko  
Ms Karen Lewis  
Mr. Joseph Mapa  
Professor Michael R. Marrus  
Professor Ian R. McDonald  
Dr. John Nestor  
Mr. John F. (Jack) Petch  
Mr. Chris Ramsaroop  
Mr. Timothy Reid  
Professor Arthur Ripstein  
Dr. Susan M. Scace  
Mr. W. David Wilson  
Professor John Wedge  
  
Mr. Louis Charpentier,  
Secretary of the Governing Council

Secretariat:  
Mr. Neil Dobbs  
Ms Cristina Oke

Absent:

Mr. Sachin K. Aggarwal  
Professor Pamela Catton  
Professor Brian Corman  
Ms Shirley Hoy  
Mr. George E. Myhal  
Ms Jacqueline C. Orange  
The Honourable David R. Peterson

The Honourable Vivienne Poy  
Dr. Joseph Rotman  
Mr. Amir Shalaby  
Professor Barbara Sherwood Lollar  
Professor Jake J. Thiessen  
Mr. Adam Watson  
Mr. Robert S. Weiss

In Attendance:

Ms Holly Andrews-Taylor, member-elect of the Governing Council  
Mr. Shaun Chen, member-elect of the Governing Council  
Ms Shaila Kibria, member-elect of the Governing Council  
Mr. Ari Kopolovic, member-elect of the Governing Council  
Mr. Stefan Neata, member-elect of the Governing Council  
Ms Maureen Somerville, member-elect of the Governing Council  
Ms Oriel Varga, member-elect of the Governing Council  
Dr. John Dellandrea, Vice-President and Chief Advancement Officer  
Professor Angela Hildyard, Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity

---

<sup>1</sup> Not present for Item 1

In Attendance (cont'd):

Ms Catherine J. Riggall, Interim Vice-President, Business Affairs  
Professor Carolyn Tuohy, Vice-President, Government and Institutional Relations  
Professor Rona Abramovich, Director, Transitional Year Program  
Ms Susan Addario, Director, Office of Student Affairs  
Mr. John Bisanti, Chief Capital Projects Officer  
Mr. Jim Delaney, Assistant Director, Office of Student Affairs  
Mr. Andrew Drummond, Assistant Secretary, Office of the Governing Council  
Ms Sheree Drummond, Assistant Provost and Special Assistant to the Provost  
Dr. Beata FitzPatrick, Director of the Office of the President and Assistant Vice-President  
Ms Susan Girard, Assistant Secretary, Office of the Governing Council  
Ms Elizabeth Hoffman, Assistant Dean, Programs, Faculty of Physical Education and Health  
Mr. Paul Holmes, Judicial Affairs Officer, Office of the Governing Council  
Ms Bryn Macpherson-White, Director of University Events and Presidential Liaison (Advancement)  
Ms Margaret McKone, Administrative Manager, Office of the Governing Council  
Ms Jan Nolan, Director, Faculty Renewal  
Ms Rosie Parnass, Quality of Work Life Advisor and Special Assistant to the Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity  
Ms Christina Sass-Kortsak, Assistant Vice-President, Human Resources  
Mr. Mahadeo Sukhai, President, Graduate Students' Union  
Mr. Howard Tam, Vice-President, University Affairs, Students' Administrative Council  
Ms Roberta Tucci, Vice-President, Internal, Graduate Students' Union  
Professor Tas Venetsanopoulos, Dean, Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering  
Professor Ronald Venter, Vice-Provost, Space and Facilities Planning  
Professor Safwat Zaky, Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget

THE MEETING BEGAN *IN CAMERA*.

**1. Senior Appointment**

**Vice-President and Provost**

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT Professor Vivek Goel be appointed as Vice-President and Provost, effective June 1, 2004, until June 30, 2009, subject to Senior Salary Committee approval of the terms of his appointment.

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL MOVED INTO OPEN SESSION.

**2. Chair's Remarks**

**(a) Welcome**

The Chair welcomed members and guests to the meeting, and noted that several members-elect of the Governing Council were in attendance. He also welcomed Mr. David Wilson to his first meeting of the Governing Council.

## **2. Chair's Remarks (cont'd)**

### **(b) Resolution approved by Council during *in camera* session**

The Chair announced that the Council had approved the appointment of Professor Vivek Goel to the position of Vice-President and Provost, effective June 1, 2004. Members and guests applauded Professor Goel.

The Chair thanked those members of the Governing Council who had served on the Advisory Committee: Mr. Muhammad Ahmad, Professor Ray Cummins, Ms Françoise Ko, Professor Ian McDonald, and Ms Rose Patten.

