

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL
REPORT NUMBER 330 OF
THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Monday, December 4, 2000

To the Governing Council,
University of Toronto.

Your Committee reports that it held a meeting on Monday, December 4, 2000 at 5:00 p.m. in the Board Room, Simcoe Hall, with the following members present:

Ms Wendy M. Cecil-Cockwell (In the Chair)	Professor Ronald D. Venter
Mrs. Mary Anne V. Chambers, Vice-Chair	
Dr. Robert J. Birgeneau, President	Non-Voting Member:
Professor W. Raymond Cummins	
Mr. Brian Davis	Mr. Louis R. Charpentier
Ms Naana Afua Jumah	
Professor Brian Langille	Secretariat:
Mr. Gerald A. Lokash	
Dr. John P. Nestor	Ms Margaret McKone
Dr. Joseph L. Rotman	
Mrs. Susan M. Scace	

Regrets:

Ms Nancy L. Watson

In Attendance:

Mr. Brian Burchell, Chair, the University Affairs Board
Professor Jack Carr, Chair, the Academic Board
Mr. Amir Shalaby, Chair, the Business Board
Professor Adel S. Sedra, member, the Governing Council, and Vice-President and Provost
Mr. Elan Ohayon, member, the Governing Council
Ms Wendy Talfourd-Jones, member, the Governing Council and Chair, the Elections Committee
Professor Michael G. Finlayson, Vice-President, Administration and Human Resources
Mr. Kasi Rao, Director of the Office of the President and Director of Government Relations

Chairman's Remarks:

The Chairman reported with sadness on the recent death of Mr. Terrence Stephen, member of the Council and former Vice-Chair of the Business Board. She would ask the Council to observe a moment of silence at its December 14 meeting.

The Chairman noted that a correction had been made to the agenda subsequent to the mailing of meeting packages. Copies of the corrected agenda had been distributed to members electronically the previous Friday. Corrected agendas had also been placed on the table at the outset of the meeting.

Chairman's Remarks (cont'd):

The Chairman observed that the agenda appeared lengthy, however, the focus of the Executive Committee was to be on the process that had resulted in the motions before it and not to re-debate the substance of the motions.

The Chairman noted that, pursuant to section 28 (e) and 33 of *By-Law Number 2*, consideration of items 1, 2 and 3 would take place *in camera*, with the Board Chairs invited to remain.

1. Senior Appointments

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

Following discussion,

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED

to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation

THAT the recommendation for a senior appointment, outlined in the memorandum from the President dated November 29, 2000, be approved.

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

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

The Executive Committee then considered a recommendation from the Secretary of the Governing Council for two senior appointments.

Following discussion,

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED

to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation

THAT the recommendations for two senior appointments, outlined in the memorandum from the Secretary of the Governing Council dated November 29, 2000, be approved.

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

THAT, pursuant to sections 38 of *By-Law Number 2*, the senior appointments be considered by the Governing Council *in camera*.

2. External Appointment: Sunnybrook and Women's College Health Sciences Centre

Mr. Charpentier introduced the proposal noting that its approval by the Executive Committee had been previously sought and secured through a mail/e-mail ballot. At this time, the Executive Committee was asked to confirm formally the recommendation.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

THAT Mr. H. Garfield Emerson be appointed as an unaffiliated director to the Board of Directors of Sunnybrook and Women's College Health Sciences Centre until October 30, 2001.

3. Board and Committee Assignments – Appointments to the Business Board

The Chairman noted there were currently two vacancies on the Business Board in the seats to be filled from the Lieutenant-Governor-In-Council appointees. Authority to replace Governing Council members on committees or boards was exercised by the Executive Committee and reported for information to the Governing Council.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

THAT Ms Carol Stephenson and Mr. John Tory be appointed to the Business Board effective immediately for terms continuing to June 30, 2001.

THE COMMITTEE MOVED INTO CLOSED SESSION.

4. Report of the Previous Meeting – Report # 329 (October 13, 2000)

Report Number 329 of the Executive Committee meeting held on October 13, 2000 was approved.

5. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting

There were no items of business arising from the previous meeting.

6. Minutes of the Governing Council Meeting held on October 19, 2000

Members had received for information a copy of the minutes of the Governing Council meeting held on October 19, 2000.

A member drew attention to an error in the manner in which an item had been reported. Mr. Charpentier undertook to amend the Minutes accordingly.

7. Business Arising from the October 19 Meeting of the Governing Council**(a) Arising from Item 7 - Notice of Motion: Office of the Ombudsperson**

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

THAT the Governing Council restore full funding to the Office of the Ombudsperson.

The Chairman noted that the Council's *By-law Number 2* stated the following:

At any meeting of the Council a member may give notice of a motion to be presented at a subsequent meeting of the Council. A motion of which notice is given as aforesaid shall be considered by the Executive Committee for inclusion on the agenda of a subsequent meeting or other action as it deems appropriate, and the Committee shall report to the Council at the regular meeting next following the meeting at which the aforesaid notice of the motion had been given, the action that it has taken with respect to such a motion.

Invited to comment, Mr. Charpentier reported that a review of the Office of the Ombudsperson by the Governing Council was to take place in the current academic year and that questions of resources would normally be considered as part of such a review.

In response to questions, Mr. Charpentier clarified that the Ombudsperson reported to the Governing Council. Therefore, the Executive Committee was the first-entry point within governance to consider proposals concerning the Office. The position of Ombudsperson was currently a 60% appointment. The review committee's membership and terms of reference would be brought to the Governing Council for approval. It was anticipated that the review of the Office would be completed by April.

The member of the Governing Council who had provided the notice of motion withdrew his proposal in light of the information provided.

(b) Arising from Item 13 - Notice of Motion: *Code of Student Conduct*

Invited to comment, Mr. Charpentier noted that Professor Ian Orchard, Vice-Provost, Students, would soon be contacting members of the University Affairs Board regarding his intention to request the establishment of a special committee of that Board to provide advice on specific ways that the *Code of Student Conduct* could be amended to enable it to better realize its stated objectives. The Board would be asked to approve the terms of reference and the membership of this special committee at its December 13, 2000 meeting. The Secretary continued that the University Affairs Board was responsible for non-academic discipline, including the *Code of Student Conduct*. Therefore, if the Executive Committee determined that the proposal should be considered by governance, it would reasonably refer the motion to the University Affairs Board.

The member of the Governing Council who had provided notice of the proposed motion responded that he did not have sufficient information concerning the special committee and, therefore, could not comment on this initiative in relation to his proposal.

A member reiterated that jurisdiction for the *Code of Student Conduct* was rightly that of the University Affairs Board. For this reason, he did not advocate consideration of the individual's proposal by the Governing Council.

7. Business Arising from the October 19 Meeting of the Governing Council (cont'd)**(b) Arising from Item 13 - Notice of Motion: *Code of Student Conduct*** (cont'd)

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

THAT the following motion **not** be placed on the agenda of the next Governing Council meeting:

THAT the *Code of Student Conduct* be repealed.

(c) Arising from Item 10 – Employment Equity Reports

The Secretary recalled that at the October 19 meeting of the Council, a member had asked that the Executive Committee formally consider his request to have the annual employment equity report distributed to and considered by the Governing Council. He reiterated that responsibility for reviewing the annual report had been delegated by the Council both to the Academic Board, which was responsible for academic appointments policy, and to the Business Board, which was responsible for personnel policy for administrative staff. The reports of these boards, which contained an account of members' discussion, were forwarded to the Council for information. In the absence of a request from one or both Boards to have the annual report considered by the Council for a specified reason, it was appropriate to respect the authority delegated to those Boards.

The member who had given the notice of motion disagreed. He averred that the information contained in the annual employment equity report should be of major concern to members of the Council. He believed it was appropriate and necessary for members of the Council to receive the annual report.

