

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO  
**THE GOVERNING COUNCIL**

**Thursday, June 29, 2000**

MINUTES OF THE GOVERNING COUNCIL meeting held on Thursday, June 29, 2000 at 3:30 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall.

Present:

Ms Wendy M. Cecil-Cockwell (In the Chair)	The Honourable Robert K. Rae
Ms Mary Anne V. Chambers, Vice-Chair	Professor Wendy Rolph
The Honourable Henry N. R. Jackman, Chancellor	Dr. Joseph L. Rotman
Professor J. Robert S. Prichard, President*	Mrs. Susan M. Scace
Professor Mary Beattie	Professor Adel S. Sedra
Dr. Robert Bennett	Professor Kenneth Sevcik
Mr. Brian C. Burchell	Mr. Amir Shalaby
Professor Jack Carr	Mr. Robert G. Spencer
Professor John R. G. Challis	Mr. Terrence L. Stephen
Professor W. Raymond Cummins	Ms Wendy Talfourd-Jones
Dr. Shari Graham Fell	Mr. John H. Tory
Professor Vivek Goel	Professor Ronald D. Venter
Dr. Anne Golden	Ms Nancy L. Watson
Dr. Robert J. Kyle	Dr. Alexander R. Waugh
Mr. Gerald A. Lokash	Ms Judith Wilson
Professor John T. Mayhall	Mr. Vilko Zbogar
Professor Ian R. McDonald	
Mr. Ahmed Rafi Mian	Mr. Louis R. Charpentier, Secretary of the Governing Council
Professor Heather Munroe-Blum	
Dr. John P. Nestor	<u>Secretariat:</u>
Mr. Elan Ohayon	Mr. Neil Dobbs
Ms Rose M. Patten	Ms Margaret McKone
The Honourable David R. Peterson	
Mr. Kashif S. Pirzada	

Absent:

The Honourable William G. Davis	Mr. Peter A. Herrndorf
Ms Shruti Dev-Nayyar	Professor Brian Langille
Ms Wanda M. Dorosz	Ms Jacqueline C. Orange
Mr. Ljupco Gjorgjinski	Professor Emmet I. Robbins
Mr. Paul V. Godfrey	

\* Not present for item 1.

In Attendance:

Professor David Cook, Vice-Provost  
Dr. Jon S. Dellandrea, Vice-President and Chief Development Officer  
Professor Michael G. Finlayson, Vice-President, Administration and Human Resources  
Professor Derek McCammond, Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget  
Professor Ian Orchard, Vice-Provost, Students  
Professor Carolyn Tuohy, Deputy Provost  
Mr. Robert G. White, Chief Financial Officer  
Professor Carl Amrhein, Dean, Faculty of Arts and Science  
Ms Susan Bloch-Nevitte, Director, Public Affairs  
Mr. W. G. Tad Brown, Finance and Development Counsel  
Professor Ian Clark, President, Council of Ontario Universities  
Mr. Matthew Cockburn, Torys  
Mr. Brian Davis, Torys  
Mr. Martin England, Assistant Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget  
Dr. Beata FitzPatrick, Assistant Provost  
Ms Rivi Frankle, Director of Alumni and Development  
Ms Manon LePaven, President, Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students  
Professor Judith Globerman, Status of Women Officer  
Ms Cathy McCauley, Executive Assistant to the President, Director of Special Events and Associate Campaign Director  
Dr. Peter Munsche, Assistant Vice-President, Technology Transfer  
Ms Cristine Oke, Assistant Vice-Provost, Professional Faculties  
Miss Janice Oliver, Assistant Vice-President, Operations and Services  
Mr. Kasi Rao, Director of the Office of the President and Director of Government Relations  
Ms Maureen Somerville, Chair, College of Electors  
Mr. Jorge Sousa, President, Graduate Students' Union

IN ACCORDANCE WITH A DETERMINATION BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE PURSUANT TO SECTION 38 OF BY-LAW NUMBER 2, THE GOVERNING COUNCIL CONSIDERED ITEMS 1 – 4 *IN CAMERA*.

**1. Senior Appointment**

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT Professor J. Robert S. Prichard be appointed President Emeritus effective July 1, 2000.

**2. Committee for Honorary Degrees: Membership**

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT the following members be appointed to the Committee for Honorary Degrees for 2000-2001.

2. **Committee for Honorary Degrees: Membership** (cont'd.)

Administrative Staff

Dr. Claire Alleyne

Lay Members

Ms Susan Scace

Dr. Lionel Schipper

TBA

Students

Mr. Tyler Burgess, full-time undergraduate, University College

Ms Jenny Carson, graduate student, School of Graduate Studies, Department of History

Teaching Staff

University Professor Michael Collins, Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering, Department of Civil Engineering

University Professor Linda Hutcheon, Faculty of Arts and Science, Department of English

Professor Brian Langille, Faculty of Law

University Professor Tak Mak, Faculty of Medicine, Department of Medical Biophysics\*

3. **Major Gift**

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

- (a) THAT the University of Toronto accept the proposed gift of three quarters of the shares in McClelland & Stewart Ltd., on terms and conditions that are essentially consistent with those set out in the confidential memorandum presented to the Business Board on June 22, 2000;
- (b) THAT the President and the Secretary of the Governing Council be authorized to execute such agreements or instruments as are required to effect such transfer of the shares to the University of Toronto including, without limitation,
  - the Unanimous Shareholder's agreement between the Governing Council of the University of Toronto, McClelland & Stewart Ltd., Random House of Canada Ltd. and First Plazas Inc.;
  - an undertaking by the University of Toronto in favour of the Director of Investigations, Investment Canada; and
  - such other documents or instruments as are required,

subject to their being essentially consistent with the terms and conditions set out in the confidential summary presented to the Business Board; and

---

\* Secretary's Note: Dr. Mak declined the invitation to serve on the Committee.

**3. Major Gift** (cont'd.)

(c) THAT the University of Toronto, in its capacity as a shareholder and through its nominee directors on the board of McClelland & Stewart Ltd., participate in the other arrangements contemplated by the confidential summary, including,

- the acquisition by McClelland & Stewart of the book publishing assets of the business currently conducted by First Plazas Inc., through its divisions known as "McClelland & Stewart" (and other subsidiaries); and

the entering into by McClelland & Stewart and Random House of Canada Ltd. of an administrative services and financial support agreement.

**4. Board and Committee Assignments, 2000-2001**

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT the Board and Committee assignments for 2000-2001, as described in the chart dated June 29, 2000, which include a "TBA" for the part-time undergraduate /graduate seat on the Executive Committee, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 326 of the Executive Committee as Appendix "A", be approved; and

THAT the nomination process for the part-time undergraduate/graduate seat on the Executive Committee be re-initiated with the clear understanding that one or more names could come forward, and that the Executive Committee would make a recommendation to the Governing Council on the name or names which emerge.

**5. Minutes of the Previous Meeting held on May 11, 2000**

The Chairman pointed out that a revised copy of the minutes had been placed on the table. It contained no substantive changes; rather, the minutes had undergone a rigorous internal proof-reading process, which had lead to a number of minor editorial revisions.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT the Minutes of the previous meeting, held on May 11, 2000, be approved.

