

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO  
**THE GOVERNING COUNCIL**

**Thursday, October 25, 2001**

MINUTES OF THE GOVERNING COUNCIL meeting held on Thursday, October 25, 2001 at 4:00 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall.

Present:

Ms Wendy M. Cecil (In the Chair)	Professor Ian R. McDonald
Dr. Thomas H. Simpson, Vice-Chair	Mr. David Melville
Professor Robert J. Birgeneau, President	Mr. Andrew Morgan
Professor Mary Beattie	Dr. John P. Nestor
Dr. Robert Bennett	Ms Jacqueline C. Orange
Professor Philip Byer	Ms Rose M. Patten
Professor Jack Carr	The Honourable David R. Peterson
Ms Mary Anne V. Chambers	Mr. Kashif Pirzada
Professor W. Raymond Cummins	Ms Patricia Ricci
Mr. Brian Davis	Mrs. Susan M. Scace
Dr. Claude Davis	Ms Heather Schramm
Professor Sherwin Desser	Ms Wendy Swinton
Dr. Alice Dong	Professor Donna Wells
Dr. Inez Elliston	Ms Geeta Yadav
Ms Susan Eng	
Dr. Shari Graham Fell	Mr. Louis R. Charpentier, Secretary of the Governing Council
Professor Luigi Girolametto	
Professor David Jenkins	
Ms Françoise Ko	<u>Secretariat:</u>
Professor Brian Langille	Mr. Neil Dobbs
Ms Karen Lewis	Ms Cristina Oke
Mr. Gerald A. Lokash	

Absent:

Professor Brian Corman	Dr. Joseph L. Rotman
The Honourable William G. Davis	Professor Adel S. Sedra
Mr. Paul V. Godfrey	Mr. Amir Shalaby
Ms Shirley Hoy	Ms Carol Stephenson
The Honourable Henry N. R. Jackman	Mr. John H. Tory
Professor Heather Munroe-Blum	Mr. Robert S. Weiss
The Honourable Robert K. Rae	

In Attendance:

Mr. Felix P. Chee, Vice-President – Business Affairs  
Dr. Jon S. Dellandrea, Vice-President and Chief Advancement Officer  
Dr. Sheldon Levy, Vice-President, Government and Institutional Relations  
Dr. Beata FitzPatrick, Director of the Office of the President and Assistant Vice-President  
Professor Vivek Goel, Vice-Provost, Faculty  
Professor Derek McCammond, Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget\*  
Professor Robert McNutt, Principal, University of Toronto at Mississauga

\* Not present for Item 1.

In Attendance (cont'd):

Professor Ian Orchard, Vice-Provost, Students  
Ms Susan Girard, Assistant Secretary of the Governing Council  
Ms Maureen Giuliani, incoming President, Graduate Students' Association, Ontario Institute  
for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto (OISE/UT)  
Ms Georgina Gray, Director of University Events and Presidential Liaison (Advancement)  
Professor Rhonda Love, President, University of Toronto Faculty Association  
Ms Mary McGee, Assistant Provost  
Professor Cecilia Reynolds, Associate Dean, Academic Program, OISE/UT  
Ms Elizabeth Sisam, Director, Campus and Facilities Planning  
Ms Maureen Somerville, Chair, College of Electors  
Mrs. Beverley Stefureak, Assistant Secretary of the Governing Council  
Ms Mary Ward, University Ombudsperson

IN ACCORDANCE WITH A DETERMINATION BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE  
PURSUANT TO SECTION 38 OF BY-LAW NUMBER 2, THE GOVERNING  
COUNCIL CONSIDERED ITEMS 1, 2 AND 3 *IN CAMERA*.

**1. Senior Appointment: Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget**

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT the appointment of Professor Derek McCammond as  
Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget, be extended for one year  
from July 1, 2002 to June 30, 2003.

**2. Board and Committee Appointment – Committee for Honorary Degrees**

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT Professor Janet Rossant be appointed a member of  
the Committee for Honorary Degrees for 2001-2002,  
effective immediately.

**3. Board and Committee Appointment – Academic Board**

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT Mr. David Melville be assigned to the Academic  
Board for 2001-2002, effective immediately.

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL RETURNED TO OPEN SESSION.

#### **4. Chairman's Remarks**

##### **(a) Welcomes**

The Chairman welcomed Mr. David Melville to his first meeting as a member of the Governing Council. He had been elected by acclamation earlier in October in the part-time undergraduate student constituency.