8. Academic Board: Items for Confirmation**(a) Item 11 - Degrees: Faculty of Dentistry - Specialty Designation on M.Sc. Diplomas**
(Arising from Report Number 102 of the Academic Board)

Professor Carr noted that the proposal to place specialty notations on the M.Sc. parchments had been presented to the Academic Board as a special case. A memorandum from Professor Tuohy had indicated that the notation was for the purpose of recognizing postgraduate training leading to a certification in a statutorily regulated professional specialty. He continued that this proposal was not expected to lead to a flurry of similar requests.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE CONFIRMED

The proposal to add specialty notations to M.Sc. degree parchments, as described in the submission from the Faculty of Dentistry dated January 10, 2000, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 102 of the Academic Board as Appendix "G", effective immediately.

8. Academic Board: Items for Confirmation (cont'd)**(b) Item 12 - Faculty of Pharmacy: Constitution - Revisions**
(Arising from Report Number 102 of the Academic Board)

Professor Carr reported that there had been no substantive discussion of this proposal by the Academic Board.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE CONFIRMED

The constitution of the Faculty of Pharmacy, last amended June 3, 1999, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 102 of the Academic Board as Appendix "H".

9. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council**(a) Item 4 - Capital Project: Bahen Centre for Information Technology: Change in Scope**
(Arising from Report Number 102 of the Academic Board)

Professor Carr noted that the proposal called for a change in the scope of the Bahen Centre for Information Technology by:

- shelling-in the sixth floor at a cost of \$5.2 million, adding 1,900 net assignable square meters; and
- expanding the chiller facilities at a cost of \$2.27 million.

Two other factors affecting the cost of the project had been inflation escalation and the complexity of the site, particularly the need to include an historically designated building. The cost of the building had increased from \$88 million to just over \$104 million and the space had increased by 3,000 net assignable square meters (nasm) to just over 19,000 nasm. The sources of funds were outlined in Professor McCammond's memorandum and included an allocation from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund to construct the shelled space.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED

to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation

- (i) THAT the revised scope of the Bahen Centre for Information Technology of 19,300 net assignable square meters (nasm) be approved;
- (ii) THAT the revised project cost of \$104.63-million and the revised funding sources, outlined in Professor McCammond's memorandum of October 10, 2000, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 102 of the Academic Board as Appendix "A", be approved; and
- (iii) THAT an allocation of a \$5.197-million from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund to construct 1,900 nasm of shelled space, be approved.

9. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council (cont'd)**(b) Item 7 - Capital Project: OISE/UT and University of Toronto Schools at 371 Bloor Street West - Users' Committee Report**
(Arising from Report Number 102 of the Academic Board)

Professor Carr noted that the proposed project called for the improvement and modernization of the building that was the home of the former Faculty of Education at 371 Bloor Street West. The renovated building would accommodate the increased enrolment of the University of Toronto School (UTS) and the current needs of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto (OISE/UT). The project also included building a new athletic wing. The cost of the project, about \$23 million, would be covered by UTS fundraising, OISE/UT, and an allocation from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund.

Professor Carr continued that discussion at both the Planning and Budget Committee and the Academic Board had focused on the role of UTS with respect to the University's mission and whether it should be subsidized by the University. Some members had suggested that UTS was a private high school. In response, the Dean of OISE/UT had noted that UTS was an integral part of OISE/UT and was a research facility. The Provost had explained to the Planning and Budget Committee that UTS had historically received funding from the provincial government until it had been withdrawn in 1993. Comments had also been made about the proposed athletic facilities which, when completed, would be superior to those at both the University of Toronto at Scarborough and the University of Toronto at Mississauga.

A member noted that when the proposal was presented to the Governing Council for approval, it would be helpful for the administration to articulate clearly the relationship between UTS and the OISE/UT. A member echoed this suggestion, noting that UTS was perceived by some to be a private high school. Professor Sedra responded that he would invite Professor Fullan, Dean of OISE/UT to address the matter at the meeting of the Council.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED

to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation

- (i) THAT the Users' Committee Report of the University of Toronto Schools and OISE/UT at 371 Bloor Street West, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 102 of the Academic Board as Appendix "D", be approved in principle;
- (ii) THAT the project cost of \$23,240,000 be approved and that implementation begin when the private funding has been raised;
- (iii) THAT \$3.5-million be allocated from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund when the private funding has been raised.

