

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

Thursday October 31, 2002

MINUTES OF THE GOVERNING COUNCIL meeting held on Thursday,
October 31, 2002 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
Professor Mary Beattie
Dr. Robert Bennett
Mr. Mark Braun
Professor Philip Byer
Professor Brian Corman
Professor W. Raymond Cummins
Mr. Brian Davis
Dr. Claude Davis
Professor Sherwin Desser
Dr. Alice Dong
Dr. Inez Elliston
Ms Susan Eng
Dr. Shari Graham Fell
Professor Luigi Girolametto
Mr. Paul V. Godfrey
Mr. Gerald Halbert
Ms Durré Hanif
Professor Brian Langille
Professor Ian R. McDonald
Professor Michael Marrus
Mr. David Melville
Mr. Sean Mullin
Mr. Colm Murphy
Mr. George Myhal

Dr. John P. Nestor
Professor Shirley Neuman
Mr. Elan Ohayon
Ms Jacqueline C. Orange
Mr. John F. (Jack) Petch
Mr. Chris Ramsaroop
Mr. Timothy Reid
Mrs. Susan M. Scace
Mr. Amir Shalaby
Ms Carol Stephenson
Mr. John H. Tory
Professor Carolyn Tuohy
Mr. Robert S. Weiss

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

Secretariat:

Mr. Neil Dobbs
Ms Cristina Oke

Absent:

The Honourable William G. Davis
Professor Ellen Hodnett
Ms Shirley Hoy
The Honourable Henry N. R. Jackman
Professor David Jenkins
Ms Karen Lewis
The Honourable David R. Peterson
Dr. Joseph L. Rotman
Professor John Wedge

In Attendance:

Mr. Felix Chee, Vice-President, Business Affairs
 Dr. Sheldon Levy, Vice-President, Government and Institutional Relations and Interim Vice-Provost, Students
 Mr. John Bisanti, Chief Capital Projects Officer
 Dr. Beata FitzPatrick, Director of the Office of the President and Assistant Vice-President
 Ms Rivi Frankle, Assistant Vice-President, Alumni and Development
 Professor Derek McCammond, Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget
 Ms Mary McGee, Assistant Provost
 Ms Catherine Riggall, Assistant Vice-President, Facilities and Services
 Professor Ronald Venter, Vice-Provost, Space and Facilities Planning
 Professor Rona Abramovitch, Director, Transitional Year Program
 Ms Murphy Browne, African Heritage/Black Cultural Program, Toronto District School Board
 Mr. Terry Buckland, Executive Assistant, Arts and Science Students' Union
 Mr. Christopher Collins, President, Graduate Students' Union
 Professor David Farrar, Chair, Department of Chemistry and Vice-Provost, Students designate *
 Ms Georgina Gray, Director, University Events and Presidential Liaison, Advancement
 Mr. Andrij Harasymowycz, University Affairs Commissioner and Orientation Co-Chair, 2002, University College Literary and Athletic Society
 Mr. Mohammed Hashim, University Affairs Commissioner, Students' Administrative Council
 Mr. Craig Hegins, Member, College of Electors
 Mr. Paul Holmes, Judicial Affairs Officer, Office of the Governing Council
 Mr. Rocco Kusi-Achampong, President, Students' Administrative Council
 Mr. John Lea, Vice-President, Operations, Students' Administration Council
 Mr. Ken Lavin, Chair, University and External Affairs Committee, University of Toronto Faculty Association
 Ms Margaret McKone, Administrative Manager, Office of the Governing Council
 Ms Kristine Maitland, Member, College of Electors
 Professor Paul Perron, Principal, University College
 Ms Emily Sadowski, President, Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students
 Ms Nadalina Reid, Executive Secretary, Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students
 Ms Maureen Somerville, Chair, College of Electors
 Mrs. Beverley Stefureak, Assistant Secretary of the Governing Council
 Ms Barbara Thompson, President, University of Toronto Alumni Association

* not present for Item 1

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*.

1. Senior Appointment: Vice-Provost, Students

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT Professor David Farrar be appointed as Vice-Provost, Students, for a six and one-half -year term from January 1, 2003 to June 30, 2009, subject to Senior Salary Committee approval of his compensation arrangements.