The Chairman also welcomed Mr. Felix Chee, who had taken up his position of Vice-President, Business Affairs on October 15.

##### **(b) College of Electors**

The Chairman welcomed Ms Maureen Somerville (Chair) and members of the College of Electors who were in attendance. The College was responsible for electing the alumni members of the Governing Council. They would be meeting informally after the Governing Council meeting.

##### **(c) In Camera resolutions**

The Chairman announced the resolutions approved by the Council during its *in camera* session: the one-year extension of the term of Professor Derek McCammond as Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget, the appointment of Professor Janet Rossant to the Committee for Honorary Degrees, and the appointment of Mr. David Melville to the Academic Board.

##### **(d) Council of Ontario Universities (C.O.U.) Briefing Notes**

The Chairman reviewed the documentation that had been placed on the table for the meeting. She commended to members' attention the C.O.U. Briefing Notes which they had received, and noted that the Notes provided a strong and clear Ontario-wide context for many of the issues that would be coming before the Council.

#### **5. Order of the Agenda**

It was AGREED to vary the order of the agenda to move forward the Annual Report of the Ombudsperson and the Administrative Response to follow the President's Report.

#### **6. Address By Non-Member: Graduate Students' Association of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto**

The Chairman reported that the Executive Committee had granted speaking privileges to the incoming President of Graduate Students' Association of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto (OISE/UT), subject to the five-minute time limit for all addresses by non-members to the Council.

Ms Giuliani said that while the University had garnered much favourable publicity from the press reports that graduate students would be receiving funding packages amounting to \$17,000 - \$22,000 per year, fewer than 50% of the graduate students at OISE/UT were receiving such packages. Some were receiving aid amounting to only \$3,000 to \$4,000 per year, and many were receiving no funding at all. While it was true that the proportion of

**6. Address By Non-Member: Graduate Students' Association of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto (cont'd)**

OISE/UT students receiving packages would increase to 80% in 2001-02, five years had passed since the merger, and a large gap remained. Given the high cost of tuition fees and living expenses, OISE/UT students could not wait. Many were desperate. PhD students at OISE/UT were among the University's professional-program students and should be treated in the same manner as other such students. Ms Giuliani presented a petition signed by 700 people calling upon the University to make available sufficient funding to provide full funding packages for all OISE/UT students.

The Chairman thanked Ms Giuliani for her remarks and invited the President and Professor Orchard to respond.

The President observed that he agreed with many of Ms Giuliani's remarks. OISE/UT was a very important component of the University. At the five-year point, the merger was proceeding very well, and the University had benefited from the expertise in education available at OISE/UT.

Professor Orchard recalled that the Task Force on Graduate Student Financial Support had highlighted OISE/UT as being a division in particular need, and the Provost had immediately added \$1.3-million of funding for graduate student support at OISE/UT. There were, nonetheless, shortfalls in student funding at OISE/UT and elsewhere. At the time of the merger, because of the nature of the flow of funding from the Province, it had been agreed that OISE/UT students would not be eligible for the existing University Open Fellowship Program. The University had therefore inherited a situation of inadequate graduate student funding from the independent OISE, and had been investing money to remedy the problem since the merger. While OISE/UT students had no access to the University's fellowship budget, they did have access to all new funding programs, and Professor Orchard was confident that the University would succeed in closing the funding gap in a short period of time.

He indicated that addressing the shortfall in student financial support at OISE/UT, and in other divisions with inadequate funding, was a priority.

**7. Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

The minutes of the previous meeting held on September 20, 2001 were approved.

**8. Business Arising from the Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

There was no business arising from the previous meeting.

**9. Report of the President**

**(a) Vice-President, Business Affairs**

The President repeated the welcome to Mr. Chee, and reaffirmed that Mr. Chee would be the Chief Financial Officer of the University as well as the Vice-President, Business Affairs. The President expressed his thanks to Ms Sheila Brown and Mr. Pierre Piché for their contributions as Acting Chief Financial Officer and Acting Controller, respectively.

## **9. Report of the President (cont'd)**

### **(a) Vice-President, Business Affairs (cont'd)**

The President also thanked Dr. Sheldon Levy for his work as Interim Vice-President, Business Affairs.

The President noted that, although there were now seven Vice-Presidents, only one position – that of Vice-President, Government and Institutional Relations – was new. The other vice-presidential positions represented a restructuring in responsibilities. The next challenge was to fill the position of Vice-President and Provost for July 1, 2002, when Professor Sedra would complete his extended term.