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

**(a) Item 13(a) - Question Period: Dr. Chun Notice of Motion**

The Chairman reported that at the May 11 meeting, a member had given notice of motion that the matter of Dr. Kin-Yip Chun appear as a separate item on the agenda for today's meeting of the Governing Council. By-Law Number 2, section 54, provided that a member may give notice of a motion to be presented at a subsequent meeting of the Council. Such motions were to be considered by the Executive Committee for inclusion on the agenda of a subsequent meeting or for other action as the Executive Committee deemed appropriate. The Committee had

**6. Business Arising from the Minutes of the Previous Meeting (cont'd.)****(a) Item 13(a) - Question Period: Dr. Chun Notice of Motion** (cont'd.)

considered the member's notice of motion and had declined to add the matter to today's agenda. Report Number 325 of the Executive Committee documented the basis for this decision.

The member who had given notice of motion said that the matter was one of equity and democracy. He was concerned that this very important matter had never been before the Governing Council for discussion as a separate item. Rather than a full discussion based on full documentation, the matter had been relegated to the "Report of the President" item on the agenda, where there was no documentation before Council for consideration. In his view, this had resulted in an abrogation of the responsibility of duly elected members since the matter concerned the exclusion of entire groups from the University.

The Chairman thanked the member for his comment but reiterated that the Executive Committee had considered the notice and reasons for the request. The Committee had declined to place the matter on the agenda.

**(b) Item 3 – Minutes of the Previous Meeting: Physical Accessibility**

A member said that he had previously given notice of motion concerning the establishment of a physical accessibility fund and he had asked that the material in support of his notice of motion be distributed to members of the Governing Council. However, the material had not been included in his package for the meeting. The Chairman noted that the material had been placed on the table. The member expressed his view that there were serious problems with respect to accessibility, which should be dealt with before September. The Secretary explained that the notice of motion had been considered at length by the Planning and Budget Committee and had been dealt with at that level. The member had also given the same notice of motion at the Academic Board; it had been referred to the Planning and Budget Committee by the Agenda Committee.

**7. Budget Report, 2000-2001**

The Chairman said that the Budget was considered by both the Academic Board and the Business Board before it was forwarded to the Governing Council for approval. The Academic Board was primarily responsible for the allocation of resources contained in the Budget. The Business Board was the source of the Governing Council's advice about financial matters. It was asked to concur with the recommendation of the Academic Board that the Budget be approved. That Board's concurrence indicated its view that the Budget was a fiscally responsible one.

Professor Mayhall noted that the Provost had presented the proposed Budget Report at the 100th meeting of the Academic Board. Professor Sedra was, in fact, the only member of the Board to serve for all one hundred meetings. For the first time in many years, the Budget Report proposed no new spending reductions. It included a substantial increase in student financial aid and it established a fund for the new Canada Research Chairs. Budget projections for the end of the year 2000-2001 showed a small deficit of \$3-million on the year. At the Board meeting, members had commented on graduate student funding, the research supplement for all holders of named chairs, and the allocations in support of student residence projects.

Mr. Shalaby said that the Business Board's responsibility was to ensure the fiscal soundness of the Budget and its compliance, over the planning period, with the financial boundaries established by Governing Council policy. The Business Board had found that the budget did comply. The Board had examined the assumptions upon which the Budget was based and asked the President to express his opinion about those assumptions and the risk involved in adopting

**7. Budget Report, 2000-2001 (cont'd.)**

them. The President assured the Board that the assumptions were realistic and within an acceptable range. The Business Board had, therefore, concurred with the recommendation of the Academic Board that the Budget Report be approved.

Professor Sedra presented the highlights of the Budget Report to the Council and responded to a number of questions for clarification. A copy of his Power Point presentation is attached hereto as Appendix "A".

**(a) Support for administrative systems.** A member referred to the proposal to allocate \$1-million from the Administrative Priorities Fund to support administrative systems. He hoped that this would in part support counselling staff to assist students. There was clear need for additional counselling staff at the member's division, the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto (OISE/UT). Had this need been considered? Professor Sedra replied that counselling staff was not what was meant by the term "systems." With respect to the particular need cited by the member, funding in the academic divisions was provided in response to academic plans. The Dean for OISE/UT had not yet submitted his division's plan; therefore, Professor Sedra did not know whether funding expansion of student counselling services would be a funding priority. If he and the Dean agreed that this should be a priority, then a proposal for further funding for counselling services would be included in the proposal for Academic Priorities Funding made to the Planning and Budget Committee in the fall.

**(b) Quality enhancement.** A member noted that one of the purposes of the Academic Transitional Fund was "to sustain and enhance program quality." Was a reduction in class size regarded as a quality enhancement? Professor Sedra replied in the affirmative. Again, he stressed that the dean of each division submitted a prioritized list of requests for support from the Academic Priorities Fund, based on the division's plan. Requests for academic appointments could, of course, serve to limit increases in class size. The President noted that the holders of the new Canada Research Chairs would be expected, like other faculty members, to teach, and their appointment would further assist with respect to class size.

**(c) Supplemental Retirement Arrangement.** A member asked about the amount of pension contribution savings to be transferred each year to cover the University's obligation under the Supplemental Retirement Arrangement. When would the transfers be complete? Invited to reply, Mr. White said that the total past service cost was about \$100-million. At the end of the past fiscal year, \$74.2-million had been set aside in the special fund. Therefore, a further \$25-million would be required over the remaining four years of the budget plan. In addition, the current service cost of the plan was about \$3-million per year; that was the cost of the University's promise to pay supplemental benefits on account of the service of qualified employees during the year.

**(d) Budget reductions to administrative divisions.** In response to a member's question, Professor Sedra recalled that reductions to administrative divisions over the past several years, arising from the Social Contract and the Common Sense Revolution, had been made in a ratio of 1.5 to 1, administrative to academic divisions. As a result, the budgets of administrative divisions had been reduced by about 20% over the past six or seven years. The President stressed that these higher reductions applied to administrative divisions (i.e. those not reporting to the Provost) and not to administrative staff. About two thirds of the University's administrative staff were employed in academic divisions.

**7. Budget Report, 2000-2001** (cont'd.)

(e) **Address by Mr. Jorge Sousa, President of the Graduate Students' Union.** The Chairman invited the President of the Graduate Students' Union to address the Governing Council. Mr. Sousa noted that he had spoken on the budget at the meetings of both the Academic Board and the Business Board, and that he was not speaking to advise members to vote for or against the Budget Report. The Graduate Students' Union applauded the commitment to increase graduate student funding, with a further base-budget appropriation of \$9-million to be phased in over four years. This increase would go a long way towards meeting the cost of implementing the recommendations of the forthcoming Report of the Task Force on Graduate Student Financial Support. The question was: was this enough? The administration's response was that this amount was the best possible. Mr. Sousa thought that the response was inadequate. Graduate students were struggling daily to make ends meet, with some being forced to use food banks. Tuition fees had increased by 5% per year, and ancillary fees were increasing year after year. In addition, the general cost of living was increasing significantly, especially in the Toronto area. The University found it possible to spend millions of dollars on capital projects. In these circumstances, was it correct to describe the budget as fiscally responsible? Was it responsible to lavish millions of dollars on capital projects when graduate students required further assistance at once?