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL RETURNED TO OPEN SESSION.

2. Chair's Remarks

(a) Welcome

The Chair welcomed members and guests to the meeting. He acknowledged the presence of Ms Maureen Somerville, Chair of the College of Electors, and other members of the College who were present at the meeting. He also recognized Ms Barbara Thompson, President of the University of Toronto Alumni Association, who was in attendance.

(b) *In Camera* resolutions

The Chair announced the resolution approved by the Council during its *in camera* session: the appointment of Professor David Farrar as Vice-Provost, Students, effective January 1, 2003.

At the invitation of the Chair, Professor Neuman introduced Professor Farrar to those present. Professor Neuman noted that Professor Farrar, an inorganic chemist, had joined the University of Toronto faculty in 1981 after completing his B.Sc. and M.Sc. degrees at the University of Toronto and his doctorate at the University of Western Ontario. He had eight years of academic administrative experience: five years as Associate Chair, Undergraduate Students, and three years in his current position as Chair of the Department of Chemistry in the Faculty of Arts and Science. He was a model researcher/educator who believed that educating students was the most important facet of a faculty position at the University of Toronto. Professor Neuman indicated that Professor Farrar would lead the undergraduate and graduate student experience initiatives in the upcoming academic planning exercise.

Professor Neuman concluded by thanking members of the Advisory Committee for their work. Members and guests joined in applause to welcome Professor Farrar.

At the invitation of the Chair, Professor Farrar thanked members for approving his appointment and expressed enthusiasm for his new position.

(c) Address By Non-Member

The Chair noted that he had granted a speaking request received from Ms Murphy Browne, a part-time Woodsworth College student, part-time instructor and historian in the African Heritage/Black Cultural Program of the Toronto District School Board, and a facilitator in the African Studies Program of the University of Toronto.

On motion duly made and seconded

IT WAS RESOLVED

THAT the order of the agenda be varied to allow Ms Browne to address the Council immediately, rather than under Other Business.

3. Address by a Non-Member

(a) Remarks

At the invitation of the Chair, Ms Murphy Browne addressed the Council. She described the reductions to funding for public education that were being made by the provincial government, and reminded members that a supervisor had been appointed to take over the role of elected trustees of the Toronto District School Board.

She informed members that the African Heritage Program, which had been established in 1977, was in danger of being cut, even though there was a demand for the program. She expressed concern that many black children did not attend university, and requested that members of the Governing Council examine what was happening to public education, and write to the Premier of Ontario and members of the provincial legislative assembly.

(b) Notice of Motion

A member gave a Notice of Motion:

Whereas the Governing Council of the University of Toronto recognizes the importance of a quality and universally accessible elementary and secondary education system,

Whereas the Toronto District School Board has been taken over by the province of Ontario due to an inability to meet demanding budgetary restraints due to provincial cuts and downloading

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Governing Council of the University of Toronto direct the administration of the University of Toronto to undertake a study on the impact provincial budgetary cuts have had on admissions to the University of Toronto.

This study would examine the impact budgetary restrictions have had on admissions of students who are from Toronto and the surrounding areas' diverse, multicultural, and multilingual communities.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the Governing Council supports the free, democratic representation provided by elected trustees and invites these elected representatives of public education in the City of Toronto to participate in a coalition to preserve public education at the elementary, secondary and post-secondary levels.

The President indicated his empathy with the concerns expressed by Ms Browne.

4. Minutes of the Previous Meeting, September 19, 2002

The minutes of the previous meeting held on September 19, 2002 were approved.

5. Business Arising from the Previous Meeting

The Chair reported that two items of Business Arising had been dealt with at the Executive Committee – the videotaping of Council meetings and health and safety issues with respect to the demolition of Varsity Stadium. The discussion was included in Report Number 353 of the Executive Committee.