The President described the work of the Committee to Review the Office of the Vice-President and Provost, and indicated that the Report of the Committee was being drafted. The Advisory Committee on the Appointment of a Vice-President and Provost had held its first meeting.

### **(b) Federal Government Relations**

The President reported on meetings he had attended with senior government officials. He emphasized the importance of the innovation agenda to higher education in Canada. He highlighted the success of the University with respect to the Canadian Institutes of Health Research.

### **(c) Provincial Government Relations**

The President informed members that enrolment expansion was the main focus of attention in discussions with provincial government representatives. He identified two major issues: the size of the enrolment expansion and the need for capital funding. He explained that the participation rate was higher than had been predicted in any model, therefore the amount required to fully fund all new students in Ontario had increased by a factor of almost two. Although the overlap of the fiscal year of the government and the University might provide short-term relief, eventually there would be a shortfall in funding that would have to be addressed in order to maintain full average funding for the additional students.

The President reported that the provincial government had not yet made any further commitments with respect to capital funding beyond that already announced through SuperBuild.

### **(d) Municipal/Community Relations**

The President summarized the meetings that were being held with local municipal councillors to make them aware that the University was a major component of the municipal economy. He outlined the speech he had given to the Rotary Club on the University's outreach initiative at Seaton House. He described his interview on TVOntario by Allan Gregg. In response to concerns that some of his remarks in the television interview with respect to pension issues had seemed ambiguous, he clarified that, in June 2001, an enhancement of 30% of pensionable income up to \$38,000 (the Yearly Maximum Pensionable Earnings (YMPE)) had been approved for pre-1996 retirees on a six-month basis. That enhancement, as well as other possible enhancements for both retired and current faculty would be part of the current round of negotiations with the Faculty Association. He noted that his article on academic freedom which had been published in the *Toronto Star* had drawn a large amount of attention.

**9. Report of the President (cont'd)****(e) Recent Meetings of University Presidents/Executive Heads****(i) Council of Ontario Universities (COU)**

The President informed members that the main topics of discussion at the most recent COU meeting had been the funding of new students and student financial aid. Support for need-based student aid differed across Ontario universities. The President had advocated that the definition of merit-based aid should be rethought.

**(ii) Association of American Universities (AAU)**

The President described the recent meeting of the Association of American Universities (AAU). American universities were concerned that there could be a post-September 11<sup>th</sup> impact on foreign graduate students. The President also noted that a recent report of the United States Senate identified inadequate funding of research at the post-secondary level as the second greatest threat to American national security.

**(f) Security Issues on Campus in the wake of September 11**

The President reported that a number of false alarms and threats had been reported on the three campuses since September 11. The President distributed to members a copy of a memorandum from the Vice-President and Provost and the Vice-President, Human Resources outlining the policies in place regarding freedom of information and privacy protection which included the Policy on Access to Information and Protection of Privacy and the Policy on Access to Student Academic Records.

**(g) Special Events**

The President described the Gairdner Awards which were being celebrated after the meeting of the Governing Council. He also reminded members of the Governing Council of the Canada-Sweden celebration on November 16, which would mark the 100<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Nobel prize and which would also be a 175<sup>th</sup> Anniversary event.

The President invited questions. A member asked whether the President would meet with student groups to develop a more appropriate indicator of student need than the OSAP need assessment. The President replied that the question pointed to two very important matters: OSAP's evaluation of need and the nature of the aid it provided. This University was working with other institutions on this matter and university representatives had met with the Minister and Deputy Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities to discuss these questions.

A member asked how best to proceed to develop relationships with non-government organizations in order to establish an equity agenda in the broadest possible way. Noting that this matter fell within the portfolio of the Vice-President, Government and Institutional Relations, the President suggested that the member provide Dr. Levy with a list of suggestions.

## **10. Ombudsperson: Annual Report and Administrative Response**

The Chairman said that the University Ombudsperson was responsible to the Governing Council, through the Chairman. As part of this responsibility, she reported annually on her activities. The administration had prepared a response to the Report and both documents had been distributed to members.

Invited to comment on her report, Ms Ward highlighted the plans of the office for the coming year to enhance its presence on the three campuses and to increase the University community's awareness of the work of the office. She noted that the recommendations in the Report dealt with: graduate supervision; the timeliness of responses to petitions and appeals and actions under the Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters; the availability of information for international students; divisional guidelines/rules/regulations for assessment in clinical and field settings; the admissions appeal process; and restricted admission to part-time students.

