

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

Wednesday, December 15, 1999

MINUTES OF THE GOVERNING COUNCIL meeting held on Wednesday, December 15, 1999 at 4:30 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall.

Present:

Ms Wendy M. Cecil-Cockwell (In the Chair)

The Honourable Henry N. R. Jackman,
Chancellor

Professor J. Robert S. Prichard, President

Professor Mary Beattie

Dr. Robert Bennett

Mr. Brian C. Burchell

Professor Jack Carr

Dr. John R. G. Challis

Professor W. Raymond Cummins

Dr. Shari Graham Fell

Professor Vivek Goel

Dr. Anne Golden

Dr. Robert J. Kyle

Professor Brian Langille

Mr. Gerald A. Lokash

Professor John T. Mayhall

Professor Ian R. McDonald

Mr. Ahmed Rafi Mian

Professor Heather Munroe-Blum

Dr. John P. Nestor

Mr. Elan Ohayon

Ms Jacqueline C. Orange

Mr. Jonathan Papoulidis

The Honourable David R. Peterson

Professor Emmet I. Robbins

Professor Wendy Rolph

Mrs. Susan M. Scace

Professor Adel S. Sedra

Professor Kenneth Sevcik

Mr. Amir Shalaby

Mr. Robert G. Spencer

Ms Wendy Talfourd-Jones

Mr. John H. Tory

Professor Ronald D. Venter

Ms Nancy L. Watson

Dr. Alexander R. Waugh

Ms Judith Wilson

Mr. Vilko Zbogar

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

Secretariat:

Ms Susan Girard

Ms Margaret McKone

Absent:

Mrs. Mary Anne V. Chambers

The Honourable William G. Davis

Ms Shruti Dev

Ms Wanda M. Dorosz

Mr. Paul V. Godfrey

Mr. Peter A. Herrndorf

Ms Rose M. Patten

Mr. Kashif S. Pirzada

The Honourable Robert K. Rae

Dr. Joseph L. Rotman

Professor Kenneth Sevcik

Mr. Terrence L. Stephen

In Attendance:

Professor David Cook, Vice-Provost

Professor Michael G. Finlayson, Vice-President, Administration and Human Resources

Professor Ian Orchard, Vice-Provost, Students

Mr. Robert G. White, Chief Financial Officer

Professor Rona Abramovitch, Director of Transitional Year Programme, and Provost's Advisor
on Proactive Faculty Recruitment

Professor Carl Amrhein, Dean, Faculty of Arts and Science

In Attendance: (cont'd)

Ms Susan Bloch-Nevitte, Director, Public Affairs
Mr. Chris Borst, Graduate Students' Union
Ms Rivi Frankle, Director of Alumni and Development
Mr. Hayssam Hulays, Chair, CUPE 3902
Professor Judith Globerman, Status of Women Officer
Ms Manon LePaven, President, Association of Part-Time Undergraduate Students
Ms Cathy McCauley, Executive Assistant to the President, Director of Special Events & Associate Campaign Director
Mr. Kasi Rao, Director of the Office of the President and Director of Government Relations
Ms Patti Seaman, Secretary, Committee for Honorary Degrees
Ms Helen Simson, Convenor, Equity Issues Advisory Group, and Coordinator, *DISABILITY* Services for Students
Ms Maureen Somerville, Chair, College of Electors
Mr. Paul Tsang, President, Graduate Students' Union
Ms Betty Wu, Chinese Canadian Nurses' Association

THE MEETING COMMENCED *IN CAMERA*.

Chairman's Remarks

The Chairman recalled that Ms Grace Subrata and Professor Steve Halperin had recently resigned from the Governing Council. She was pleased to report the following new members had been elected to the Governing Council: Mr. Ahmed Mian, from the full-time undergraduate student constituency, and Professor Ken Sevcik, from the faculty constituency.