(f) **Need for preservation of accessibility.** A member spoke against the approval of the Budget Report. While the improved support for graduate students was welcome, it would be very important to consider whether accessibility was preserved in the face of repeated increases in tuition fees. The member was concerned to see the \$1-million of funding for the Administrative Priorities Fund when there had been major reductions to the funding for the equity offices, ranging from between 50% to total elimination. The budget of the Ombudsperson's Office had been reduced by 75%. There was also no provision for infrastructure funding to remedy the physical inaccessibility of many University buildings. The member would therefore vote against the proposed Budget Report.

The President responded that all activities had suffered funding reductions as a result of the drastic reduction in government funding during the Common Sense Revolution program. The equity offices could not be excluded from those reductions. Since that time, however, the University had added equity officers: an officer to promote pro-active faculty recruitment, a diversity officer at the University of Toronto at Mississauga, and the Co-ordinator of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgendered and Queer Resources and Programs. The University had established more offices than it had withdrawn, and the level of resources allocated to equity efforts in the proposed Budget Report was higher than at any time in the past. That was something in which the President took real pride.

(g) **Fiscal soundness of Budget Report.** A member spoke strongly in support of the proposed Budget Report, which he described as very sound. He commended the administration on the development of a very solid budget-planning process. Many institutions and governments were in far inferior financial condition. Considering the reduction in the value of public funding over the past decade, the University of Toronto was in very good condition, and members of the University had much to look forward to down the road.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT the Budget Report, 2000-2001, dated May 30, 2000, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 100 of the Academic Board as Appendix "E", be approved.

**7. Budget Report, 2000-2001** (cont'd.)

The President congratulated and thanked Professor Sedra, Professor McCammond, Mr. Martin England and members of their team. The budget planning process was an excellent one that successfully translated the University's academic priorities into budgetary form. The process and the outcome had won broad consensus support across the University.

**8. Capital Project: Munk Centre for International Studies - Funding Allocation**

Professor Mayhall recalled that this project had been originally approved in 1997 at a cost of \$10-million, to be funded from a private donation and an advance from the Capital Renewal Fund, pending receipt of expected government funding or further donations. If additional funding was not received, a recommendation would be brought forward for an allocation from the Capital Renewal Fund. The cost of the project had increased in 1999 to \$11.98-million and was currently estimated at \$13.03-million. The sources of funding had been outlined in Professor McCammond's memorandum dated April 12, 2000. Because government funding was not forthcoming, the second part of the motion proposed that \$6.095-million be allocated to this project from the Capital Renewal Fund.

Discussion focused on the following topics.

**(a) Precedent of proceeding with high-priority projects in the absence of secure funding.** A member, while voicing his support for the project, asked members to take note that the University had in this case decided to proceed with a project in the absence of secure funding, agreeing to use the Capital Renewal Fund if fundraising was unsuccessful. The member hoped that the precedent would be applied in the case of the proposed multi-faith centre. Another member strongly opposed proceeding with projects without clear assurance with respect to funding. The problems associated with the Munk Centre project had come under very close scrutiny in both the Planning and Budget Committee and in the Business Board, and explanations had been provided. The University should plan its use of capital funding very carefully.

The member who put forward the original suggestion stressed that he did not object to planning; on the contrary he enjoyed planning. His point was that the proposed multi-faith facility, a relatively small project, should proceed.

The President stated that Vice-Provost Orchard had taken charge of the effort to accommodate a multi-faith centre and the matter was well in hand.

**(b) Governance process.** A member said that he did not oppose the establishment of new academic units and the construction of new buildings for them. The building in this case was an attractive one. He was somewhat concerned that the building, in this case, had displaced student housing, but the University had made, and was continuing to make, alternative provision by erecting new residences elsewhere. His main concern, however, was the process. He had, when the matter was being discussed at the Planning and Budget Committee and the Academic Board, asked the consequence of a negative vote on the proposal. The University had U.S. \$4-million in hand, and it hoped to be able to fund the remainder of the cost of the project from a grant from the Government of Ontario or from the proceeds of fundraising. The project had then proceeded but the effort to find the remaining funding had not succeeded, meaning that \$6.1-million would be removed from the Capital Renewal Fund for the project. This was an amount that would not be available for other needs. The member had presented a proposal to use monies from the Capital Renewal Fund to make various University buildings accessible to people with physical disabilities, but that proposal had been rejected. The member was concerned that different criteria were being applied to the use of the University's own funds in the Capital Renewal Fund; monies appeared to be readily available for this project with its high corporate profile, but were not available at all to provide physical accessibility to classrooms.



**8. Capital Project: Munk Centre for International Studies - Funding Allocation** (cont'd.)

(c) **Accessibility of the building.** A member expressed concern about information that some of the washrooms in this project would not be fully accessible to people with physical disabilities. He hoped that the University would ensure that any deficiency would be remedied.

In the course of discussion the President reported that the proposed Centre for International Studies had won the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada / Scotia Bank Award for internationalization - the first winner of that award. University Professor Janice Stein and her colleagues had done an outstanding job in their planning for the Centre and its programs. The building itself was superb. The new "Signature Room" on the southwest corner of the building had real promise of becoming one of the prime spaces on campus. The official opening of the building was scheduled to take place on August 28, 2000.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

- (a) THAT the increased project cost of \$13.03-million for the Munk Centre for International Studies be approved, funded from the sources as outlined in Professor McCammond's memorandum dated April 12, 2000, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 100 of the Academic Board as Appendix "A"; and
- (b) THAT a \$6.095-million allocation from the Capital Renewal Fund to the Munk Centre for International Studies capital project be approved.

**9. Canada Research Chairs Program: Framework for Allocating Chairs – Discussion Paper**

Professor Mayhall reported that the Provost had provided to the Academic Board a detailed presentation of the Canada Research Chairs (CRC) Program and the Fund the University was establishing to administer its funding allocations. Members of the Academic Board had engaged in a lengthy discussion of the CRC Program and its funding aspects. The topics discussed had included the appointment process, the steering effect of the chairs, the planning process and the contracted timelines, the research supplement, the coverage of overhead costs, diversity in new faculty appointments and interdisciplinary research clusters.

Professor Sedra presented to the Council the highlights of the discussion paper on a framework for allocating Canada Research Chairs. A copy of his Power Point presentation is attached hereto as Appendix "B".

Discussion focused on the following topics.

(a) **Overhead charge on Chairs: potential to disadvantage recruitment efforts.** A member asked if the Governing Council of the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR) had confirmed that the University could deduct the cost of overhead from the funds received under the CRC Program. Also, the member wondered if other Canadian universities had plans to charge overhead on the chairs. If not, this could potentially disadvantage the University of Toronto in its recruitment of new chair holders.