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

(c) Item 8 - Budget: University Infrastructure Investment Fund - Allocation to Faculty of Architecture, Landscape, and Design Building , Phase 3 Renovations
(Arising from Report Number 102 of the Academic Board)

Professor Carr recalled that in 1998, the Governing Council had approved a Users' Committee report for the renovation of the building which housed the Faculty of Architecture, Landscape, and Design. The total cost had been just under \$10 million and the project was to proceed in phases as funding became available. The first two phases had been completed and the third phase - the renovation of the exhibition hall and the installation of bay windows - was ready to proceed. The cost was \$690,000. The Faculty had raised half of that amount and the Provost had agreed, in response to the Faculty's academic and budget plan, to match the donation with an allocation from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED

to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation

THAT \$345,000 be allocated from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund for Phase 3 renovations to the Faculty of Architecture, Landscape, and Design building.

(d) Item 9 - Ontario SuperBuild Renewal Program / Ontario Facilities Renewal Fund / Accommodation and Facilities Directorate Infrastructure Plan for 2000-2001
(Arising from Report Number 102 of the Academic Board)

Professor Carr reported that the Academic Board was recommending the approval of a plan to spend just over \$12 million on infrastructure projects. The projects included upgrades to classroom and research labs, improved campus communication networks, physical plant renewal, deferred maintenance and physical accessibility projects. Funding for the latter priority had also been received from the Students' Administrative Council and its advice would be sought on the list of physical accessibility projects to be undertaken.

In response to a member's inquiry, Professor Finlayson reported on the current status of the University's infrastructure renewal projects. The projects' costs totaled in the range of \$150 - \$200 million. During the last three years, expenditures of \$10 - \$15 million had been approved for various infrastructure renewal projects. The administration had sought to address the projects deemed to be most urgent. He clarified that the estimated costs for the identified infrastructure renewal projects escalated each year owing to the delay in addressing those projects for which funding could not be secured. While the list had not grown significantly during the past few years, there remained a great many projects to be completed. A member noted that many of the University's buildings had been constructed in the 1960s and were now in need of major renovations.

The President added that this was a matter of priority for the Council of Ontario Universities. It was estimated that the cost of infrastructure renewal in Ontario's universities was approximately \$500 million to \$1 billion. The COU was advocating an increase in operating revenue to address this problem of \$129 million per year for the next five years.

The Chairman asked that the President to include an update on this matter in his report to the Governing Council.

9. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council (cont'd)**(d) Item 9 - Ontario SuperBuild Renewal Program / Ontario Facilities Renewal Fund / Accommodation and Facilities Directorate Infrastructure Plan for 2000-2001** (cont'd)

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED

to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation

THAT Schedule A to Professor McCammond's memorandum of October 26, 2000, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 102 of the Academic Board as Appendix "F", for allocations totaling \$12,062,110 be recommended for approval as the University's SRP/OFRF/AFD Infrastructure Plan for 2000-01.

(e) Item 5 - Capital Project: New College Residence Expansion - Users' Committee Report
(Arising from Report Number 102 of the Academic Board, Excerpt from Report Number 94 of the University Affairs Board and Report Number 108 of the Business Board)

Professor Carr noted that the Academic Board was recommending approval in principle of a new New College residence, at the corner of Willcocks Street and Spadina Avenue. The project would be a dormitory-style residence housing 280 students and seven dons. The proposed cost was just over \$22 million and would be financed by \$750,000 from New College, a 25-year mortgage to be repaid from fees and a yearly allocation from the Academic Priorities Fund (APF) for a period of eight years. The funds for the APF allocation had been set aside in the 2000-2001 Budget Report, approved last spring. He continued that discussion at the Planning and Budget Committee and the Academic Board had focused on the appropriateness of using the APF to fund residence construction, the location of residence expansion compared to the proposed enrolment expansion, and the reasons for the difference in costs of the various residence projects currently being considered.