1. Report Number 40 of the Committee for Honorary Degrees

Council considered and approved the recommendations contained in Report Number 40 of the Committee for Honorary Degrees.

The Chairman reminded members that nominees' names were strictly confidential. When all individuals had responded to the offers of an honorary degree, the President would report to Governing Council; following that report, the President would make a public announcement. The President urged governors who wished to participate in any of the convocation ceremonies to get in touch with Ms Cathy McCauley in his office.

A member commended the new format for presentation of the candidates.

The Chairman reiterated the importance of keeping the candidates names confidential until announced publicly at Governing Council following their acceptance of the University's offer. She then expressed her gratitude to the Chancellor and members of the Committee for Honorary Degrees for their hard work.

The President reported on a personnel matter.

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL MOVED INTO OPEN SESSION.

2. Address by Non-Members

The Chairman noted that the Governing Council had procedures for non-members to address the Governing Council and its boards and committees on matters not on the agenda. She had approved two speaking requests for today's meeting.

2. Address by Non-Members (cont'd)

(a) **Ms Betty Wu, Chinese Canadian Nurses' Association**

Ms Wu introduced herself to Council, noting that she was the Secretary and past president of the Chinese Canadian Nurses' Association (CCNA). She had immigrated to Canada and was now a Canadian citizen working as a Registered Nurse. She was also an alumnus of the University, having obtained a Master's degree from the Faculty of Nursing.

Founded in 1986, the CCNA had as one of its objectives the professional advancement of its members and other workers. It was committed to ongoing professional education and believed that scholarship and learning deserved to be recognized both in the general market place as well as in academe. Its members attended classes and had been strong and loyal supporters of the University.

Ms Wu noted that one-third of private donations to the University of Toronto came from Chinese patrons. The only overseas funding office established by the University was located in Hong Kong. It was distressing to note that although 25% of University students were of Chinese background, less than 2% of tenured full professors were from this group. There seemed to be a reluctance for the University to recognize merit attained by Chinese Canadians. She continued that the CCNA was further disturbed by the fact that over half of the student body were visible minorities, yet less than 9% of the regular faculty were visible minorities themselves. This was really disappointing and raised the fear of systemic racism, which was harmful to everyone and compromised academic excellence.

Ms Wu cited Dr. Kin-Yip Chun's ongoing case against the University, involving a charge of systemic racism. Council had heard from many groups urging a fair resolution of the matter.

In conclusion, Ms Wu noted that the question of employment equity in the university setting needed to be brought into more prominent focus and that it was an obligation of the University of Toronto to ensure that its students and scholars could respond with joy and creativity to common human needs and conditions.

A member indicated that he wished to speak to Ms Wu's address. The chairman clarified that it would only be appropriate at this stage for the member to pose a question for clarification. It would not be appropriate for him to make a statement. The member noted that this was a matter on the agenda, and therefore, he was entitled as a member of Council to speak to it for a period of up to five minutes. The Chairman reiterated that the member was only permitted to ask a question for clarification at this point of the meeting. The President added that the Council's procedures provided for up to three five-minute interventions by non-members of Council to address matters not on the agenda. Matters raised in these deputations were, by definition, not agenda items, and not to be debated. Should members wish to raise any issues arising from the deputations, they were free to do so under "other business". The member expressed dissatisfaction with the process given that the speaker would have to wait until the end of the agenda to hear a brief comment on her deputation. The President responded that the Chairman had made her ruling based on the *Procedures for Non-Members to Address the Governing Council and its Boards and Committees*, which had been approved by the Governing Council in 1992. Prior to the adoption of these procedures, there had been no opportunity for non-members to address Council. It would be up to the Governing Council to make changes to these procedures, as the member was suggesting. The member countered that the procedures did not speak to the ability of members to comment on non-members' deputations. He continued that it was his reading of the Governing Council's By-law that members could always comment on agenda items and that this was such an item. Given that the procedures made no reference to the provisions of members to speak to non-members' comments, he urged the standard should therefore be to permit members' comments at this point of the agenda. The President responded

2. Address by Non-Members (cont'd)

that he had been one of the authors of the procedures, which had been discussed by the Executive Committee prior to their adoption. The intent of the procedures was as he had previously stated. In the end it was the ruling of the Governing Council and the Chairman as to whether this was a correct interpretation. The Chairman ruled that the member should raise his comment under other business.