At the invitation of the Chair, Professor Goel thanked the members of the Advisory Committee and the Governing Council for their confidence in him, and acknowledged the support of his colleagues in the senior administration. He said he looked forward to the opportunity of continuing to support the mission of the University, and noted that there was much work to be done to achieve the goals outlined in Stepping UP.

### **(c) Re-appointment of Ms Rose Patten to Governing Council**

The Chair reported that the Lieutenant Governor had issued an Order in Council that Ms Rose M. Patten be reappointed a member of the University of Toronto Governing Council for a period of three years, effective from the 1<sup>st</sup> day of July, 2004 to the 30<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2007.

### **(d) Performance Evaluation of Governance**

The Chair advised members that a copy of a questionnaire on the performance of Governing Council and its Boards and Committees had been placed on the table. He asked members to complete the survey and return it to the Office of the Governing Council by 5 p.m. on Monday June 7, 2004.

### **(e) Requests from Non-members to Address Governing Council**

The Chair reported that he had granted the speaking request of the Graduate Students' Union, and would call upon the speaker at the appropriate time in the agenda.

### **(f) Audio web-cast**

The Chair reminded members that meeting was being broadcast on the web and that private conversations could be picked up and broadcast. He asked non-members who were invited to speak during the meeting to use a standing microphone so that their comments would be heard by those listening to the audio web cast.

## **3. Minutes of the Previous Meeting, April 29, 2004**

The minutes of the meeting held on April 29, 2004 were approved.

## **4. Business Arising from the Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

The Chair noted that there had been one item of business arising – a request from a member to the President concerning advice on how members of the Governing Council could assist with efforts to obtain funding from external agencies, such as the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) for international students. Information had been provided to the member. A member asked that the response be distributed to all members of the Governing Council. The Chair agreed that this would be done.

#### **4. Business Arising from the Minutes of the Previous Meeting (cont'd)**

A member indicated that a meeting had been held to discuss the matter of aid to international students, and asked that a report of that meeting be made to Council. The Chair agreed to hear the report under Other Business.

#### **5. Report of the President**

##### **(a) Vice-President and Provost**

The President thanked Professor Goel for accepting the position of Vice-President and Provost, and expressed his confidence in Professor Goel's ability to continue to fulfill the demands of the position.

##### **(b) Provincial Budget**

The President expressed disappointment with the Provincial Budget. Although the Budget had included the tuition fee replacement funding (minus the student aid set-aside) that had been previously announced (\$41.7 million for the Ontario system for the coming year), the Budget had not increased the quality enhancement funding as had been earlier promised to universities (the increase would have been some \$40 million). It appeared that the Government was relabelling the expected Quality Enhancement Funds as Tuition Replacement Funding. The clear outcome would be that the quality of, and accessibility to postsecondary education would suffer. The lack of additional funding for postsecondary education exacerbated the last-place position of Ontario for per-student funding. All universities in Ontario were committed to address this issue. It would be critical that the Government fulfill its commitment made during its election campaign to strengthen post-secondary education in Ontario by bringing per student funding at least to the national average during its current term of office.

On the positive side, the President noted that the provincial government had made a commitment to strengthen the Ontario Student Assistance Program (OSAP) and to OSAP reform, an initiative that had been led by University of Toronto students working with the administration. Included in the budget was the announcement of the Commission to study postsecondary education financing, led by the Honorable Robert Rae. This Commission would be starting its work in early autumn. The President had met with a number of other University Presidents who wished to prepare a joint position paper which the University of Toronto would lead.

##### **(c) Federal Government Relations**

The President informed members that he, along with Professor John Challis and Professor Carolyn Tuohy had recently held very positive meetings with key members of the federal civil service.

Invited to comment, Professor Tuohy reinforced the President's comments about the positive meetings in Ottawa. She also emphasized the importance of the 'Rae Commission'. It would be the major undertaking in postsecondary education of the current provincial government.

##### **(d) Discussion**

A member reminded the Council of the Ontario Student Opportunity Trust Fund (OSOTF) which would provide matching funds for donations for student financial aid. The member requested an update on the progress of the OSOTF program at the next Governing Council meeting.

**5. Report of the President (cont'd)**

**(d) Discussion (cont'd)**

A member asked what principles would be included in the position paper that was being developed by the University. The President replied that the University would continue to emphasize the importance of enhanced quality and accessibility.

The member noted that student groups had met to develop strategies for the current federal election, and asked the President what action was being taken by the University. The President replied that the University remained politically neutral in elections and did not support any particular party. Invited to comment, Professor Tuohy indicated that the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC) was being active in the federal election campaign and had created an election kit on issues in post-secondary education that supporters could use in meetings with candidates. The University would not be taking a separate position from that of AUCC.