The President indicated that he was pleased with the Report and with the recommended increased presence of the Ombudsperson on the three campuses.

A member asked whether graduate supervision affected the time to completion of degree, one of the annual Performance Indicators. Ms Ward replied that graduate supervision remained a key area of concern.

A member commented that there was no comment in the administrative response concerning Recommendation 2 in the Report. That recommendation had requested an update to the information provided last year regarding students' evaluation of graduate student teaching and supervision within the context of proposed changes to the 'Guidelines for the Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness in Promotion and Tenure Decisions'. Invited to reply, Professor Goel indicated that graduate student comments would be considered in the on-going review of the Divisional Guidelines.

A member noted the increase in the number of cases in the miscellaneous constituency, which included continuing education students, former employees and students, parents of students, applicants for admission, alumni and others.

A member referred to the 50% increase in the number of web-site visits and the 7% increase in the Office's case load, and inquired how the Office was using the web as a means of communication. Ms Ward replied that the web site was an information and referral resource rather than a conflict resolution mechanism.

The Chairman thanked Ms Ward for her report.

## **11. School of Graduate Studies: Proposed New Master of Financial Economics Program** **Enrolment Growth Fund: Allocation - Faculty of Arts and Science re M.F.E. Program**

Professor Carr said that the proposed program would be unique in North America and complementary to the Master of Mathematical Finance and the MBA programs. Initially, tuition revenue, net of student aid, would fund the program. When a steady-state enrolment of 22 was reached, a base allocation from the Enrolment Growth Fund would be transferred to the program. At the Academic Board, a member had

**11. School of Graduate Studies: Proposed New Master of Financial Economics Program**  
**Enrolment Growth Fund: Allocation - Faculty of Arts and Science re M.F.E. Program (cont'd)**

asked about the ability of the participating divisions to mount the program on existing resources. The Board had been assured that the divisions were prepared to do so and that the program had been a part of their academic plans.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT the proposal for the establishment of a Master of Financial Economics (M.F.E.) program, to be offered jointly by the Graduate Department of Economics and the Rotman School of Management, as described in the submission from the School of Graduate Studies dated May 7, 2001, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 108 of the Academic Board as Appendix "A", be approved, effective August 2002.

THAT an allocation of \$255,255 from the Enrolment Growth Fund to the Faculty of Arts and Science in support of the Master of Financial Economics program be approved, conditional on meeting the enrolment target.

**12. University Infrastructure Investment Fund: Allocation - Faculty of Arts and Science, Growth Facility for Plant Research**

Professor Carr reported that the Growth Facility project would cost \$6.9-million, \$5.6-million of which would come from external sources - the Canada Foundation for Innovation and the Ontario Innovation Trust. The project would provide greenhouse facilities on the rooftop of the Earth Sciences Complex and expansion of the growth chambers in the basement. The Academic Board recommended a \$374,000 allocation from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund. At the Board meeting, Professor Venter had reported on discussions with the City concerning possible relocation of elements of the current greenhouses.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT an allocation of \$374,000 from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund to the Faculty of Arts and Science for the University of Toronto Growth Facility for Plant Research be approved.



**13. Academic Priorities Fund: Allocation - Faculty of Arts and Science, University of Toronto at Mississauga, and the University of Toronto at Scarborough - Quality Enhancement in Undergraduate Commerce, Management and Business Programs**

Professor Carr said that the proposed allocations would be used for increased teaching-assistant support, additional computing equipment, improved program administration, better web communications, and support of student events and activities. There had been no questions on this item at the Academic Board.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT the following allocations from the Academic Priorities Fund for quality improvements in undergraduate commerce, management and business programs be approved:

- (a) \$278,037 one-time-only to the Faculty of Arts and Science,
- (b) \$171,519 one-time-only to the University of Toronto at Mississauga, and
- (c) \$120,000 one-time-only to the University of Toronto at Scarborough.