(b) Mr. Hayssam Hulays, Chair, CUPE 3902

Mr. Hulays noted that the membership of CUPE 3902, the union representing the University teaching assistants and student instructors, was on the verge of a strike. It had been bargaining with the administration since late June; however, the parties remained far apart on major issues. The membership had set a strike date of December 22 so that it would not interfere with the conduct of undergraduate examinations.

Mr. Hulays continued that the union had three major issues: benefits, wages and subsequent appointments. As protectors of the long-term academic health and reputation of this University, members of the Governing Council should consider and respond to the needs of teaching assistants and student instructors at this institution.

Over the last few years as tuition had escalated, the union's members received less of their wages after tuition was paid. In fact, most of its members paid more in tuition than they received in wages. Tuition constituted a major portion of students' cost of living. The administration had so far refused to discuss tuition rebates. It justified this refusal by claiming that a waiver/rebate scheme was entirely without precedent and that it would create two classes of students. The union disagreed. Tuition waivers/rebates were common for teaching assistants at many American universities (including those to which the University of Toronto liked to compare itself: Wisconsin, MIT, Harvard, Michigan) and at York University. At the University of Toronto, tuition waivers were granted to faculty, staff and their children.

Mr. Hulays continued that another major item was wage parity with colleagues at York University. Currently, the University's teaching assistants were paid \$7 an hour less than that paid to York teaching assistants. Mr. Hulays said that the administration's proposed increases constituted a wage roll-back for the union's average member because of the tuition increase of \$600 in 1998-1999 and the proposed increase of \$260 next year.

Mr. Hulays continued that a new task force was being struck by the Provost to study graduate support. It was interesting to him that on the eve of a strike the Provost decided to establish such a committee. The union's members believed that University's task forces and committees were used to deflect attention from issues and give the false impression that something was being done. By way of example, Mr. Hulays cited a previous committee to study student workload issues, whose recommendations were never implemented by the administration, despite repeated requests from the union. It was hoped that this new task force was a genuine attempt to grapple with the problem; however, action was very much needed at this time.

The union's members lacked dental and vision coverage. They also needed appointments beyond those permitted now. Job security was less than that for colleagues at York, McMaster, and Carleton. Job security, he emphasized, could be used to attract good graduate students who would know they would have the financial wherewithal to complete their degrees.

2. Address by Non-Members (cont'd)

Mr. Hulays suggested that the union's members had been subject to unlawful conduct by the administration. A number of them had had their teaching contracts held back or had been threatened with the cancellation of their courses in the event that they decided to strike. Faced with many complaints from its members and in receipt of a memorandum from the Provost, the union had filed a complaint against the University with the Ontario Labour Board. It was unacceptable that the administration should threaten union members with a loss of their jobs if they struck (for any period of time). The union had been on strike in the past and the administration had not canceled courses. Union members should be allowed to return to work after the strike was over. He indicated that the union believed that the administration wanted union members to be afraid for their jobs, and thus weaken support for a potential strike. This was unacceptable for any employer, particularly a University, whose purpose was to advance the cause of free enquiry and respect for free thought and legitimate dissent. In his view, these actions undermined the very essence of the University.

In conclusion, Mr. Hulays noted that the Governing Council had the mandate to ensure that in the future, the University could boast about the level of its education, in terms of undergraduate teaching and the quality of graduate research being produced. Under the current situation, far from being assured this reputation, the University of Toronto's name was being further eroded. It was the Council's responsibility to urge the administration to conduct itself with fairness and dignity and not to further tarnish the University's reputation.