**6. Varsity Site Redevelopment**

**(a) Introduction**

The President recalled that a number of proposals for the Varsity site had been discussed over the past six years. He acknowledged the unrelenting commitment of Dr. Dellandrea to the redevelopment of the Varsity site. The President advised members that they were being given a preview of the redevelopment. The details of the redevelopment remained to be worked out. The completed proposal was scheduled to proceed through governance in the fall of 2004.

**(b) Proposal**

At the invitation of the Chair, Dr. Dellandrea described the agreement that had been reached concerning the Varsity site. The redevelopment would result in a 25,000-seat stadium which would serve as a permanent home and focal point for Canadian soccer. It would also become the home field of the Toronto Argonauts Football Club (Argonauts) of the Canadian Football League (CFL) beginning in 2006.

Dr. Dellandrea reported that the federal and provincial governments had pledged a combined \$35 million towards the \$80 million cost of the project. This funding was contingent upon the Canadian Soccer Association (CSA) winning the right to host the 2007 Fédération Internationale de Football Association (FIFA) Men's Under-20 World Youth Championship. The announcement of the site of the 2007 championship would be made in October 2004.

An additional \$15 million would come from University fundraising efforts. Pledges in that amount had been received, but no agreements had yet been finalized. The remaining \$30 million would be financed by the University, with the Argonauts paying the annual debt service charge of \$2.1 million. One of the principles for the redevelopment of the Varsity site was that the University would not use funds from its operating budget for the capital cost.

At the invitation of the Chair, Ms Catherine Riggall, Interim Vice-President, Business Affairs, provided an overview of the project which included the following points.

**(i) Summary of Recent Proposals for Redevelopment**

- 1999: Millenium proposal, included retail stores and condominiums
- 1999: Baird Sampson Report: included student residences and Varsity stadium

**6. Varsity Site Redevelopment (cont'd)****(b) Proposal (cont'd)**

- 2002: Student Referendum on Varsity proposal rejected increased student fees to finance project.
- 2003: modified plan: no residences, 5,000 seat stadium at cost of \$30 million to University
- 2004: current proposal: partnership of University, federal and provincial governments, Toronto Argonauts Football Club and Canadian Soccer Association.
- 1999: Memorandum from President Prichard had stated that the following items should be considered for this site:
  - Athletics facilities
  - Student housing
  - Commercial development
  - Admissions Building
  - Daycare
  - Campus entrance and access
  - Protection of Philosopher's Walk
  - Perspectives of OISE/UT and Faculty of Social Work

**(ii) Current Plan for Varsity**

- 25,000 seat stadium
- 8 lane track
- Event level 5 metres below current ground level
- Bloor Street commercial footage at north end
- Pedestrian Plaza on west side, integrated to Arena on east side
- Small office tower with office space to be used by Toronto Argonauts and Canadian Soccer Association
- Athletics facilities:
  - Dedicated Argonaut space
  - Dedicated University space
  - Shared space
- No additional parking
- Closure of Devonshire
- Service access for Woodsworth, Trinity and Varsity
- Urban design considerations, traffic and noise issues

**(iii) Deal Basics**

- Argonauts to manage and operate the facility: receive revenue and pay expenses
- University's debt costs will be paid by Argonauts from revenues of operations
- University to pay for use of facilities: \$1.2 million from the operating budget of the Faculty of Physical Education and Health
- University to retain ownership of land and buildings and approval of naming, leases, advertising, etc.
- 35 year deal

**(iv) Approval Process**

- Implementation team led by Ms Catherine Riggall will:
  - develop space and time usage plans
  - interact with the community and the City of Toronto
  - develop financial commitment and legal documentation

**6. Varsity Site Redevelopment (cont'd)**

**(b) Proposal (cont'd)**

- Updates given to Academic Board, Business Board and Governing Council in June 2004
- Documentation prepared for Planning and Budget Committee in September, proceeding through to Governing Council in October 2004.

**(c) Discussion**

A member asked what would happen in the event of default by one of the parties to the agreement. Ms Riggall replied that safeguards would be negotiated into the agreement. A member asked whether the City of Toronto and the neighbours had been engaged in the discussion of the redevelopment. The President replied that the proposal had the support of various officials of the City of Toronto.

A member recalled the discussions during 2002, when the plans for the development of the Varsity site were regarded as creating an appropriate northern gateway to the University. At that time, the proposed stadium size was 5,000 seats. The member requested that the presentation of the eventual proposal to governance include a comparison against past proposals and the campus planning principles. The Chair of the Academic Board stated that the Academic Board would be interested in the impact of this proposal on academic programs, on capital projects related to other academic programs, and on fundraising initiatives for other academic programs.