The President responded that the issue was not within the jurisdiction of CIHR Governing Council; rather, it was dictated by the rules issued by a Secretariat of Industry Canada, which governed the CRC Program. The University had been in a continuing dialogue with the Secretariat as to its intentions and had recently received an encouraging communication from

**9. Canada Research Chairs Program: Framework for Allocating Chairs – Discussion Paper** (cont'd.)

the Secretariat's Chief of Staff. The University had also consulted with the ten major research universities across Canada – known as the G10 universities. While each university was taking its own particular approach in response to the CRC Program, there appeared to be a high degree of congruence on the basic principles which should be brought to bear and which were reflected in the University of Toronto's submission. At the request of the Secretariat, the University's document had been circulated broadly to universities across Canada. It was not yet known how each university would respond in its submission. The President clarified that it had not been the intention of Ottawa to impose uniform rules for the institutional administration of the CRC Program. Rather, Ottawa had wished to give the greatest possible delegation to each university to work through its submission in a principled way. While there was agreement in general as to the principles that should be adhered to, each University would apply these principles in a different way.

**(b) Overhead charge on Chairs housed in affiliated institutions.** A member declared that he had a conflict of interest concerning this item because he served as a trustee of the University Health Network. He continued that concern had been expressed within that forum in response to the University's plans to administer a 40% charge on all chairs, including those housed in affiliated institutions. In such cases, 6% would be charged to cover University-wide costs including library facilities, institutional management, and administration of academic appointments, and 34% would be returned to the Faculty of Medicine for cluster support and institutional costs. The member feared that affiliated institutions might respond to this plan by seeking to recoup their own overhead costs from the University, thereby leading to a counter-productive relationship.

The President responded that while he believed that this had been an initial concern, members of the affiliated institutions were actively devoting their energies to the planning processes in place to maximize fully their participation in the CRC Program. He did not believe that the University's relationships with its affiliated institutions would deteriorate as a result of disagreements arising from overhead recovery. The University's strength came from its complementarities and its partnerships. In this context it was important for the University to act constantly in a principled and supportive way in partnership with its affiliated institutions. The President believed that the University had acted in a manner consistent with this principle and he hoped that the University's position would be accepted over time.

A member noted that he believed this was an ongoing issue which would remain active for some time.

**(c) Rationale for proportion of Chairs allocated to the Faculty of Medicine.** A member observed that the assumption within the discussion paper was for 130 of the University's 251 chairs to be housed within the Faculty of Medicine. The member asked if this proportion of chair holders to one faculty was normal for a university of this size and mandate, especially given recent significant gifts that would benefit the Faculty of Medicine.

The President clarified that the proposed allocation of 130 chairs was to the health sciences, which fell within the CIHR disciplines. While a substantive number of chairs would be allocated within the Faculty of Medicine, the Faculty was exceptionally large and productive, housing approximately 4700 faculty, a number equal to almost twice the faculty in all other divisions combined.

**9. Canada Research Chairs Program: Framework for Allocating Chairs – Discussion Paper (cont'd.)**

A member added that the proportion of chairs to the Faculty of Medicine was also attributable to the Faculty's success rate in granting council competitions. He added that an expansion of the CIHR mandate would lead to a much broader scope of research, encompassing the humanities, the social sciences and broader community / population health studies.

**(d) Recruitment of chair holders.** A member asked if the University would recruit new chair holders from both within Canada and internationally? Also, was there a national strategy to ensure that no university was disadvantaged in the recruitment process (e.g. shuffling of faculty from one university to another)?

The President responded that the overarching objective was to recruit the very best people. To assist with this objective, the Government of Canada would relax immigration procedures for these chair searches. In response to the latter question, the President noted that the overall aspiration was to strengthen the entire country. There were no plans to place a prohibition on hiring faculty from one Canadian university to another as the strategic gathering of faculty to concentrate a university's strengths would enhance Canada's overall strengths, research and innovation. However, it was also an aspiration that outstanding faculty would be repatriated and attracted to Canada.

**(e) Chair clusters.** A member asked if chair clusters could be housed solely within one Faculty or was there a requirement that they be cross-disciplinary? Another member asked how many clusters had been identified to date.

The Provost responded that there were no limitations on the location of chair clusters. They could be across departments and faculties. He anticipated that while a good number of clusters would be housed within the health sciences, the total number of chair clusters had not yet been determined as work continued with the divisions to identify and prioritize clusters.

**(f) Appointment process for hiring new faculty: equity issues.** A member indicated his support for increased faculty at the University. However, as another member had suggested, a large proportion of chairs would be allocated within the Faculty of Medicine. While this would serve to ameliorate needs within this division, the member expressed concern for smaller divisions that would not benefit substantially from the CRC Program. The member continued that he was concerned that the procedures for appointment of new chairs would not seek to address employment equity at the University. He cited the discussion paper, which noted that excellent candidates from a diversity of backgrounds would be sought for chair appointments. These appointments were also to be undertaken in accordance with the University's procedures for recruitment and hiring of new faculty, as had been outlined in a memorandum from the Provost on January 24, 2000. However, the member suggested that the University's hiring practices had not addressed the imbalance at the University. He referred to the University's Employment Equity Reports for 1997-98 and 1998-99, the latter of which had not yet been discussed by the Academic Board owing to a lengthy June agenda. These reports indicated that the number of full-time faculty in the tenure stream who were visible minorities or persons with a disability had dropped from last year. Therefore, despite the existence of policy in this area, the University continued to lose ground. As well, documentation distributed earlier in the year to the Council compiled by Dr. Chandrakant Shah and his colleagues indicated that it would take up to 100 years to address the issue. The member noted that he could not, therefore, support the proposed Framework until the Governing Council sought to examine its employment equity policies and actively seek to remedy the current imbalance.

**9. Canada Research Chairs Program: Framework for Allocating Chairs – Discussion Paper (cont'd.)**

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT A Framework for Allocating Canada Research Chairs at the University of Toronto: Discussion Paper, dated June 1, 2000, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 100 of the Academic Board as Appendix “C”, be endorsed.

The President noted that the Framework had arisen from a very positive process led by President-Designate Birgeneau and Professors Cook, Munroe-Blum, Sedra and Tuohy and their colleagues. He was very proud that the University had arrived at a process which dealt with the largest allocation of chairs to any university in the country. He congratulated his colleagues on their work to date, noting that the exciting component of the project would be the implementation of the Framework.

**10. Policy on Research Involving Human Subjects**

Professor Mayhall said that the proposed policy had been developed in response to the Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct of Research Involving Human Subjects. The Tri-Council Statement required that the University institute such a policy in the year 2000. Developed with broad consultation from the University community, the policy covered all research at the University, whether funded or unfunded, and would be accompanied by guidelines and operating procedures, which were being drafted by the administration. Professor Mayhall continued that there had been no questions on the policy itself at the meeting of the Academic Board; discussion at the Committee level had focused on the administrative guidelines.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT the Policy on Research Involving Human Subjects, dated April 19, 2000, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 100 of the Academic Board as Appendix “F”, be approved.