Mr. Burchell noted that the University Affairs Board was asked to offer its advice on capital projects that fell within its terms of reference (e.g. athletics facilities, parking garages and residences). The Board's consideration of the proposal currently before members had included the residence design, the process for approval of residence fees, the style of the residence contemplated, consultations with neighbours, and the physical accessibility of the new residence. The University Affairs Board had had a thorough discussion of the proposal and had ultimately lent its unanimous endorsement to the recommendation of the Academic Board.

On behalf of Mr. Shalaby, the Secretary of the Governing Council reported that the Business Board's responsibility with respect to Users' Committee Reports on residence projects as to examine the business plan. The Board, by its concurrence, advised the Governing Council that the revenue for the project would be sufficient to balance its expense. He noted that the Board had been advised by Miss Oliver that the University's Controller had reviewed the business plan carefully and had been satisfied that the project was viable. The Business Board had concurred with the recommendation for approval of the Users' Committee Report.

9. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council (cont'd)**(e) Item 5 - Capital Project: New College Residence Expansion - Users' Committee Report**
(cont'd)

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED

to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation

- (i) THAT the Users' Committee Report of the New College Student Residence Expansion, proposing a 11,355 gross square meter building on site 5 of the St. George Campus, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 102 of the Academic Board as Appendix "B", be approved in principle;
- (ii) THAT the project cost of \$22,400,880 be approved;
- (iii) THAT the sources of funding, \$750,000 from New College, and a 25-year mortgage for the remainder to be repaid from residence fees and an allocation from the Academic Priorities Fund, be approved; and
- (iv) THAT the base funding of up to \$352,000 be allocated from the Academic Priorities Fund to New College for a period of eight years, the allocation to be reviewed at that time.

(f) Item 6 - Capital Project: University of Toronto at Mississauga Residence Phase 7 - Users' Committee Report

(Arising from Report Number 102 of the Academic Board, Report Number 94 of the University Affairs Board and Report Number 108 of the Business Board)

Professor Carr noted that this proposal concerned a Users' Committee Report which proposed the seventh residential project at the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM). It would provide suite-style accommodation for 192 students. The proposed cost was just over \$14 million and would be financed by \$40,000 from UTM, a 25-year mortgage to be repaid by fees and an annual allocation from the Academic Priorities Fund for a period of eight years. Although there had been no discussion of this item *per se*, general points had been raised during the discussion of New College's project.

Mr. Burchell noted that the University Affairs Board's deliberation of this project had focused on accessibility and the type of student population at the UTM, which was drawn primarily from small towns within Ontario. Once again, the University Affairs Board had had a thorough discussion of the proposal and had ultimately lent its endorsement to the recommendation of the Academic Board. The Secretary noted that the Business Board had also concurred with the recommendation.

9. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council (cont'd)**(f) Item 6 -Capital Project: University of Toronto at Mississauga Residence Phase 7 - Users' Committee Report** (cont'd)

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED

to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation

- (i) THAT the Users' Committee Report of the University of Toronto at Mississauga (U.T.M.) Student Residence proposing a 7278 gross square meter building on the U.T.M. Campus, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 102 of the Academic Board as Appendix "C", be approved in principle;
- (ii) THAT the project cost of \$14,059,095 be approved;
- (iii) THAT the sources of funding, \$40,000 from the Parking Ancillary, and a 25-year mortgage for the remainder to be repaid from residence fees and an allocation from the Academic Priorities Fund, be approved; and
- (iv) THAT the base funding of up to \$100,000 be allocated from the Academic Priorities Fund to U.T.M. for a period of eight years, the allocation to be reviewed at that time.

(g) Item 3 - Business Board Terms of Reference with Respect to Investments
(Arising from Report Number 108 of the Business Board)

The Secretary of the Governing Council noted that the Business Board had proposed some housekeeping changes to its terms of reference to reflect the establishment of the University of Toronto Asset Management Corporation (UTAM) and UTAM's assumption of responsibility for the University's investments. The revised terms of reference also reflected the fact that the University's pension plans were now regulated by the Financial Services Commission of Ontario, which had replaced the former Pension Commission of Ontario.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED

to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation

THAT the proposed revised section 4.1(b) of the Business Board terms of reference, concerning investments, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 108 of the Business Board as Attachment 2 to Appendix "A", be approved.

9. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council (cont'd)**(h) Item 8 - Governing Council Elections: Web-based Voting / Teaching Staff Constituencies / Election Guidelines 2001**

(Arising from Report Number 94 of the University Affairs Board)

Mr. Burchell noted that the University Affairs Board had considered three proposals from its Elections Committee pertaining to the Governing Council Elections.

The first proposal sought to conduct the 2001 election for undergraduate student representatives on the Governing Council solely by web-based voting. This was a move also being undertaken by the Students' Administrative Council, which conducted its election concurrent with the Governing Council election. Members had expressed some concern that the elimination of the traditional ballot-box voting system would lead to a decline in voters. Members had also expressed concern about access to terminals during the election. In response, an amendment had been made to the motion at the University Affairs Board requiring a review of the 2001 election process with a report being made to the November 2001 meeting of the University Affairs Board.

The second set of motions sought to address an imbalance in the distribution of teaching staff seats on the Governing Council for the following reasons.

- The basis on which the 12 seats were evenly divided in 1972 between the Arts and Science constituencies and the other constituencies had altered significantly enough to justify a change.
- The transfer several years ago to the University of employment contracts for teaching staff of the federated universities had resulted in a three-person constituency.
- The Faculty of Information Studies currently shared a constituency with OISE/UT, a large multi-departmental faculty, rather than with similar small/single department professional faculties.

The proposed change rectified an imbalance within the teaching staff constituency and did not lead to an increase in faculty seats overall.

The final resolution sought approval of the Election Guidelines for 2001, which incorporated these changes.

In response to a member's inquiry, Mr. Charpentier clarified that the timeframe had been extended for the web-based election and would now take place during a seven-day period over extended hours.

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

(h) **Item 8 - Governing Council Elections: Web-based Voting / Teaching Staff Constituencies / Election Guidelines 2001** (cont'd)

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED

to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation

Web-based Voting

THAT the 2001 election for undergraduate student representatives on the Governing Council be conducted by web-based voting; and

THAT a review of the 2001 election process be undertaken with a report being made to the University Affairs Board at its November meeting at which time the method for conducting the election of undergraduate student representatives on the Governing Council by web-based voting would be reconsidered.

Teaching Staff Constituencies

THAT Constituency IA for members of the teaching staff who have their major appointments in the federated universities be disestablished and the remaining members of that constituency be assigned to the appropriate Arts and Science constituencies;

THAT the number of seats in Constituency III be increased from 2 seats to 3 seats; and

THAT the teaching staff members in the Faculty of Information Studies be moved from Constituency VI to Constituency V.

Election Guidelines 2001

THAT the Election Guidelines 2001, amended to reflect all the above changes, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 94 of the University Affairs Board as Appendix "C", be approved.

10. **Reports for Information**

The Chairman noted that members had received the following Reports for information.

Report Number 102 of the Academic Board (November 16, 2000)

Report Number 108 of the Business Board (November 20, 2000)

Report Number 93 of the University Affairs Board (August 10, 2000)

Excerpt from Report Number 94 of the University Affairs Board (November 7, 2000)

11. Report of the President

The President reported briefly on the following matters.

(a) Senior Administration

As he had reported earlier in a memorandum to the University community, the President had established an advisory process for the new position of Vice-President, Business Affairs. The new Vice-President would be responsible for managing the University's business infrastructure to provide the academic enterprise with the support it required. The Vice-President would also be responsible for the management of University-wide finance-related functions, including the current office of the Chief Financial Officer; University-wide operations and services, including construction, campus facilities, real estate and ancillary operations; health and safety activities, ensuring compliance with occupational health, safety and environmental legislation; and the integration and effectiveness of all of the University's administrative management systems to enable university-wide access to information and accurate reporting.

The President had struck a committee to advise him on the appointment of the Vice-President with the intent of bringing a recommendation to the Governing Council in the new year.