A member referred to page 9 of the minutes of September 19, and asked whether information concerning non-provincial financial aid and professional programs was available. The Chair reminded the member that it was helpful to receive advance notice of such questions so that the appropriate information could be prepared. The member indicated his intention of circulating a document showing the average ScotiaBank loan held by students in professional faculties¹ and requested that a report containing updated information on non-provincial financial aid and professional programs be given at the next meeting of the Governing Council. The Chair ruled that this matter was not “business arising”, but the redebating of a matter already dealt with by the Governing Council.

It was duly moved and seconded,

THAT the ruling of the Chair, that the items that had been raised were not properly business arising from the minutes of the previous meeting, be appealed.

The member requested that the Chair step down because of a conflict of interest with respect to ScotiaMcLeod. The Chair replied that he had no current involvement with ScotiaMcLeod. The member later apologized for his remark.

The vote was taken.
The appeal was defeated.

The member raised the matter of videotaping meetings of the Governing Council, and noted that a guest was not being allowed to videotape a portion of the current meeting. The Chair stated that the matter could be considered under Other Business.

6. Report of the President

The President gave a presentation continuing on the theme of “University Education that Canadians Deserve” in which he made the following points:

- in the recent Speech from the Throne, the federal government had stated that ‘...Canada’s youth need and deserve the best education possible and Canada needs universities that produce the best knowledge and the best graduates.’
- With respect to the question raised at the previous meeting – could the University afford both to provide education for everyone and to be the best university – the University was funded by the province and was part of a system that presupposed that each university would admit its fair share of students. Managing increased enrolment was the issue that had to be addressed. Implementation of the framework for three-campus planning and the creation of

¹ The page was from the Report of the Vice-Provost, Students: Student Financial Support, 1999-2000, November 22, 2000; Appendix 2, Figure 5.

6. Report of the President (cont'd)

programs that were complementary to those already in place would strengthen the University.

- Academic planning was the key to moving forward. All academic units within the University would be asked to identify the major intellectual challenges facing their disciplines. The new faculty positions created through expansion and special programs were the most important resource available and had to be invested wisely.
- The University had to be willing to shift its focus away from areas that were becoming less important and to invest its constrained resources in areas that would be at the forefront of scholarship in the 21st century.
- Recruitment of faculty had to be broadly-based and pro-active. The best minds from around the world had to be brought to the University. Graduate faculty and programs had to attract the best international students to enhance quality and diversity. The undergraduate student body currently reflected the diversity of the Greater Toronto Area (GTA).
- The best faculty gave equal value to teaching and research, and combined research, scholarship and education in unique ways that shaped both the undergraduate and graduate experience. The importance of teaching had been recognized by the creation of the Office of Teaching Advancement. The creation of an Academy of University Teaching Fellows to celebrate the University's most distinguished undergraduate teachers had been suggested by the Committee of Deans on Undergraduate Education, and was being developed.
- The University did not have adequate resources to achieve its vision. An endowed Chairs program that would supplement the salaries and research support that could be offered to attract and retain high level of faculty was necessary. Sources of funding other than the operating budget were necessary for graduate student support that would allow the University to compete with other top schools for the best graduate students. Net tuition increases coupled with a strong needs-based student financial support program were another necessity.
- The Provost would be issuing discussion papers to the University community in the near future. Members of the Governing Council were encouraged to become involved and to support the senior leadership of the University in leading the University of Toronto to rank among the best public research universities in the world.

A member noted that the University was behind in faculty recruiting in comparison with its peer institutions, and asked whether anything else could be done. The President replied that, while salaries were lower at the University of Toronto than at universities in the United States, Europe or Japan, and research funding was less than that offered at other institutions, excellent faculty still chose to come to the University of Toronto for many reasons.

6. Report of the President (cont'd)

A member asked whether private funding goals would be realigned in light of realigned academic priorities. The President replied that the University would consider shifting resources if units made compelling cases for support that would enable them to move to the top of their discipline.

A member noted that the President had referred to teaching by top scholars as a way in which the student experience within the classroom was enhanced. He asked the President to comment on what the University needed to do to bring student experience outside the classroom to a leading level. The President replied that this would be one of the challenges faced by the newly-appointed Vice-Provost, Students. Current initiatives included the expansion of residence capacity to increase the residential character of the University and to build community, opportunities for undergraduate students to work with leading researchers and to further their own scholarship, and small group seminars and research courses such as the 199, 299 and 399 series courses offered in the Faculty of Arts and Science. The President noted that, given the enrolment at the University of Toronto, students had to be pro-active in seeking out such opportunities.