The President commended Professor Munroe-Blum and Dr. Munsche and their colleagues for their work on this Policy.

**11. Summer Executive Authority**

The Vice-Chair noted that each June the Governing Council was asked to delegate to the President authority to take any actions necessary on behalf of the Governing Council during the summer months. Individual authorizations were counter-signed by the Chairman and were reported for information to the appropriate board or committee. Items not regarded as urgent would be held for consideration in the usual matter.

A member expressed serious reservations with the delegation of summer executive authority to the President given the decision at the outset of the meeting to approve the board and committee assignments with a vacant position on the Executive Committee for the part-time undergraduate and graduate student constituencies. Consequently, these constituencies would be unrepresented on the Executive Committee during the course of the summer. The President and the Chairman clarified that the proposal gave authority to the President to act on matters that were deemed

**11. Summer Executive Authority** (cont'd.)

urgent. There were no meetings of the Executive Committee during the course of the summer. An assignment to the vacant position would be considered at the first scheduled Executive Committee meeting in September and a recommendation made to the September meeting of the Governing Council.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

- (1) THAT until the next regular meeting of the Governing Council or its appropriate committee or board, authority be granted to the President for:
  - (i) appointments to categories 2, 3, and 4 of the Policy on Appointments and Remuneration approved by the Governing Council of the University of Toronto, dated May 13, 1999;
  - (ii) approval of such additional curriculum changes as may arise for the summer and September 2000;
  - (iii) decisions on other matters the urgency of which does not permit their deferral until the next regular meeting of the Governing Council or its appropriate standing committee or board.
- (2) THAT all actions taken under this authority be approved by the Chairman of the Governing Council prior to implementation and reported to the appropriate committee or board for information.

**12. Audited Financial Statements for the Year Ended April 30, 2000**

The Chairman noted that this and the following two items arose from the June 22 meeting of the Business Board. She drew members' attention to an Excerpt Report from that meeting that had been placed on the table. The inclusion on the agenda of these items had been endorsed by the Executive Committee.

The Chairman noted that the audited financial statements were before the Governing Council for approval. The "Financial Highlights" and the *Supplementary Financial Report* had been provided for information only.

Mr. Shalaby introduced the financial statements on behalf of the Business Board. He noted that Mr. Bob Weiss, Chair of the Audit Committee, and his colleagues on the Audit Committee had looked at the financial statements over the course of two meetings, with the external auditors present on both occasions. The Committee had also met privately with the external auditors with no University staff present. The Committee had concluded that the statements had provided a full and fair disclosure of the University's finances.

Mr. Shalaby continued that preparing the financial statements in time for their approval at the June meeting of the Governing Council was a remarkable task, and Canada's largest and most complex University was one of the few in the country to do it. He congratulated the following: Mr. Bob White; Ms Sheila Brown, Controller; Mr. Pierre Piché, Associate Controller; Mr. Mark Britt, Director of Internal Audit; the external auditors, and all members of their teams.

Mr. Shalaby added that members of the Audit Committee were also to be commended for their diligent work throughout the year, including their careful review of the financial statements.

**12. Audited Financial Statements for the Year Ended April 30, 2000** (cont'd.)

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT the University of Toronto audited financial statements for the fiscal year ended April 30, 2000, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 106 of the Business Board as Appendix "A", be approved.

**13. Campaign Budget**

Mr. Shalaby noted that the Business Board had received the previous week a very complete report on the spectacular success of the Campaign, which had exceeded its original target of \$300-million, had increased that target to \$575-million, had exceeded that new target, and was now planning to increase the target again. The original Campaign Budget had been approved until April 30, 2000. At the time the original budget had been approved, Dr. Dellandrea and his colleagues had undertaken to keep the Campaign spending to under the industry norm of between 11% and 13%. The actual fundraising expense had come in under 10%.

Mr. Shalaby continued that the Business Board was now recommending a budget to take the Campaign through to 2004. Dr. Dellandrea was confident that the Campaign would be able to maintain its pace, bringing in over \$100-million per year. To do so, it was proposed to budget \$7.78-million per year for central Campaign expenses as well as \$2-million per year to assist the academic divisions in their Campaign efforts. Funding would likely come from two sources. First, all donations would be held back for four months, with the investment earnings going to fund the Campaign. Second, a part of the fee charged to administer the endowment funds would go to this purpose. If, and only if, those sources were insufficient, the Provost would recommend an allocation for the Campaign from the transition funds.

Dr. Dellandrea presented to the Council the highlights of the Campaign Budget. A copy of his Power Point presentation is attached hereto as Appendix "C".

Two member commended the work of the President and Dr. Dellandrea and their staff and offered their congratulations for the remarkable success of the Campaign to date.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT the annual Campaign Budget Proposal from 2000-01 through 2003-04, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 106 of the Business Board as Appendix "B", be approved.

The Chairman noted that a motion was required to extend the length of the meeting.

It was duly moved and seconded,

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

The motion was carried.

**14. Appointment of External Auditors for 2000-01**

Mr. Shalaby noted that the Audit Committee had reported to the Business Board that it was satisfied that the external auditors were doing their job well. The relationship between the auditors and the administration was a good one and facilitated the audit. The University and the auditors had arranged for a periodic change in the partner responsible for the audit. This prevented the relationship between the auditors and the administration from growing too close, sacrificing the objectivity of the audit. The current partner was in only his second year on this audit. The Audit Committee had also reviewed the auditors' consulting assignments over the past year, and it had been satisfied that their scope and nature posed no problem to the objectivity of the audit.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

- (a) THAT Ernst & Young be re-appointed as external auditors of the University of Toronto for the fiscal year ending April 30, 2001;
- (b) THAT Ernst & Young be re-appointed as external auditors of the University of Toronto pension fund for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2001;
- (c) THAT Ernst & Young be appointed as external auditors of the Employees Pension Plan for the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2001; and
- (d) THAT the members of the University of Toronto Innovations Foundation be requested to appoint Ernst & Young as the external auditors of the Foundation for the fiscal year ending April 30, 2001 at a remuneration to be fixed by the Directors of the Foundation.

**15. Report of the President**

In his final report to the Governing Council, the President addressed the following topics.

**(a) President Emeritus Claude T. Bissell: 1916-2000**

The President reported with great sadness and regret the recent death of Professor Claude T. Bissell, President of the University from 1958 to 1971. His contributions to the development of the University had been enormous. A private funeral had been held the previous Monday, at which the Presidents Emeritus Evans and Connell had joined President Prichard in representing the University. The President invited members of the Council to a memorial gathering of Professor Bissell's friends and colleagues scheduled for Thursday, September 21, 2000 in the quadrangle of Massey College.

The President recalled Claude Bissell's extraordinary contributions to the University of Toronto. His expansive vision and unwavering commitment to the University had created the modern University of Toronto, and had shaped and given life to the Governing Council.

The Council observed a moment of silence in honour of President Emeritus Bissell.