The President had also distributed memoranda to the University community on the departures of both Ms Catherine McCauley and Mr. Kasi Rao from his Office, both of whom had served the University with distinction. He had since reviewed the positions and recruitment for their positions would begin in the very near future.

(b) Provincial Government Relations

The President briefed members on his recent meetings with The Honourable Diane Cunningham, Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities, as well as with other senior officials concerning issues of importance to the University and post-secondary education.

The University continued to make representations to the provincial government on the need for adequate operating and capital funding for the University to increase its enrolment. In doing so, the University was making the case that the quality of its academic programs would not be sacrificed as a result of enrolment growth. If enrolment expansion were to occur, it could be primarily at the University of Toronto at Mississauga and the University of Toronto at Scarborough. This growth would provide a valuable opportunity for differentiation across the University's three campuses and would be consistent with the University's overall academic mission.

Following a discussion, the President emphasized that enrolment growth plans as well as any revised academic plans incorporating new and distinct programs for the Scarborough and Mississauga would be developed by these campuses following their established academic planning processes.

A member suggested that the University employ a firm to undertake market research on the perceived strength of the University's academic programs and their economic impact, the results of which would prove useful in lobbying the government and in recruiting future students. The President undertook to forward the member's suggestion to Dr. Levy.

11. Report of the President (cont'd)**(c) Federal Government Relations**

The President briefed members on his recent meetings with the Prime Minister, the Right Honourable Jean Chrétien and with Tory leader, the Right Honourable Joe Clark, who had visited the St. George campus.

The University continued to make the case that the federal government should pay the full cost of research. The President was optimistic that there would be progress in this area in the future.

(d) Maclean's Annual Ranking of Universities

The President reported that the University had, for the seventh year running, placed first among the Canadian universities in its category.

(e) Nobel Laureate Lecture Series

The President had attended the John C. Polanyi Nobel Laureate Lecture Series, at Convocation Hall on Tuesday, November 28, 2000. The theme of this year's series was Building With Molecules. Four renowned chemists had spoken on a variety of topics, all with the connecting thread of molecular building. The featured speakers included: Sir John Meurig Thomas, Master of Peterhouse, Cambridge, England; K. Barry Sharpless, The Scripps Research Institute, La Jolla, California; Richard E. Smalley, Rice University, Houston, Texas (Nobel Prize for Chemistry 1996); and Ahmed Zewail, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, California (Nobel Prize for Chemistry 1999). The lectures had been well-attended and well received.

12. Date of Next Meeting

The Chairman reminded members of the Committee's next meeting on Monday, January 29, 2001, at 5:00 p.m.

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

The Chairman sought members' advice on a request to address the Governing Council from Mr. Bob Spencer, a former member of the Governing Council, and current Executive Director of the Ontario Association of Food Banks. His request to address the Council on the Ontario Association of Food Banks had been circulated to members with their agenda packages.

Following discussion, it was determined that, as formulated, the proposal was not developed sufficiently to be considered by the University Affairs Board (an appropriate point of entry) nor by the Governing Council. It was determined that the President meet with Mr. Spencer to clarify Mr. Spencer's goals and to explore what options if any the University could consider pursuing.

The Chairman then sought members' advice on a verbal request received earlier in the day from Mr. Adam Bretholz, President, Students' Administrative Council (SAC). Mr. Betholz

13. Other Business

(a) Requests to Address the Governing Council (cont'd)

had sought permission to update the Council regularly at its meetings on work being undertaken by SAC. Members were in agreement that the major student groups should normally be accorded speaking rights concerning matters on the Council's agenda. With respect to a briefing on the undertakings of any student group, however, the Chairman and members advised that student groups should be invited to submit their briefing in writing for distribution to members of the Council.

(b) Order of the Agenda

The Chairman consulted with the Committee on the order of the agenda items for the December 14 meeting of the Council.

(c) Holiday Reception

The Chairman invited members to a holiday reception to follow the December 14 meeting of the Governing Council at the Gallery Grill, Hart House.

The meeting adjourned at 7:00 p.m.

Secretary

December 5, 2000

Chairman