**14. Capital Project: University of Toronto at Scarborough - Academic Resource Centre Building - Change of Scope**

Professor Carr recalled that a considerable portion of the University's enrolment growth was planned for the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC) and the need for academic buildings was therefore urgent. Planning for the Academic Resource Centre building had been well advanced when the funding for enrolment growth was announced. The total scope of the building would change only slightly, but the library facilities within the building would be greatly expanded. The new classroom capacity, originally part of this project, would be provided in separate buildings. There had been no discussion of this item at the Academic Board.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

- (a) THAT the June 2001 Revisions to the Users' Committee Report for the Academic Resource Centre at the University of Toronto at Scarborough be approved in principle,
- (b) THAT the project scope of 3,104 net assignable square meters (nasm) of new space and 2,978 nasm of renovated space at a cost of \$19,980,500 with the funding sources as outlined below be approved:

SuperBuild/Centennial Lease	\$10.30 million
Private Sector Funds or Enrolment Revenue	9.91 million
Institutional Contribution	1.20 million
<b>Gross Income</b>	<b>21.41 million</b>

**14. Capital Project: University of Toronto at Scarborough - Academic Resource Centre Building - Change of Scope (cont'd)**

Remediation Cost Centennial	(1.25) million
Access to Opportunities Program	
Lab Commitment	(0.10) million
Due Diligence Costs	(0.08) million
<b>Net Income</b>	<b>19.98 million</b>

**15. Academic Priorities Fund, Academic Transition Fund, and Enrolment Growth Funds: Allocations**

- (a) **Academic Priorities Fund and Enrolment Growth Fund: Allocation - University of Toronto at Mississauga**
- (b) **Academic Priorities Fund: Allocation - Faculty of Arts and Science re Victoria University Programs in Renaissance Studies and in Literary Studies**
- (c) **Academic Transition Fund: Allocation - Faculty of Arts and Science and Divisional Campaign Expenses**

Professor Carr said that one-time-only allocations are being provided to help UTM meet enrolment expansion needs this year. Its program in Communication, Culture and Information Technology was also available for the first time to entering students this year. UTM's requests for the new program support and for enrolment expansion were interrelated. Members may recall that UTM's academic plan and the expected base allocation from the APF had not been approved pending the decision from MTCU on enrolment expansion funding.

With respect to the second proposed allocation, Professor Carr noted that specialist, major and minor programs in Renaissance Studies and in Literary Studies were offered in the Faculty of Arts and Science by faculty currently appointed to Victoria College. It was proposed that the three faculty members be transferred to the Faculty. Victoria University would transfer two thirds of their salaries and benefits, and a base-budget allocation from the Academic Priorities Fund was proposed to fund the remaining one third. There had been no debate on this item at the Academic Board.

With respect to the third proposal, Professor Carr said that the proposed one-time-only allocations from the Academic Transitional Fund would be used for laboratory modifications and equipment upgrades in two departments in the Faculty of Arts and Science. The proposed support for additional campaign expenses in the academic divisions arose from the extension of the Campaign goal to \$1 billion and the need to update the Campaign priorities.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

- (a) THAT the following one-time-only allocations be approved to enable the University of Toronto at Mississauga to meet enrolment expansion needs in 2001-02

- (i) \$800,000 one-time-only from the Enrolment Growth Fund; and

**15. Academic Priorities Fund, Academic Transition Fund, and Enrolment Growth Funds: Allocations (cont'd)**

- (ii) \$609,000 one-time-only from the Academic Priorities Fund.
- (b) THAT a base budget allocation of \$110,140 from the Academic Priorities Fund to the Faculty of Arts and Science be approved in support of the Victoria University Programs in Renaissance Studies and in Literary Studies.
- (c) THAT the following allocations from the Academic Transition Fund be approved:
  - (i) \$60,000 to the Faculty of Arts & Science for the purchase of microscale equipment by the Department of Chemistry;
  - (ii) \$60,000 to the Faculty of Arts & Science for upgrading observatories by the Department of Astronomy and Astrophysics;
  - (iii) \$950,000 for additional support to Divisional Campaign expenditures.

**16. Capital Project: University of Toronto at Mississauga - Parking Garage, Communication, Culture and Information Technology Building**

Professor Carr reported that the Academic Board had considered the proposal for a 400-space parking garage under the new Communication, Culture and Information Technology building at the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM). As part of the Mississauga master plan, new buildings were to be constructed on the sites of current parking lots. In addition, UTM was committed to maintaining the natural areas of its campus, which could otherwise have provided alternative sites for parking lots. The proposed garage, which would cost an estimated \$12.89 million, would be financed by a mortgage repaid entirely through the UTM parking ancillary. There had been no debate on the proposal at the Academic Board.

Ms Patten reported that the Business Board had also considered this proposal. Its terms of reference required the Board to review “major projects, plans or programs outside the normal course of business that required the balancing of expense and revenue (e.g. . . . parking structures).” The Business Board concurred with the recommendation.