**15. Report of the President** (cont'd.)**(b) Vice-President, Government and Institutional Relations – New Position**

At the previous meeting of the Council, the President had reported that President-Designate Birgeneau had decided to appoint a Vice-President, Government and Institutional Relations. An advisory committee had been appointed and the process had gone very well. Several exceptional candidates had been identified and it was expected that the search would be completed the following week. Following a recommendation from President-Designate Birgeneau, special meetings would be called of the Executive Committee and the Governing Council to approve the appointment.

**(c) Transition to New President**

The transition to the new President was proceeding and had been virtually seamless. President-Designate Birgeneau was already engaged on the key files and was looking forward to taking office. He had decided to defer the annual priority setting process until the beginning of August and would welcome any communications from members of the Council. The Birgeneaus were arriving this weekend at which time the Prichard family would move from 93 Highland Avenue.

The President noted that the Secretary of Cabinet and her senior deputy colleagues had hosted a dinner in honour of Professor Birgeneau.

**(d) Personnel****Chief Financial Officer**

The President reported with regret the decision of the University's Chief Financial Officer, Mr. Bob White, to retire effective January 31, 2001.

The President noted that he was very grateful to Mr. White for delaying his retirement to allow for a smooth transition as Professor Birgeneau determined his new senior team and administrative structure.

The President commended Mr. White for a long and distinguished career which had made a very important difference to the health the University, as was evident from the financial statements approved earlier in the meeting.

The President, joined by members of the Council, expressed his gratitude to Mr. White.

**Vice-Provost David Cook**

The President expressed his gratitude to Professor David Cook, who had for the past year returned to the position of Vice-Provost, replacing Professor Paul Gooch, who had been on administrative leave. Professor Cook would assume the position of Principal of Victoria College, effective July 1, 2000.

The President then provided a brief overview of the following portfolios.

**(e) Federal Government Relations**

The University had gone through a remarkable period of change in its relationship with the federal government during the past ten years as was evident from the emergence of major new federal programs of direct support for universities including:



**15. Report of the President** (cont'd.)**(e) Federal Government Relations** (cont'd.)

- Canada Foundation for Innovation;
- Canada Research Chairs Program;
- National Centres of Excellence;
- Canadian Institutes of Health Research;
- Human Genome;
- Millennium Scholarships; and
- student aid enhancements.

Outstanding issues included:

- recovery of the full cost of research;
- obtaining increased granting council support and graduate student support; and
- finding ways to support the University's core operating support.

Notwithstanding the above issues, the President characterized the University's relations with the federal government during the past few years as excellent. He was optimistic that this relationship would continue in the next few years.

The President paid tribute to Professor Munroe-Blum, who had lead responsibility on the federal government file.

**(f) Provincial Government Relations**

At the provincial level, the University had been through tumultuous times during the past decade.

Major new themes in the province's approach to post-secondary education had included the following:

- a changing role of tuition and student financial aid;
- increased special initiatives versus block grants;
- explicit attention to research (e.g. the Munroe-Blum Report); and
- a major emphasis on performance, competition, and matching funds while moving away from entitlements based on size and scale.

It had been a wrenching decade for the University with the introduction of the following:

- Expenditure Control Program;
- Social Contract; and
- Common Sense Revolution.

Recent initiatives, which suggested an encouraging recovery, included the following:

- Superbuild Fund;
- Ontario Research and Development Challenge Fund;
- Ontario Innovation Trust;
- Research Performance Fund;
- Premier's Research Excellence Awards;
- Ontario Graduate Scholarships in Science and Technology;
- increased Ontario Graduate Scholarships;
- Ontario Student Opportunity Trust Fund;

**15. Report of the President** (cont'd.)**(f) Provincial Government Relations** (cont'd.)

- Access to Opportunity Program;
- increased funding for Education programs;
- increased funding for Nursing programs;
- increased funds for access and growth; and
- new performance funds.

The above initiatives had occurred in the last 36 months and were cumulatively having a very positive effect on the University's future prospects.

Despite the progress achieved during the past few years, there remained major outstanding issues, which included the following:

- need for increased basic operating support;
- faculty recruitment;
- system growth;
- advanced degree programs;
- differentiation, accountability, performance;
- funding of the clinically based health professions; and
- greater support for the unique role of the University of Toronto to higher education and research in Ontario and Canada.

**(g) Council of Ontario Universities and Professor Ian Clark**

The President recorded his gratitude to Professor Ian Clark, who served as President of the Council of Ontario Universities. The University's relations with COU had never been stronger and much of the above-noted successes were a result of the University's vigorous participation in the work of COU. The President expressed his gratitude to Professor Clark and his colleagues for their considerable efforts in advancing the cause of higher education in Ontario.

**(h) Campaign**

As had been reported earlier in the meeting, the Campaign continued to make outstanding progress. A significant achievement included an endowment totaling in excess of \$500-million for student aid.

**(i) Budget and Finances**

The University had an excellent budget for the coming year and there had been significant growth in revenue. The University's finances were very strong and had enjoyed a clean audit leading to unqualified statements. The University of Toronto Asset Management Corporation was now in place to manage the University's funds. The University's financial and budget management were very strong. A recent mock credit rating was stronger than that for the provincial government. The Long-range Budget Guidelines and budget process were excellent, resulting in a genuine capacity both to maintain financial equilibrium and to allocate resources effectively. The University's endowment had now become a significant force, having grown to \$1.3 billion (including the Federated Universities this amount increased to \$1.5 billion). This amount remained modest on a per student basis when compared with that of the major universities in North America.

**15. Report of the President** (cont'd.)**(i) Budget and Finances** (cont'd.)

Outstanding issues included the following:

- Significant competitive disadvantage: the gap between the University's aspirations and its resources;
- Global competition for outstanding faculty; and
- Pressure for growth at the expense of quality.

**(j) Academic Mission and Planning**

The University's central mission remained to be Canada's preeminent university and to rank with the finest universities in the world. The President was pleased that there was broad consensus within and outside the University that this was the right role for the University of Toronto. To achieve this mission, the University required goals, plans, a process of constant change, and reallocation of resources.

The President noted that he was very proud of the University's significant progress in its academic planning and budgeting procedures. Virtually every aspect of the University's work in the undergraduate, graduate, and professional programs had undergone change, including the following:

- major advances in the structure and rigour of programs in the Faculty of Arts and Science (e.g. elimination of 15-credit degree, commitment to liberal education);
- emphasis on the University's unique contribution in the areas of Nursing, Architecture, Forestry, Physical Therapy and Occupational Therapy;
- setting of the highest possible sights to ensure the University's professional faculties (e.g. Medicine, Law, Management, Education, Engineering and Pharmacy) were leaders within Canada.

Also, there had been full integration of graduate work into every academic division within the University.

Simultaneously, there had been tremendous advances in the University's capacity for research. New research facilities included the Centre for Cellular and Biomolecular Research, the new Chemistry wing and the Centre for Information Technology. The University had also enjoyed higher-than-average success rates in performance-based competitions under the following programs: Canada Foundation for Innovation, Ontario Innovation Trust, Canada Research Chairs, Premier's Research Excellence Awards, and Canadian Institutes of Health Research. The University now ranked first with all three national granting councils. It was estimated that during the past six years, the amount of external funding to the University and its affiliated teaching hospitals in support of research amounted to approximately \$2 billion. However, the need for increased public funding remained the dominant and central force within this portfolio.