A member asked, given the anticipated increased enrolment, what steps the University was taking to ensure that incoming students who had graduated from a secondary school system affected by budget cuts would satisfy the University's need for high quality graduates. The President replied that the University had a responsibility to provide an appropriately high standard university experience to students who were entering the University. The largest increase in enrolment was expected at the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM) and the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC). The academic leaders of those campuses were developing programs that would enhance the experience of incoming students.

A member noted the decline in students who reported themselves as being members of a visible minority and asked what steps the University was taking to ensure that diversity increased. The President noted that the 3% decrease in undergraduate students was within the margin of error, and that about half of the students surveyed self-identified as coming from groups defined as visible minorities. He also noted that the University had no formal plan for increasing these numbers.

The member noted the correlation between diversity and accessibility, and commented that many students of colour could not afford to attend the University of Toronto. The member urged the University to find ways of communicating the funding guarantee to communities that were under-represented at the University, and to engage in dialogue with those communities.

The President described a program involving the Regent Park community that was funded by the University and by private sources. Through this program, students from Grade 8 onwards were encouraged to consider post-secondary education and financial support was made available to them.

A member suggested that it would be useful to the Council to receive a brief report summarizing the actions that were being taken by the University in the recruitment of students and of faculty to increase the diversity of the University.

The President noted that a study of scholarship acceptances indicated that visible minority students who were offered scholarships to several Ontario universities,

6. Report of the President (cont'd)

including the University of Toronto, were more likely to accept the University of Toronto scholarship. In his view, this was a positive reflection of the University's diversity.

A member asked how the University could ensure that the best candidates globally could be recruited for the faculty positions that would be available in the next few years. The President replied that a major change in federal law last year allowed international searches for all faculty positions, and that departments were being pro-active in their searches. Recent faculty hires reflected a wide range of backgrounds and cultures.

The Chair noted that the President's written report had been placed on the table, and invited members to raise any questions that they had. No questions were raised on the report.

7. Capital Project: University College Residence Expansion - Project Planning Report - Revised**(a) Approval**

Professor Cummins informed members that this capital project had come forward from the Academic Board for approval in principle. Because it was a residence project, the University Affairs Board and the Business Board had been asked to concur. The former Board looked at student life issues and fees and the latter Board at the business plan. After approval in principle by the Governing Council, Business Board usually dealt with the project at a second meeting when the recommendation to execute the project was considered. In this case, Business Board had dealt with the two issues, concurrence and execution, at the same time, with the result a firmer cost estimate for the building had been known. Planning and Budget and University Affairs Board had met first and were given a cost estimate of \$21.5 million but members were informed that a slighter higher cost was being considered. At the end of September, Business Board had considered the cost for execution of the project at \$22 million. When Academic Board met, the lower cost had been recommended by the Planning and Budget Committee but the cost estimate had been amended on the recommendation of the Provost. There was a corresponding change in the amount of the financing.

With respect to debate at the Board, members had asked about fees, which were not part of the Board's jurisdiction. There had been no other questions.

Mr. Shalaby reported that the Business Board's duty with respect to residence proposals was to examine the business plan to ensure that the financing could be repaid by the revenue from rents. In this case, the amount of rent revenue required had been reduced by various other sources of funding to be provided up-front. The Business Board had been satisfied with the business plan, and it had therefore concurred with the Academic Board's recommendation, subject to the understanding that the projected residence rates were the ones that were in fact charged over the years. The Board considered all major capital projects – usually after Governing Council approved them in principle – to authorize their execution. In this case, the Board had carried out that second step in advance, and had authorized the Vice-President, Business Affairs to proceed with construction, subject to Governing Council approval.