A member commented that, in his view, it was unusual to have \$15 million of donations committed to a partly commercial project. Dr. Dellandrea replied that these donations were targeted by the donors to this particular project, and would not otherwise be made to the University. A member asked about the certainty of the \$15 million donations that had been described. Dr. Dellandrea replied that no formal agreements were in place concerning these donations, but he was confident they would be realized. He also indicated that additional donations would be sought to create an endowment to fund the costs of the use of the stadium, and to fund related capital projects, especially the improvement of Varsity Arena.

A member observed that an empty stadium had a different impact on the community than one filled for professional sports events, and asked whether the one community meeting described in the presentation would be sufficient. The President replied that several community meetings were anticipated. A member noted that previous proposals for the Varsity site had included student housing and day care facilities. In his view, housing and day care should be incorporated into the design of the current proposal.

A member pointed out that other sports, such as lacrosse, field hockey, and rugger, would be accommodated in the proposed stadium. There was a demonstrated need for additional recreational facilities at the University.

The Chair recognized Ms Elizabeth Hoffman, Assistant Dean, Programs, of the Faculty of Physical Education and Health, and invited her to comment. She informed members that the current athletics facilities were used by a high proportion of students, and that there were waiting lists for all activities provided by the Faculty. The current Athletics Centre did not provide sufficient facilities to meet demand. The proposed stadium would be used by members of the University community for jogging, running and walking, as well as for team sports.

A member reiterated his concern about the necessity of a 25,000-seat stadium, rather than a smaller one. The President replied that the 25,000-seat stadium would provide facilities that

**6. Varsity Site Redevelopment (cont'd)**

**c) Discussion (cont'd)**

could be effectively used for various activities other than athletics, for example orientation activities. Building and financing a smaller 5,000-seat stadium without external support would cost the University \$30 million, and would also result in a charge to the University's operating budget of \$3-million per year.

A member emphasized the importance of preserving Philosopher's Walk, which was used for a wide variety of activities. Another member asked that the presentation to governance of the proposal for the redevelopment include information on how the redevelopment fit into the University's academic plan and priorities, how the funding for the redevelopment of the site affected funding for other capital projects, and how the proposal adhered to principles such as being the northern gateway to the University. Professor Goel reminded members that the renderings in the presentation were preliminary impressions only. The proposal was consistent with two of the main principles of the academic plan: student experience and internationalization. Soccer was the most international of team sports and members from virtually all communities would come to the University to watch games and to participate. He noted the success of the partnership of McGill University with the Montreal Alouettes of the Canadian Football League.

The Chair reminded members that this item had been for information only at this time.

**7. Scarborough Campus Students' Union: Recognition as a Representative Student Committee**

Mr. Ahmad informed members that, at its meeting of April 28, the University Affairs Board (UAB) had considered a motion to declare the Scarborough Campus Students' Union (SCSU) a 'representative student committee' under the terms of the 1947 *University of Toronto Act*. The power to do this had rested with the former Board of Governors and had been transferred to the Governing Council with the *Act* of 1971. To date, there were three representative student committees: the Students' Administrative Council (SAC), the Graduate Students' Union (GSU), and the Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students (APUS), the latter two of which had been recognized in the 1970s.

Mr. Ahmad explained that SAC and SCSU had been working towards this for the past year. The motion to recognize SCSU as a representative student committee had passed unanimously at UAB, with four principles appended by the administration on the agreement of the student leaders present.

At a prior meeting of the Board, a concern had been raised that the designation might lead to a 'slippery slope' of many more student groups seeking representative status. At the April meeting, this concern had not been raised. Members felt that recognition of SCSU was one step in the evolution of student representation at the University of Toronto with the advent of the tri-campus model.

A member asked if it was the long-term intention of the University to break the *Long-Term Protocol on the Increase or Introduction of Compulsory Non-Tuition Related Fees* (the "Protocol"). At the invitation of the Chair, Mr. Jim Delaney replied that the *Protocol* was a requirement of the provincial government, and the University had no plan either to change or renegotiate the *Protocol*.



7. **Scarborough Campus Students' Union: Recognition as a Representative Student Committee (cont'd)**

The member asked whether the University would move ahead with equal speed to reverse the decision to recognize SCSU as a representative student committee, should the students at the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC) reconsider their decision. A member responded that SAC and SCSU had been discussing this matter for a long period of time. The fact that the motion had been added to the agenda of the UAB and had received unanimous support was an indication of the openness of the governance process. The member expressed his thanks to the administration and to the Secretary of the Governing Council for the support that had been provided to students in this matter.