Other initiatives within this area included Universitas 21, and the Advisory Council on Science and Technology, which was developing international initiatives for Canada. The Canada Foundation for Innovation was poised to set aside a special fund, which would allow the University of Toronto's participation in this initiative.

With respect to faculty, the President noted that the University had made wonderful appointments, both lateral and senior. Tenure procedures had been strengthened and there was ever increasing diversity in faculty appointments. The President was optimistic that this trend would continue.

**15. Report of the President** (cont'd.)**(k) Students**

The University's academic programs were very much in demand, with increased applications in almost every field. The University's active student recruitment program was beginning to pay dividends, resulting in an increased percentage of students from outside the Greater Toronto Area, thereby reflecting the University's national role and aspirations. Yield rates (i.e. the proportion of offers of admission made by the University that were accepted by students) were increasing, particularly in Medicine, which currently enjoyed an unprecedented yield rate of approximately 80%.

Of particular pride to the President had been the introduction of a policy, which was perhaps the strongest commitment to social justice approved by the Governing Council. Following the recommendations of the Task Force on Tuition Fees and Student Financial Support, authored by Professors Tuohy and McCammond, the Governing Council had approved a policy which provided that no student would be unable to accept an offer of admission or complete his/her program of study because of insufficient resources. Last year, the University had spent \$56-million towards financial aid and next year almost \$65-million had been budgeted for this purpose. This commitment remained a first priority in the budget. The policy had led to increased representation of students from families who had not previously participated in post-secondary education. This commitment was unique in Canada.

The President continued that the Task Force on Graduate Student Support, chaired by Vice-Provost Orchard, was moving the University in the same direction with respect to graduate students. Allocations in support of this area had been incorporated within the Budget Report, approved earlier in the meeting.

The University continued with its residence expansion plans and student services were being strengthened. Professor Orchard, the inaugural holder of the position of Vice-Provost, Students, had made a powerful difference to the advancement of student interests at the University. The President congratulated Professor Orchard on the accomplishments within his portfolio.

**(l) Employee Relations**

The University had this year reached a first collective agreement with the United Steelworkers of America (USWA), which represented the majority of the University's administrative staff. From all accounts, the University's relationship with USWA was proceeding extremely well. The President congratulated Professor Finlayson and his colleagues on this achievement.

The President recalled that it had been a very challenging year for the University in terms of its relations with employee groups. Fourteen collective agreements had required negotiation, with thirteen being settled satisfactorily. Agreement with CUPE 1230, representing the University's teaching assistants, had not been reached. A strike had ensued, which, after several weeks, had been settled with the assistance of mediation. The President was optimistic that the Report of the Task Force on Graduate Student Financial Support, chaired by Vice-Provost Orchard, would address many of the issues raised.

The administration had initiated discussions with the University of Toronto Faculty Association concerning the Association's request for a revised pension plan for new faculty members. The proposal was for a defined contribution plan to replace the current defined benefit plan. The President noted that this was not a direction in which other employee groups had expressed an interest, nor was it one that would be imposed on current employees of the University.

**15. Report of the President** (cont'd.)**(l) Employee Relations** (cont'd.)

The administration continued to face real challenges with respect to faculty compensation as the market place for outstanding faculty became even more challenging.

**(m) Campus Planning**

The University had made great strides in campus planning with the adoption of the Campus Master Plans and the Open Space Plan. A number of significant projects were under construction and many more were planned. This was an area in which there would be significant activity in the next few years.

**(n) Reputation**

The University continued to be very well regarded. In each of the last six years, Maclean's magazine had ranked the University first in the research category for Canada's universities. These results recognized the outstanding contributions made by the University's employees. Also encouraging was the University's increased ranking each year in the various reputational categories.

The University was recognized both within Canada and abroad as a national institution of great significance.

**(o) Personal Plans**

The President noted that effective July 1, 2000, he would have offices at the Faculty of Law and at OISE/UT. Members could contact him by phone: 978-2083 or by E-mail: <[r.prichard@utoronto.ca](mailto:r.prichard@utoronto.ca)>. From September, 2000 through to June, 2001, he would be on research leave at Harvard Law School.

The Chairman observed that another motion was required to further extend the meeting.

It was duly moved and seconded,

THAT the time of adjournment be further extended to 7:00 p.m.

The motion was carried.

**(p) Gratitude**

The President recorded his gratitude to members of the community for the privilege of serving the University, for the support provided and for the contributions members had made to the advancement of the University.

The President thanked members of the Governing Council on behalf of the University for their volunteer contributions to the leadership and governance of the University. He expressed his personal gratitude to members for their support and encouragement during his Presidency.

The President then expressed his personal gratitude to the Chancellor, the Chairman, the Secretary of the Governing Council and members of the Secretariat, senior members of the administration, in particular members of the President's office, and each of his Vice-Presidential colleagues.

**16. Reports for Information**

Members received for information the following reports.

- Report Number 100 of the Academic Board (June 14, 2000)
- Report Number 105 of the Business Board (May 1, 2000)
- Report Number 325 of the Executive Committee (June 19, 2000)
- Report Number 91 of the University Affairs Board (April 18, 2000)
- Report Number 92 of the University Affairs Board (May 23, 2000)

**17. Date of the Next Meeting**

The Chairman reminded continuing members that the next regular meeting was scheduled for Thursday, September 14, 2000 at 4:30 p.m. An orientation session for new and continuing members would be held on Tuesday, August 29, 2000.

**18. Question Period**

A member posed a series of requests and questions. What was the status of the multi-faith facility? He also asked that the administration report at the next meeting of the Governing Council on any developments that arose during the summer concerning Dr. Chun's dispute with the University. He also asked that the matter appear as an agenda item on the next meeting of the Council so that there would be adequate time for members to discuss the issue. The member offered his congratulations to Dr. Chun's daughter, who had been accepted by Victoria College. The member asked about the University's position concerning the strike of part-time workers at the Bookstore of the University of Toronto Press Incorporated. He noted that the University's administration had previously indicated that the employment dispute was not within the University's purview; however, the directorship of the Press was appointed by the University. Also, the Bookstore was located on campus and employed students of the University. It was therefore incumbent upon the Bookstore to adhere to high labour standards. The strike was affecting those students employed at the Bookstore and campus morale.

Vice-Provost Orchard reported that a users' committee had been struck to examine the issue of a multi-faith facility. This committee was being chaired by Ms Susan Addario, Director of Student Affairs, and a final report was expected in the near future. Several potential sites had been identified and funding opportunities were also being explored.

The President added his congratulations on the acceptance of Dr. Chun's daughter to Victoria College. He clarified that there were no new developments at the current time concerning Dr. Chun's dispute with the University. The Chairman would be apprised of any developments that might arise during the course of the summer and he believed that President-Designate Birgeneau would be pleased to provide a report if the matter still required discussion in the fall.