7. Capital Project: University College Residence Expansion - Project Planning Report - Revised (cont'd)**(a) Approval (cont'd)**

Dr. Nestor commented that, when the University Affairs Board had considered this motion, members had been made aware that there was a strong likelihood of the total cost increasing somewhat within the two weeks following the Board's meeting. The change would have been the outcome of more accurate costing and would have been accompanied by an increase in the number of beds. The Board had further understood that the change would have had no implications for those parts of this project that fell within its responsibility. Dr. Nestor concurred with the recommendation of the Academic Board on behalf of the University Affairs Board.

A member stated that, in his view, the proposed nine-story building was inappropriate for the proposed location.

At the invitation of the Chair, Mr. Chee reported that the City of Toronto had requested earlier in the week that the project site revert to an earlier site. Dr. Levy added that the need for affordable housing was crucial, and that the University would press the City to make a decision on this project as soon as possible.

A member expressed concern at the increased cost, since the number of storeys had been reduced from eleven to nine, and the number of beds had been reduced by nine. Mr. Bisanti replied that the planning for the residence had tried to balance cost with design.

A member asked what the rental disparity was between residence and off-campus accommodation. Dr. Levy replied that the University did not have exact figures on off campus housing costs.

A member spoke in favour of the project. He noted that, even after the completion of this residence, University College would still have the lowest percentage of residence space on the St. George campus for its students. He stated that the project planning process had been a model for student involvement, and that the University College students' society, the Literary and Athletic Society, had unanimously supported this project.

A member asked whether the entire residence would be accessible. Professor Venter replied that it had been concluded that rooms for students with special needs should be provided on a campus-wide basis rather than project by project. One room in this project was available for a student with disabilities, but the residence was designed to allow movement throughout the building. He noted that the allocation from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund (UIIF) was to provide accessibility to the drama studio in the adjacent University College Union building. Mr. Bisanti added that washrooms and corridors throughout the building were designed to be accessible.

A member asked for clarification concerning the recommendation being considered for approval, given the possible relocation of the project. Mr. Chee stated that Governing Council approval was for the scope, size, location and purpose of the capital project. If these changed, specifically if the residence was to be on a different site, the administration would seek Governing Council approval for the revised project.

At the invitation of the Chair, Professor Perron commented that University College had raised 55% of the necessary funds for the project.

7. Capital Project: University College Residence Expansion - Project Planning Report - Revised (cont'd)**(a) Approval (cont'd)**

On motion duly made and seconded

IT WAS RESOLVED

1. THAT the Revised Project Planning Report for the University College Residence Expansion be approved in principle;
2. THAT the project scope totaling approximately 7,400 gross square metres, allowing for the construction of the University College Residence Expansion on site 22, an approved building site, be approved;
3. THAT the project cost of \$22,000,000 be approved, with the funding sources as follows:
 - i) Donation from University College of \$2,500,000
 - ii) University College Residence Ancillary allocation of \$1,485,000
 - iii) University College Food Service allocation of \$800,000
 - iv) University Infrastructure Investment Fund allocation of \$70,000, and
 - v) Financing in the amount of \$17,145,000 to be repaid from residence fee revenues over a 25-year amortization period at 8 % per annum.

(b) Notice of Motion

A member gave the following notice of motion:

Be It Resolved

THAT the University of Toronto eliminate any rental disparity between colleges by creating a centralized fund to offset costs.

The Chair suggested that the Executive Committee should refer the motion to the University Affairs Board.

8. University Infrastructure Investment Fund: Allocation - Faculty of Information Studies

A member voiced his disapproval of consent agenda items, and raised two items: the use of T-cards for access to the lounge, and the accessibility of the lounge. Professor Neuman replied that the access was being controlled because the space was somewhat isolated. She also indicated that the space was accessible. The Chair reminded the Council that members with questions about consent items were asked to be in touch with the appropriate administrator well before the meeting. Members who had concerns about the approval of a consent item were asked to notify the Secretary in advance so that a

8. University Infrastructure Investment Fund: Allocation - Faculty of Information Studies (cont'd)

presentation of the item could be prepared by the Board Chair and appropriate officers invited to attend the meeting.

On motion duly made and seconded

IT WAS RESOLVED

THAT an allocation of \$35,000 be made from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund to address the partial cost of the dividing wall and related access doors to allow for the creation of student study space within the Faculty of Information Studies.

