

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

Friday February 14, 2003

MINUTES OF THE GOVERNING COUNCIL meeting held on Friday, February 14, 2003
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
The Honourable Henry N. R. Jackman,
Chancellor
Professor Mary Beattie
Dr. Robert Bennett
Professor Brian Corman
Professor W. Raymond Cummins
Mr. Brian Davis
Dr. Claude Davis
The Honourable William G. Davis
Professor Sherwin Desser
Dr. Inez Elliston
Ms Susan Eng
Professor Luigi Girolametto
Mr. Gerald Halbert
Ms Durré Hanif
Professor Ellen Hodnett
Ms Karen Lewis
Professor Ian R. McDonald
Professor Michael Marrus
Mr. David Melville

Mr. Sean Mullin
Mr. Colm Murphy
Dr. John P. Nestor
Professor Shirley Neuman
Mr. Elan Ohayon
Ms Jacqueline C. Orange
Mr. Josh Paterson
Mr. John F. (Jack) Petch
The Honourable David R. Peterson
Mr. Chris Ramsaroop
Mr. Timothy Reid
Mr. Amir Shalaby
Professor Carolyn Tuohy
Professor John Wedge

Secretariat:

Mr. Neil Dobbs
Ms Cristina Oke
Mrs. Beverley Stefureak

Absent:

Mr. Mark Braun
Professor Philip Byer
Dr. Alice Dong
Dr. Shari Graham Fell
Mr. Paul V. Godfrey
Ms Shirley Hoy
Professor David Jenkins
Professor Brian Langille
Mr. George Myhal

Dr. Joseph L. Rotman
Mrs. Susan M. Scace
Ms Carol Stephenson
Mr. John H. Tory
Mr. Robert S. Weiss

Mr. Louis R. Charpentier,
Secretary of the Governing Council

In Attendance:

Mr. Felix Chee, Vice-President, Business Affairs
Professor Angela Hildyard, Vice-President, Human Resources
Dr. Sheldon Levy, Vice-President, Government and Institutional Relations
Professor David Farrar, Vice-Provost, Students
Dr. Beata FitzPatrick, Director of the Office of the President and Assistant Vice-President
Ms Rivi Frankle, Assistant Vice-President, Alumni and Development
Professor Vivek Goel, Vice-Provost, Faculty
Professor Derek McCammond, Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget
Ms Cathy Riggall, Assistant Vice-President, Facilities and Services
Professor Ronald Venter, Vice-Provost, Space and Facilities Planning
Ms Susan Addario, Director, Student Services
Mr. Don Beaton, Director, Real Estate
Mr. John Bisanti, Chief Capital Projects Officer
Ms Sue Bloch-Nevitte, Director, Public Affairs and Advancement Communications
Ms Sheila Brown, Controller and Director of Financial Services
Mr. Jim Delaney, Assistant Director, Student Services
Professor Connie Guberman, Status of Women Officer
Mr. Mohammed Hashim, University Affairs Commissioner, Students' Administrative Council
Mr. Paul Holmes, Judicial Affairs Officer, Office of the Governing Council
Ms Lesley Lewis, Assistant Provost and Special Assistant to the Vice-President and Provost
Mr. Steve Moate, Senior Employment Relations Legal Counsel
Mr. Jason Price, Vice-President, Graduate Students' Association, Ontario Institute for
Studies in Education of the University of Toronto (OISE/U)T
Ms Silvia Rosatone, Manager of Convocations and Governance Committees Secretary,
Office of the Governing Council
Ms Emily Sadowski, President, Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students
Ms Maureen Somerville, Chair, College of Electors

IN ACCORDANCE WITH A DETERMINATION BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE PURSUANT TO SECTION 38 OF BY-LAW NUMBER 2, THE GOVERNING COUNCIL CONSIDERED ITEM 1 *IN CAMERA*.

IN ACCORDANCE WITH A DETERMINATION BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE PURSUANT TO SECTION 70 (K) OF BY-LAW NUMBER 2, THE GOVERNING COUNCIL CONSIDERED ITEM 2 IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE *IN CAMERA*

1. Senior Appointments

(a) Deputy Provost

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT Professor Vivek Goel be appointed Deputy Provost for a three and one-half year term from January 1, 2003 to June 30, 2006.