With respect to the strike of part-time workers at the Bookstore, the President clarified that the University of Toronto Press was a separate incorporated institution. As such, its employees were not employees of the University of Toronto. In the President's judgement, any intervention in the labour dispute would not be useful. There was no evidence that the Press had acted in contravention of labour standards and he believed the dispute was best resolved through the process of collective bargaining between the two parties.

### 19. Chairman's Closing Remarks

The Chairman thanked all members for their contributions to the Council's work over the past year. She offered special thanks to members who were completing their service on the Governing Council.

- **Professor John Challis** was a distinguished scientist and Chair of the Department of Physiology. His research work was known internationally, and his presentation of scientific papers had taken him to all parts of the world. He had, however, given generously of his time during his three-year term to serve on the Academic Board and the Planning and Budget Committee, and he was an active participant in that high-intensity activity called the Presidential Search Committee.
- **Ms Shruti Dev-Nayyar** represented the full-time undergraduate professional faculty students and served on Governing Council for one year. She served on the Business Board, the Executive Committee and the Academic Appeals Committee and had been an active contributor to governance. This June, she graduated from the Faculty of Pharmacy and completed her Board examinations, and was about to begin her career. She was also married this year. It had been a truly remarkable year for Ms Dev-Nayyar.
- **Dr. Robert Kyle** had been a member of the Council for six years. He had served on the Academic Board and both its committees, the Business Board, and the Executive Committee. He had always prepared meticulously for meetings, something that was obvious from his active participation and clear mastery of the topics that had been discussed in this room. His service as a Governor had, however, gone far beyond this room. The University's relationship with each of the affiliated teaching hospitals was managed in a body called the Joint Hospital Relations Committee. Those committees had consisted of four senior representatives of the hospital and four senior representatives of the University. The University half of the Committee included a member of the Governing Council, and Dr. Kyle had been playing that demanding role.
- **Professor John Mayhall** was completing a full nine-year term on Governing Council. For the three years previous to that, he was the Faculty of Dentistry's teaching staff representative on the Academic Board. He spent his first two years as a governor on the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs prior to moving to the Academic Board. He had served as Vice-Chair of the Board for five years and had been chair of the Board for the last two. As chair of the Board he had also attended the Executive Committee meetings. In addition, he had served on the Academic Appeals Committee for his entire term as governor. Of the 107 appeals completed since he had begun his term, John had served on 65 of them. The Appeals Committee was losing one of its mainstays. The Chairman thanked Professor Mayhall for his dedication and outstanding commitment.
- **Mr. Ahmed Mian** had been elected to the Council late in the fall term following a resignation. He, therefore, had put in extra duty in getting up to speed on the workings of Council. He had succeeded wonderfully, serving on both the University Affairs Board and the Academic Board. In both fora he had lent a passionate voice in support of equity issues and student issues. The Chairman wished Mr. Mian luck in his future endeavours.

---

**19. Chairman's Closing Remarks** (cont'd.)

- **Mr. Kashif Pirzada** had been an active member of the Business Board, the University Affairs Board and the Academic Appeals Committee. The Chairman noted that it must be an intimidating experience for a student member, who often served for only one year, to understand what was going on in the governance, and in particular the Business Board, much less to make his or her views known forcefully and articulately. Mr. Pirzada, who had also been a scholarship student, had certainly expressed his views with clarity and force. The Chairman also congratulated Mr. Pirzada on his acceptance into the medical program at the University of Toronto.
- **Professor Wendy Rolph** was completing a six-year term as a member of Governing Council. In the late 1980s and early 1990s she had served on the Academic Board as an elected teaching staff member. Over both terms, she had served as Chair of the Committee for Academic Policy and Programs for seven years and as Vice-Chair for one year. She has been a member of the Academic Board throughout and this year she had served as a member of the Executive Committee. For a time her day job had been Chair of the Department of Spanish and Portuguese and since 1998, she had served as Vice-Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Science. The Chairman thanked Professor Rolph for her exemplary service.
- **Mr. Bob Spencer** had served on the Governing Council for five years. The Chairman noted that many of the University's student members have gone on to illustrious later careers in public office. Mr. Spencer had done things a bit differently. Having apprenticed as Chair of the Toronto Board of Education, he had then stepped up to the Governing Council. His history with respect to the Governing Council, however, went a long way back before his election as a member in 1995. As an undergraduate student, Mr. Spencer had been active in Students' Administration Council politics and he had served on the University-Wide Committee, which in 1970 recommended the formation of our unicameral Governing Council. The University had a distinguished history of governors who have commuted from distant parts of the country - Mr. Spencer was the first student member who had come from as far as Edmonton to attend meetings. He had served on the Academic Board, Planning and Budget, the University Affairs Board and the Executive Committee and had been an active participant in governance, speaking strongly on the need for family housing for students, accessibility and many other issues.
- **Dr. Alex Waugh** had become an institution on the Governing Council and in the University, and he was retiring from both. He had served on the Governing Council for ten and one half years, chairing the University Affairs Board, among many other notable contributions to governance. He had been an outstanding servant of the University for over three decades and an extraordinary servant to its students, especially its part-time students. The Chairman noted that she had no doubt that Dr. Waugh would find a way to continue to serve the University in the coming years!
- **Ms Judith Wilson** had, for five years, been an articulate member of the Council and a champion of her colleagues on the administrative staff. She had served on the Planning and Budget Committee, which was widely regarded as the Council's hardest working body, the Business Board, the Academic Board, the Elections Committee, and the Executive Committee, as well as stepping in when needed on the Academic Appeals Committee. Ms Wilson, along with Professor Mayhall, had served as a member of the Search Committee for the Secretary of the Governing Council – a committee to which the Chairman was particularly indebted. Ms Wilson would now concentrate her extracurricular efforts on her work as an officer of the University of Toronto local of the Steelworkers' Union. The Chairman noted the Council would miss Ms Wilson's passionate interventions and she wished her well in her future endeavours!



**19. Chairman's Closing Remarks** (cont'd.)

- **Mr. Vilko Zbogar** was a representative of the full-time undergraduate professional faculty students and had served on the Governing Council for one year. His assignments had included the Planning and Budget Committee and the Business Board. Mr. Zbogar had also sat on an academic appeal in his early days as governor. His interventions at meetings had been thoughtful and passionate. Mr. Zbogar had recently graduated from the Faculty of Law and was to be married later in the week. The Chairman offered him her congratulations and best wishes.

The Chairman and representatives of the Council paid tribute to J. Robert S. Prichard, whose term as President would end on June 30, 2000. A copy of the Chairman's remarks is attached hereto as Appendix "D".

**20. Naming Announcement: J. Robert S. Prichard Alumni House**

The Chairman reported with great pleasure that, in recognition of the President's outstanding contributions to the University, the Executive Committee had approved the naming of 21 King's College Circle as J. Robert S. Prichard Alumni House.

The meeting adjourned at 7:30 p.m.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Secretary

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chairman

August 30, 2000