The President noted that at the meeting of the last Executive Committee, a member had indicated that she wished for the issue of teaching assistants to appear on the agenda so as to provide an opportunity for discussion. Given that the raising of the issue by a non-member did not, as he had previously explained, denote the matter as an agenda item, he had undertaken to include the issue in his President's Report, and to pause at that time to provide an opportunity for comment immediately after his briefing on this matter.

3. Minutes of the Previous Meetings

The Chairman noted that members had received copies of the Minutes of the regular meeting held on November 4, 1999 and the Minutes of the special meeting held on November 30, 1999.

(a) Minutes of the regular meeting held on November 4, 1999

Item 3 - Report of the President -- (e) Municipal Relations

A member who had been absent from the November 4 meeting expressed his pleasure with the reported outcome concerning the ownership of the laneway on which the new Centre for Information Technology was to be built. Specifically, the University had acquired the property from the municipal government, who, in turn, had announced that the proceeds from the sale would be used to create an endowed scholarship at the University of Toronto in honour of the late Dan Leckie.

Item 3 - Report of the President -- (l) Other Matters

A member recalled that upon completion of the President's Report at the November 4 meeting, he had wished to comment on many of the points raised. At that time the Chairman had indicated that he could speak for up to five minutes on this agenda item. The member had responded that the tradition had been for members to speak for up to five minutes on each point raised by the President. At that time, he believed that the Secretary of the Governing Council had clarified that

3. Minutes of the Previous Meetings (cont'd)

because of the length of the President's Report, members could be permitted five minutes per point raised. The Minutes did not correctly recall this ruling. He reiterated that given many subjects were addressed by the President in his report, it was important that members be provided with the opportunity to discuss each subject independently, rather than having to condense their questions and concerns into one five-minute intervention. The Chairman invited the Secretary of the Governing Council to reply. Mr. Charpentier recalled that his response on this matter at the November 4 meeting had been that discussion of the President's Report, beyond an initial question, should occur under question period, at which time governors were free to raise any questions that they wished.

Item 14 - Investments: Governance and Management

A member drew attention to a paragraph at the bottom of page 20 of the Minutes concerning the new Corporation's responsibilities concerning real estate. Specifically, he wondered about the University's plans for dealing with property currently owned by the University. The President responded that there were no plans at present for transfer of authority of such real estate to the new Corporation. He added that, absent governance approval, there would be no such plans.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT the minutes of the November 4, 1999 meeting, as amended, be approved.

(b) Minutes of the special meeting held on November 30, 1999

Item 1 - Appointment of the President

A member noted that the Council's endorsement of a motion of gratitude to the Presidential Search Committee at the November 30 meeting did not appear in the Minutes. The Chairman thanked the member, noting that the Minutes would be amended to record this motion.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT the minutes of the November 30, 1999 meeting, be approved.

4. Business Arising from the Minutes of the Meeting held on November 4, 1999

(a) Item 3(a) - Notice of Motion: Task Force on the Abolition of Tuition Fees

The Chairman recalled that at the Governing Council's September 16 meeting, a member had given notice of the following motion,

THAT a University of Toronto Task Force be established to examine the abolition of fees for post-secondary education.

She noted that the Governing Council's By-law provided that notices of motion to the Governing Council should be considered by the Executive Committee for inclusion on the agenda of a subsequent meeting or other action as it deemed appropriate.

4. Business Arising from the Minutes of the Meeting held on November 4, 1999 (cont'd)

At the request of the mover, the Executive Committee had deferred its consideration of this motion to its December 3 meeting. The Chairman noted that Report of the December 3 meeting (pages 3 and 4) contained a record of the Executive Committee's discussion of the motion and its decision that the matter **not** be placed on the agenda of the Council's meeting.