1. Senior Appointments (cont'd)

(b) Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT Professor Safwat Zaky be appointed as Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget for a four-year term from July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2007.

2. Proposed Property Transaction

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT, notwithstanding the terms of reference of the Governing Council Boards and Committees, the Governing Council consider a proposed property transaction on the basis of the recommendation of the Business Board arising from a Special Meeting held on February 11, 2003.

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL RESOLVED ITSELF INTO COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT the consideration of the proposed property transaction be continued *in camera* and that the following people be invited to participate in the discussion: Mr. Beaton, Mr. Bisanti, Ms Bloch-Nevitte, Ms Brown, Mr. Chee, Professor Farrar, Dr. Fitzpatrick, Professor Goel, Professor Hildyard, Dr. Levy, Professor McCammond, Mr. Moate, Ms Riggall, and Professor Venter.

The Committee of the Whole adopted a recommendation concerning a property acquisition.

THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE ROSE TO MAKE ITS REPORT TO THE COUNCIL.

The Governing Council returned to Open Session and the Vice-Chair reported that the Committee of the Whole had considered a property transaction and recommended an acquisition.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

Subject to the understanding that, pursuant to its terms of reference and following the purchase, the University Affairs Board will have the opportunity to consider the proposed operating plan and structure of the residence operations,

THAT the proposal to acquire the Toronto Colony Hotel, outlined in the memorandum dated February 7, 2003 from the Vice-President, Business Affairs and considered by the Business Board on February 11, 2003, be approved.

2. Proposed Property Transaction (cont'd)

At the invitation of the Chair, Professor Hildyard addressed the Governing Council briefly. She indicated that the University would now enter into negotiations with the union representing the employees. She acknowledged that some positions would likely be eliminated, but that these cases would be addressed with full consideration for the employer's responsibility for severance entitlements and for other aspects of the collective agreement.

A handout on Frequently Asked Questions on the University's newest student residence, prepared by the Public Affairs Department, was distributed to members and guests.

3. Chair's Remarks

(a) Welcome

The Chair welcomed members and guests and announced the resolutions approved by the Council during its *in camera* session.

(b) Senior Appointments

Professor Vivek Goel was asked to stand and be acknowledged as the new Deputy Provost. Professor Safwat Zaky was introduced as the Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget, effective July 1, 2003.

(c) Speaking Requests from Non-Members

The Chair said that there had been two requests from outside speakers, and he had granted both. Ms Sadowski of the Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students would speak to item 5. Mr. Jason Price, Vice-President, Graduate Students' Association, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto (OISE/U)T, would speak for three minutes under Other Business.

(d) Audio web-cast

The Chair reminded members that the meeting was being broadcast on the Web.

4. Report of the President

(a) Honorary Degrees

A summary of the President's Report had been placed on the table. Professor Birgeneau began by recalling the special pleasure he had at this time each year of reporting on the honorary degree acceptances. He was pleased to report that all individuals who had been approved at the December meeting for the awarding of an honorary degree had accepted the offer. These were: Mr. Richard Bradshaw, Dr. Jerome Bruner, Dr. Marsha Chandler, Mr. Terrence J. Donnelly, Mr. Atom Egoyan, Dr. Hans Eichner, Dr. Owen Fiss, Mr. Warren Goldring, Dr. Evert Hoek, Dr. Terence Kavanagh, Mr. John Lawson, Dr. Douglas Lucas, Mrs. Anne Mirvish, Mr. David Mirvish, Mr. Ed Mirvish, Dr. Robert V. Moody, Dr. Philippe Nozières, Dr. Sylvia Ostry, Mr. Arthur R.A. Scace, Dr. Ruth J. Simmons, Mr. Jeffrey Skoll, and Dr. Bruce G. Trigger.

4. Report of the President (cont'd)**(b) Empire Club Address**

The President reported that he had spoken at the Empire Club during the previous week and the text of his address was at <http://www.utoronto.ca/president/060203.htm>.