The Chair invited Mr. Howard Tam, Vice-President, University Affairs of SAC, to address Council. Mr. Tam stated that SAC fully supported this motion. It had been introduced by students at the University Affairs Board under "other business" and had been passed unanimously. The motion represented the culmination of a process that had started last summer with negotiations between SAC and SCSU on the future of representation. A referendum had been held, and had passed with a large margin of victory on Jan 20-21, 2004.

Mr. Tam explained that SAC supported this recognition because SCSU had taken a leadership role at UTSC and had proven itself to be effective in representing the students at that campus. SCSU was consulted by UTSC administration on a regular basis.

Mr. Tam noted that it was an exciting time for UTSC students. A new student centre would be opening this fall, and the SCSU executive and Council had recently restructured and expanded to offer more services. Mr Tam concluded by stating the agreement of SAC with the conditions in the motion.

Professor Goel remarked that introduction of this motion into governance demonstrated that students and the administration could work together collaboratively.

A member expressed concern about the risk of fragmentation of student representation, and he stated that he would like a commitment from the administration that any further designation of a recognized student committee be limited to an appropriate student group at the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM), and not be available to any other student groups. The President replied that such a commitment was difficult to make *a priori*. The administration was always willing to listen to concerns expressed by students.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT the Scarborough Campus Students' Union (SCSU) be recognized as the Representative Student Committee and primary representative body of full-time undergraduate students registered at the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC);

and THAT the Governing Council cease its recognition of the Students' Administrative Council (SAC) as the Representative Student Committee of full-time undergraduate students registered at the University of Toronto at Scarborough;

subject to the following conditions and expectations:

**7. Scarborough Campus Students' Union: Recognition as a Representative Student Committee (cont'd)**

- 1) that for the purposes of the Memorandum of Agreement between the University of Toronto, the Students' Administrative Council, the Graduate Students' Union and the Association of Part-Time Undergraduate Students for a Long-Term Protocol on the Increase or Introduction of Compulsory Non-Tuition Related Fees (the "Protocol"), the Students' Administrative Council shall continue to represent full-time undergraduate students registered at the University of Toronto at Scarborough until such time as a new or revised Protocol is approved;
- 2) that the Scarborough Campus Students' Union will undertake, in consultation with the Association of Part-Time Undergraduate Students, to address the representation of part-time undergraduate UTSC students;
- 3) that the Students' Administrative Council will undertake, in consultation with the appropriate student societies, to address the representation of University of Toronto at Mississauga students; and
- 4) that the Students' Administrative Council and the Scarborough Campus Students' Union will undertake to advise the administration of their progress in addressing these matters in the Spring of 2005.

**8. Reports for Information**

The Council received the items for information contained in the following reports:

- (a) Report Number 134 of the Business Board (May 3, 2004)
- (b) Report Number 121 of the University Affairs Board (April 28, 2004)
- (c) Report Number 373 of the Executive Committee (May 17, 2004)

**9. Date of the Next Meeting**

The Chair reminded the members that the final regular meeting of the Governing Council for 2003-04 was scheduled for Thursday, June 24, 2004. The meeting would begin at 4:00 p.m. rather than 4:30 p.m. to accommodate the lengthy agenda.

**10. Question Period**

There were no questions for members of the senior administration.

**11. Other Business**

**(a) Funding for International Students**

A member reported that several student members of the Governing Council had met informally with Professor Tuohy and Professor Farrar to discuss possible initiatives for funding for international students.

**11. Other Business (cont'd)**

**(b) Address by Non-Member**

The Chair invited Mr. Mahadeo Sukhai, President of the Graduate Students' Union (GSU), to address the Council. Mr. Sukhai congratulated the administration on several initiatives that had been undertaken: guaranteed graduate student funding, the OSAP reform group, continued consultation on projects and issues, and continued efforts for transparency, accountability and inclusion of all constituencies. He outlined the priorities of the GSU for the coming year: implementation of the academic plan in graduate units; work on a range of equity initiatives, including the *Ontarians with Disabilities Act*, accessibility planning process and the Breaking Down Barriers student disability issues conference series; continued work on a variety of academic issues including graduate student housing, funding and library; and ongoing implementation of equity, inclusiveness, and accessibility practices within the GSU. Mr. Sukhai concluded by stating that he, and the Executive of the GSU, looked forward to working collaboratively with the Governing Council on graduate student issues.

The meeting adjourned at 6:10 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

June 7, 2004