Dr. Nestor reported that debate at the University Affairs Board had indicated agreement with the principles underlying this proposal. There was discussion about the realities of supply and demand and the viability of the projected parking rates in the City of Mississauga, where most parking was free. However, the Board was convinced of the likelihood that demand for the underground parking would significantly exceed the available spaces by the time the garage was ready for occupancy. The University Affairs Board therefore also concurred with the recommendation.

A member expressed concern that the proposal, combined with problems with public transportation, would make the Mississauga Campus accessible only by car. Invited to respond, Professor McNutt said that the Mississauga campus had regular bus service and its officers were in negotiations with the City of Mississauga to permit the establishment of a system of bus passes.

16. **Capital Project: University of Toronto at Mississauga - Parking Garage, Communication, Culture and Information Technology Building (cont'd)**

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

- (a) THAT the construction of the underground parking garage in conjunction with the construction of the Communication, Culture and Information Technology Building at the University of Toronto at Mississauga be approved in principle; and
- (b) THAT the project as identified be approved at a cost of \$12.892 million with financing carried by revenues from the UTM parking ancillary.

17. **Audit Committee Terms of Reference – Composition**

Ms Patten observed that the proposal was a housekeeping matter. The Audit Committee's terms of reference had to be amended to reflect the re-establishment of the position of Vice-President - Business Affairs, making the new Vice-President an *ex officio* member of the Audit Committee. The senior officer of the University responsible for financial matters who reports to the Vice-President would also be an *ex officio* member. Audit committees usually consisted of outside directors. Consistent with that model, both University officers would be non-voting members. To avoid the need for further housekeeping to accommodate future changes in administrative structure, the proposed terms of reference used generic descriptions of the positions rather than specific titles.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT section 1 of the terms of reference of the Audit Committee, "Composition," be amended to read as follows:

Membership is from 7 to 9 other than *ex officio* members, of whom a minimum of five will be members of the Business Board or members of the Governing Council. In addition, the following officers are *ex officio* non-voting members: the senior officer of the University reporting to the President who is responsible for financial matters, as so designated by the President; a second senior officer of the University responsible for financial matters, as so designated by the President; the Secretary of the Governing Council; and the Director, Internal Audit. Two-thirds of the voting members must be external to the University: that is, not faculty, staff or students. The Audit Committee is a technical rather than a representative committee. Its members are appointed on the basis of their expertise and interest.

**18. Reports for Information**

The Chairman noted that three Reports had been placed on the table for the meeting: Report Numbers 339 and 340 of the Executive Committee and Report Number 101 of the University Affairs Board. The Governing Council received the items reported for information in the following Reports:

- Report Number 108 of the Academic Board (October 4, 2001)
- Report Number 114 of the Business Board (October 9, 2001)
- Report Number 101 of the University Affairs Board (October 2, 2001)
- Report Number 339 of the Executive Committee (September 20, 2001)
- Report Number 340 of the Executive Committee (October 15, 2001)

Arising from Report Number 108 of the Academic Board, item 3 (The Year Ahead: The President's and Provost's Address) a member asked whether the University would be submitting recommendations to the review of the Ontario Student Assistance Program being undertaken by the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities. Professor Orchard replied that the University was represented on a Council of Ontario Universities' task force working on the matter. The President would also be forming a Task Force on Student Aid within the University. One of its terms of reference would include making recommendations on the OSAP program.

Arising from Report Number 340 of the Executive Committee, item 14 (Report of the President) a member noted discussion about an apparent request from the campus police to carry batons. A member of the Executive Committee replied that the campus police did not now carry batons and they had made no recent request to do so. Members of the Executive Committee had indicated that they would not favour any such action and had raised the matter in the context of security measures taken after September 11. It was agreed that Report Number 340 of the Executive Committee would be amended to reflect the fact that no recent request had been made.

**19. Date of the Next Meeting**

The Chairman reminded members of the Council's next meeting, scheduled for Thursday, December 20 at 4:30 p.m. The meeting would be held at the University of Toronto at Mississauga. A reception would follow at Lislehurst, the Principal's residence. As in previous years, the Secretariat would facilitate car-pooling arrangements for members.

**20. Question Period**

There were no questions raised.

**21. Other Business**

There were no items of other business.

The meeting adjourned at 5:35 p.m.

---

Secretary  
November 29, 2001

---

Chairman