(c) Professor Catherine Kallen

Earlier in the week, the President had attended a physics conference in Colorado. He told members about a public lecture given in the Aspen Opera House by Professor Catherine Kallen of McMaster University, one of Canada's leading theoretical physicists. In her talk, entitled "Superconductors and the Physics of Everything," she related her path from being an educational dropout living on her own in her mid-teens to completing degrees at the University of British Columbia and Harvard University, to becoming one of the leading world physicists. The President commented that this was an example of how excellence in public education could support non-traditional learning paths.

(d) Academic Planning: Presentation and Discussion

President Birgeneau invited Professor Neuman to speak about the academic planning exercise. Professor Neuman noted that the green papers were now available on the web at <http://www.utoronto.ca/plan2003/> and in the January 13 issue of *The Bulletin*. The green paper discussion would provide the foundation for the later white paper plan. Twelve town hall meetings had taken place. In addition, she had met with the Presidents of the Alumni Associations and the President's Circle group. Professor Farrar had met with student groups and, over all, broad consultation had been undertaken over the past several months. She was pleased with the variety of interests represented among the more than 1,200 people who had come out to the town hall meetings. She had heard great support for the green paper process and had received good input on the student experience, equity and diversity, quality of teaching, creative recruitment and retention, training and career planning for staff and space for students. The latter focused on the need for space for studying, for informal social gatherings, for athletics and for prayer. Participants had commented that additional emphasis should be placed on lifelong learning and continuing education, technology issues and how retiring faculty could continue to contribute to the University community.

The academic planning exercise was continuing to move forward but at a slower pace to allow more deliberation and consultation for the development of the white paper. During the next eight weeks, Professor Neuman would be drafting the white paper. Once the draft was released, there would be a series of round table and sector group discussions. For example, she hoped to meet with staff groups, groups of untenured assistant professors, tenured professors, etc. That consultation would take place for most of May and June with the intent that the white paper would come to governance in September.

She thanked members of the community for their constructive suggestions and debate. Today had been the deadline set for submissions from divisions and sectors, and she hoped that any who had been unable to meet that deadline would be able to get their comments in soon, so as to have them included in the background to drafting the white paper.

A member commented that he had attended a number of the town hall meetings and wished to congratulate the Provost for her patience and presentation. The process was

4. Report of the President (cont'd)**(d) Academic Planning: Presentation and Discussion (cont'd)**

open and transparent and, in his view, this was a tremendous responsibility for a senior administrator who had been here less than a year. He thought she was listening well and receiving good support from members of the community.

Another member was concerned that the planning process had been constrained to familiar models. Student groups advocated the re-envisioning of the larger questions of the University's relationship to the community at large. In particular, post-secondary education should be seen like health care as a basic need and basic right, with no tuition fees and no other physical barriers. The plan papers should contain specific undertakings to ensure ramps to all buildings within five years and to work with the community to achieve legislation providing university education without user fees as a basic right. The Chair reminded the member that the Provost had invited written submissions from the University community as part of the planning process.

(e) Innovation Agenda

The President spoke about the innovation agenda. He recalled that he had been asked at the previous meeting to speak to the implications of the commitment, made by the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC), to a doubling of faculty research productivity and a tripling of commercialization as part of the Government of Canada's innovation agenda. That commitment was based on a doubling of Federal funding for university research. This would almost certainly represent a gain for the University. At the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC), for example, 73% of this university's research-grant applications were judged as fundable, but only 47% could be funded. A doubling of funding would clearly have been of great benefit. At the Canadian Institutes for Health Research (CIHR) 60% of applications nationally were deemed fundable, but only 31% could be funded. At the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council (NSERC), 89% of the University of Toronto's applications were funded, but the grant selection committee had reported that, on average, the successful applications deserved double the funding they had received. Therefore a doubling of funding would only begin to meet the University's current needs. In addition, the new wave of faculty recently hired were extraordinarily ambitious in their research and educational activity. With respect to commercialization of the intellectual property developed by faculty, Canada had some distance to go. The President stressed that he measured the success of commercialization neither by the number of patents nor the amount of money generated, but rather by the number of high-quality, challenging jobs created for the people of Ontario – jobs enabling them to enjoy significant improvements in the quality of their lives.