9. Consolidated Calendar of Business

The Chair encouraged members to use the Consolidated Calendar of Business to focus on issues that concerned them, and to track the progress of these issues through the Committee and Board level up to the Governing Council.

10. Reports for Information

Members received the following Reports for information

Report Number 114 of the Academic Board (October 7, 2002)
Report Number 120 of the Business Board (September 30, 2002)
Report Number 107 of the University Affairs Board (September 24, 2002)
Report Number 353 of the Executive Committee (October 18, 2002)

A member referred to the discussion on consent agenda items contained in Report Number 114 of the Academic Board, and he recommended that consent agenda items not be used at the Governing Council.

The member raised two issues. He asked how the election of students to the Academic Board could be re-instated. The member formally requested that the complete documentation for the Academic Appeals case described in Report Number 268 of the Academic Appeals Committee be circulated to members of the Governing Council. He noted that there was no avenue of appeal for the student involved, and indicated that financial need was an important aspect of the case.

A member suggested that it would be appropriate for the member to address these questions in writing to the Secretary of the Governing Council for appropriate action. The Chair stated that the questions would be forwarded to the Secretary and to the Chair of the Academic Board, who would reply in due course. A member asked whether these items would be addressed under Business Arising at the next meeting of the Governing Council. The Chair replied that there was no undertaking to do that. The matters would be dealt with as the Chair of the Academic Board advised.

A member reported that, earlier in the afternoon, she had raised two questions with the Governing Council Office. The first question was the legislative or by-law authority for the Council to prohibit videotaping, in particular videotaping public portions of Council

10. Reports for Information (cont'd)

meetings, other than voting. The Chair replied that this matter had been discussed and decided at the March 25, 2002 meeting of the Executive Committee, and further reviewed in the fall, as reported in Report Numbers 352 and 353 of the Executive Committee. The matter could be referred back to the Executive Committee. With respect to taping public portions of Council meetings, the Chair reminded members that Council meetings would be videotaped and web cast if the Executive Committee decided that it was warranted. The Executive Committee had decided that videotaping and web casting would only be done through arrangements made by the Governing Council Office.

A member referred to Section 3 (4) of the University of Toronto Act, 1971², and stated that the Executive Committee did not have the authority to prohibit videotaping of Council meetings.

It was duly moved and seconded

THAT the Governing Council reconsider the decision of the Executive Committee that video cameras would not be permitted in the Council Chamber for future meetings.

The motion was defeated.

The member repeated his position that the Executive Committee did not have the authority to disallow videotaping of Governing Council meetings.

11. Date of the Next Meeting

The Chair informed members that the next meeting of the Governing Council was scheduled for Thursday December 12, 2002 at the University of Toronto at Scarborough.

12. Other Business**(a) Student Experience**

A member asked the administration to keep in mind the various activities that limited the ability of students to be pro-active in pursuing opportunities of student experience outside the classroom. These included commuting time, hours of paid employment and workload.

(b) Notice of Motion

A member gave the following notice of motion:

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Governing Council of the University of Toronto review the sale of the St. George Medical Arts Building with a full and open process including consultation from the community on the future development of this site.

² The Executive Committee may deal with any matter that is within the responsibility of the Governing Council, but no decision of the Executive Committee is effective until approved by the Governing Council, or unless the Governing Council has previously assigned authority therefore to the Executive Committee.

12. Other Business (cont'd)

(c) Residence Expansion

A member requested an update on the status of residence expansion.

(d) Financial Issues

A member requested that the document he had provided on loans held by students in professional faculties be distributed to members. The member also made reference to two situations that had occurred during the first month of the fall term that he believed were related to the lack of financial means of students. One case was the academic appeal referred to earlier in the meeting. The second case was a technical invalidation of a nomination for election to a student seat on the Governing Council for an individual who was not a registered student by the end of the nomination period for the by-election to the Governing Council. The member understood that the individual had subsequently registered.

The meeting adjourned at 6:35 p.m.

November 14, 2002

Secretary

Chair