A member expressed concern about the trend toward commercialization of research. Although he saw positive outcomes, he wondered how the University could maintain the sanctity of basic research. The President replied that the University was very supportive of basic research while at the same time recognizing its need to meet its obligations as a public university.

**5. Capital Project: University of Toronto at Scarborough, Parking Expansion and Renovation – Project Planning Report
UTSC Parking Ancillary: Fee Increases**

Professor Cummins proposed a capital project for the expansion of the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC) parking facilities and right-of-way improvements. A total of 2,399 parking spaces would be created at a total project cost of \$10.150 million. The space and the cost would be shared by Centennial College.

Mr. Shalaby added that the administration had made a convincing case to the Business Board for the urgency of this project. With four UTSC capital projects underway and a Centennial College Building nearing completion on a UTSC site, together with the significant growth in enrolment anticipated in 2003, it was evident that the project was needed and that the business plan could support it.

Dr. Nestor was invited to speak on behalf of the University Affairs Board, which had also reviewed this project. In considering the motion for concurrence, UAB had focused on its primary areas of responsibility – service level, viability of the ancillary and parking fees. Members had agreed that the project was urgently needed and had concurred with support in principle.

Dr. Nestor noted that, with respect to the approval of increases in parking rates, ancillary rates were normally approved on an annual basis by the University Affairs Board. This departure from the usual process had arisen because the business plan for the project required the revenue from these increases to support the mortgage costs up to the end of the planning period in 2007-08. In order to ensure full transparency, it was, therefore, important that the rate increases be pre-approved concurrently with the approval of the project in principle.

It was duly moved and seconded

THAT the Project Planning Report for the Expanded and Renovated Outer Parking Facilities at the University of Toronto at Scarborough, to allow for the provision of a total of 2,399 parking spaces and Right of Way Improvements, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 116 of the Academic Board as Appendix B, be approved in principle;

THAT the project cost of \$10,150,000 be approved, with the funding sources for the Outer Parking Facilities and the Right of Way Improvements to be as follows:

For the Outer Parking Facilities,

- i) UTSC Parking Ancillary allocation of \$232,000
- ii) Contribution identified with the Academic Resource Centre project of \$184,000
- iii) Financing of a mortgage in the amount of \$7,797,953 to be repaid from the parking fee revenues over a 25 year amortization period at 8% per annum

For the Right of Way Improvements,

- iv) Contribution from Centennial College for \$790,000 to support right-of-way improvements consistent with an agreement with Centennial College,
- v) Contribution from UTSC of \$1,110,000 derived from the funds received from the Centennial College SuperBuild Lease Agreement.

**5. Capital Project: University of Toronto at Scarborough, Parking Expansion and Renovation – Project Planning Report (cont'd)
UTSC Parking Ancillary: Fee Increases (cont'd)**

and

THAT, to meet the funding requirements of the Outer Parking Facility, approval be given to allow the University of Toronto at Scarborough parking ancillary to increase fees by 25% in each of 2003-04 and 2004-05 and by a minimum of 5% for each of 2005-06, 2006-07, and 2007-08, with the understanding that an increase of a higher percentage may be approved by the University Affairs Board on an annual basis, if needed to meet currently unforeseen circumstances.

A member recalled that there had been discussion at the Academic Board and at the University Affairs Board about the loss of trees due to this project, and he asked for clarification of how many. Professor Venter responded that a good number of trees had been cleared but that, due to poor soil, virtually all of the trees were either scrub brush or diseased.

A motion to amend was made by a member and was ruled out of order by the Chair, who advised that the appropriate motion would be to refer the matter back to the Academic Board.

It was duly moved and seconded

THAT the motion be referred back to the Academic Board with a view to increasing the project cost by \$100,000 that will be targeted at replenishing the tree population.

Speaking to his motion, the member said that it would be fairly simple and a nice gesture if \$100,000, or 1% of the project cost, could be spent on this, which would make a large difference to the environment and to the students.

The vote on the motion to refer back was defeated.

The vote on the main motion was carried.

The discussion of this item was interrupted repeatedly by comments from non-members who had not been invited to speak.

6. Policy for Compulsory Non-Academic Incidental Fees – Proposed Revisions

Dr. Nestor informed members that the revisions proposed by this resolution had been under consideration for approximately five years. Extensive consultation had taken place among students, members of student governments, current and former assessors to the University Affairs Board and other members of the administration. The revised policy addressed concerns that had been expressed at all of those levels about how the policy, in its current form, was unfair to a large number of students and out-of-line with how students' fees were assessed at other Ontario universities.

Dr. Nestor stressed that this proposal did not include the changed definitions of part-time or full-time students, course loads, etc., since those definitions were the responsibility of

6. Policy for Compulsory Non-Academic Incidental Fees – Proposed Revisions (cont'd)

the academic divisions. Rather, the Policy proposed changes in the way non-academic incidental fees were assessed. The proposed changes revised the Policy to be more fair to students and to better align with the new academic definitions of part-time and full-time students. The recommendations were strongly supported by members of the University Affairs Board.

It was duly moved and seconded,

THAT the amendments to the *Policy for Compulsory Non-Academic Incidental Fees*, as outlined in the January 10, 2003 proposal included in Appendix “B” to Report Number 112 of the University Affairs Board, be approved, to be effective 1 May 2003.

At the invitation of the Chair, Ms Emily Sadowski, President of the Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students (APUS), addressed Governing Council. She noted that, hidden in the policy, was a change in the definition of full-time student from those taking an 80% or higher course load to those taking a 60% or greater course load, which had implications for students. She suggested that the change be dealt with only at the University of Toronto at Scarborough, where the trimester system was being introduced. She commented that, while some part-time students would pay less for non-academic incidental fees under the proposed policy, others would pay more. She expressed concern that there were many implications to the change in definition that had not been considered, and asked that the Governing Council request a report on this matter from the University Affairs Board.

The Chair thanked Ms Sadowski for her remarks, and noted that the proposed policy revisions dealt with the collection of non-academic incidental fees and not the change in definition of part-time and full-time students.

A member asked what the implications would be for students if this policy was approved. Dr. Nestor replied that the policy aligned the non-academic incidental fees to the definition of full-time and part-time students in the academic divisions. The member asked what the consultation process had been. At the invitation of the Chair, Ms Addario replied that the policy changes had been under consideration since 1999. The policy was being brought forward at this time because of the changes in definition of full-time and part-time students that had been approved by the Faculty of Arts and Science and the University of Toronto at Mississauga, as well as the implementation of the trimester system at the University of Toronto at Scarborough. All student governments had been informed of the proposed changes, and a meeting had been held with representatives of student governments to discuss the matter.

The Chair, after observing that the questions being raised appeared to be repeating those raised at the University Affairs Board, declared an end to the questions for clarification and invited debate on the proposal.

A member asked what effect the change in definition of full-time and part-time students would have on Basic Income Units (BIUs) for the University, on the UTAPS program, and on elections. The Chair reminded the member that the policy being considered for approval dealt with non-academic incidental fees, and not with the definition of part-time and full-time students.

6. Policy for Compulsory Non-Academic Incidental Fees – Proposed Revisions
(cont'd)

On motion duly made and seconded,

It was RESOLVED that the question be put.

The motion carried with the necessary two-thirds majority.

The vote on the main motion was carried.

During the discussion of a subsequent item, a member raised a procedural concern.

It was duly moved and seconded,

THAT the ruling of the Chair, allowing the question to be called on the Policy for Compulsory Non-Academic Incidental Fees, be appealed.

The vote was taken.
The appeal was defeated.

The discussion of this item was interrupted repeatedly by comments from non-members who had not been invited to speak.

7. Creation of Assistant Vice-President Position

The President was invited to introduce the item. He indicated that the designation of the position at the Assistant Vice-President level was necessary to attract candidates with the appropriate level of expertise and credibility. The new position would be accommodated within the current budget envelope of the Vice-President, Human Resources.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT the creation of the position of Assistant Vice-President, Human Resources be approved, effective April 1, 2003.

8. Process for Consideration of Tuition Fee Schedule and Budget Proposals

The Chair invited the Vice-Chair to speak to this item which had come forward from the Executive Committee. Ms Patten reviewed briefly the proposal which had been circulated with the agenda package, noting that the proposed process reaffirmed and formalized existing conventions. It alerted members who wished to oppose discrete parts of the tuition fee schedule or budget proposal that the appropriate motion to be made was a motion to refer back the entire proposal. The process was flexible in that it gave the Chair the discretion to apply it in most cases, but to depart from it where that seemed advisable or preferable for the benefit of Council.

8. Process for Consideration of Tuition Fee Schedule and Budget Proposals (cont'd)

It was duly moved and seconded

THAT the Governing Council consider each of the following as integrated proposals:

- the tuition fee schedule for publicly funded programs,
- long-term budget guidelines or frameworks, and
- budget reports,

and that any member who opposes a part(s) of these proposals put forward, after a full debate on the entire proposal, a motion to refer back to the appropriate Board the entire proposal with a view to reconsidering the relevant part(s); and

THAT motions to amend the above proposals or to divide the proposals for separate consideration could be ruled out of order at the discretion of the Chair.

A member expressed his support of the underlying rationale for the proposal, stating that he thought that dividing or amending a tuition or budget proposal on the floor of a Governing Council meeting would usually not be a good idea. However, the member raised three concerns with the proposal being recommended. The first of those concerns was that the proposed motion had permanent application, and he thought it unwise to constrain future Councils based on temporary circumstances due largely to the current fiscal situation. The member also saw the motion as constraining the rules of order as defined in *By-Law Number 2*, in effect establishing a "standing order," and he believed that would set an inappropriate precedent. Finally, he believed the proposal transferred too much power to the Chair.

Several other members echoed those sentiments. Speaking to their concerns, the Chair noted that the resolution already had the authority that was expressed in the motions adopted by Governing Council in 1978 following the Macdonald review of governance and by the Governing Council's approval of the Balfour Report in 1988. It had been a long-standing convention that the Governing Council could not amend proposals from its Boards, but had only the options to accept, to reject or to refer back. Successive Chairs had been applying those conventions for some time. This proposal was an attempt to focus the procedural debate in a transparent way, apart from and prior to the important substantive debate on tuition fees and budget.

It was duly moved and seconded,

THAT the time of adjournment be extended to 6:30 p.m.

The motion was carried with the necessary two-thirds majority.

Professor Neuman was asked to speak to the feasibility of dividing motions on tuition and the budget. She began by stating that any changes on the floor to such a significant and interconnected proposals as the tuition fee schedule and the budget would create serious problems for the University. A change in any part of either of those items would have an effect on other parts. These were proposals that realistically could not be amended in any way without resulting in a considerable amount of redrafting by the administration.

8. Process for Consideration of Tuition Fee Schedule and Budget Proposals (cont'd)

There would most certainly be need to go back to base premises and assumptions and determine a revised approach to bring forward. This year, that would be particularly difficult, given that the University was facing its greatest fiscal challenge in twenty years. There was not a lot of flexibility in approach to presenting responsible financial proposals this year.

A member spoke strongly in favour of the motion, noting that, by convention, the effects of this resolution had been in force for many years anyway. The option to refer back was always available to the Council, and he agreed with the critical importance of presenting the tuition fee and budget proposals in a "whole cloth" manner. In his view, the adoption of this resolution would do no more than signal to the Chair that members were aware of his authority and would focus on substantive, rather than procedural, debate at the time the items were brought forward.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT the question be referred back to the Executive Committee for further consideration.

9. Minutes of the Previous Meeting: December 12, 2002

The Minutes of the meeting of December 12, 2002 were approved.

10. Business Arising from the Minutes of the Previous Meeting

The Chair reminded members that the information requested on the gender and racial distribution of honorary degree recipients had been distributed to members. The President had responded to a question that had been raised at the previous meeting concerning the Innovation Agenda. The Chair stated that there were no other items of outstanding business arising from the minutes of the previous meeting.

A member asked what steps were being taken by the University to address gender distribution in honorary degree recipients, Canada Research Chair allocation, and Governing Council elections. The Chair noted that, with respect to honorary degrees, the University had urged all members and the public to put forward nominations for members of the under-represented groups.

11. Reports for Information

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

Report Number 116 of the Academic Board (January 16, 2003)
Report Number 122 of the Business Board (January 20, 2003)
Report Number 112 of the University Affairs Board (January 21, 2003), and
Report Number 356 of the Executive Committee (February 3, 2003)

A member raised a question concerning one of the reports.

11. Reports for Information (cont'd)

Report Number 356 of the Executive Committee, Item 7(d), Notice of Motion regarding the Proposed Canada Post-Secondary Education Act of the Canadian Association of University Teachers (CAUT)

A member noted that the response provided by the administration to his notice of motion "that an ad hoc Governing Council committee including student governors and administrators be struck to examine CAUT's proposed Education Act, exploring the possibility of a spring forum," had not been included in Report Number 356 of the Executive Committee. The member distributed a document containing his response to the information provided by the administration at the February 3 meeting of the Executive Committee, and indicated that he would continue to bring this matter forward.

A member noted that the notice of motion had been withdrawn at the Executive Committee meeting of February 3. The member said that he would like to bring the motion forward again. The member gave notice of motion

THAT the Governing Council set up an ad hoc committee to discuss federal-provincial legislation for post-secondary education analogous to the Canada Health Act.

The Chair observed that the proposal might well be deemed out of order because it had been dealt with previously by the Executive Committee within the past twelve months. The member objected vigorously to that interpretation. The Chair suggested that the member attend the next meeting of the Executive Committee to make his case.

Consideration of the item was interrupted repeatedly by comments from non-members who had not been invited to speak.

12. Next Meeting

The Chair reminded members that the next regular meeting of the Governing Council was scheduled for Thursday, April 3, 2003 at 4:30 p.m.

13. Question Period

A member asked how item 7, Process for Consideration of Tuition Fee Schedule and Budget Proposals, had come to be placed on the Agenda. The Chair responded that item 7 was a recommendation of the Executive Committee.

14. Other Business

(a) Address by Non-Member

The Chair invited Mr. Jason Price to address the Council. Addressing the Council on behalf of the Aboriginal and non-aboriginal graduate students of the Indigenous Education Network, Mr. Price spoke to several concerns that he thought, if addressed, would go a long way to ameliorating the inequities experienced by aboriginal people at the University of Toronto. He expressed his concern with the University's procedure for determining the eligibility of aboriginal students for student financial support. That formula inappropriately took into account assistance provided to aboriginal students by their band councils. He commented on the under representation of aboriginal faculty at

14. Other Business (cont'd)**(a) Address by Non-Member (cont'd)**

the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto (OISE/UT) and other divisions of the University. There should, he believed, be an acknowledgement that the University of Toronto was built upon aboriginal lands. Therefore, there should be respect for and a working knowledge of aboriginal customs, ceremonies and cultural/spiritual practices. This would prevent misunderstandings of the kind that occurred when doors were broken down in response to smoke from the ceremonial burning of sweet grass in a University building. Cross-cultural understanding would build an open, inclusive and culturally respectful environment.

Mr. Price cited the euro-centric curriculum and the lack of aboriginal faculty in the Department of Curriculum, Teaching and Learning at OISE/UT as a significant concern for a division that largely existed for professional upgrading of teachers. Finally, he spoke of other Ontario universities where cultural awareness was an important component of the institutional mission and hoped that the University of Toronto could improve in addressing the needs of aboriginal students in its equity and diversity objectives.

The Chair thanked Mr. Price for his comments and the President indicated that he agreed with the sentiments.

The meeting adjourned at 6:25 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

March 17, 2003