The author of the notice of motion said he had hoped that discussion of the motion would also have taken place at the Governing Council. He continued to receive information he had requested concerning tuition fees and that this was a matter that arose frequently on campus. The Chairman interjected that the Executive Committee had disposed of the matter, having taken into consideration the points raised by the member. She noted that should the member wish to speak further to the matter, he should do so in the question period. The member noted that he would not speak further to the matter, but instead drew members' attention to the fact that this was an ongoing item and that he would inform the Council when additional information became available.

(b) Item 3(b) - Physical Accessibility: Request from a Member to add the Matter to the Agenda of the Governing Council

The Chairman recalled that at the November 4 meeting of the Governing Council, she had reported that the Executive Committee had received a request from a member to add the issue of physical accessibility to the Governing Council's agenda. At that time, she had reported that the Executive Committee had requested that the member provide a written submission that identified particular issues and described the outcome or action that the member wished Council to consider.

She continued that at its December 3 meeting, the Executive Committee had not been provided with the requested written submission; nonetheless, the member had been invited to speak briefly to his request. Report Number 321 (pages 5 - 6) contained an account of the Committee's deliberation of the request and its decision that the matter not be placed on the agenda of the Governing Council's meeting. The member had been encouraged to provide a submission to the agenda planning group of the University Affairs Board.

The author of the request clarified that he had been forwarding to the Council a concern of the Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students and the Graduate Students' Union. He hoped that the University Affairs Board would approach these organizations on the matter rather than requiring them to submit a written proposal, as this was a very busy time for students. If so, these organizations could be in a position to discuss the matter at the next meeting of the University Affairs Board. The President intervened. He clarified that as per the Governing Council's By-law, the notice of motion had been referred to the Executive Committee for consideration. That Committee's disposition of the matter had been recorded in the Report of the meeting and had been reported on by the Chairman. If the member wished to raise questions or issues concerning the Executive Committee's decision, he should do so under the question period. Given that the Executive Committee had already discussed the matter and that members of the Governing Council had read the Report of the Committee, the President did not believe it to be an effective use of time for a further elaboration of the matter. The Chairman agreed.

(c) Item 14 – Governance and Management

A member referred to the Governing Council's previous decision to establish a University of Toronto Investment Management Corporation, whose Service Agreement indicated that the new corporation would "...dispose of and otherwise deal with lands, buildings, and other interests in real estate on behalf and for the benefit of the said Council".

4. Business Arising from the Minutes of the Meeting held on November 4, 1999 (cont'd)

The member noted that he had since reviewed the *University of Toronto Act* - Item 14 - which provided that:

All property heretofore or hereafter granted, conveyed, devised or bequeathed to any person in trust for or for the benefit of the University and University College or either of them or of any college, faculty, school or department thereof or otherwise in connection therewith, subject always to any trust affecting the property, is vested in the Governing Council.

He wondered how this section of the *Act* would affect the Service Agreement approved at the previous meeting. Specifically, did the Governing Council have the power to delegate any authority to deal with real estate? If so, was the Service Agreement in conflict with the *Act*? Alternatively, perhaps this section of the *Act* could provide reassurance to those members who had sought clarification of this at the previous meeting.

The President responded that Service Agreement had been reviewed carefully by the University's solicitor, Mr. Don Guthrie. He requested that the Secretary of the Governing Council raise the member's question with Mr. Guthrie to ensure that it had been considered. In the event there was a problem, the President undertook to inform members at the next meeting of the Governing Council.

5. Enrolment Expansion at the University of Toronto: Discussion Paper

(a) Introduction

The Chairman noted that the discussion paper on enrolment expansion arose from the academic planning process. It was intended to frame the issues and focus discussion of the most important challenge to face the Ontario university system in the coming decade – how to respond to increasing demand for post-secondary education. This paper had been discussed within governance by the Planning and Budget Committee, the Academic Board, and the Executive Committee. Because of timing of the paper and the meeting schedule, the paper would not be considered by the University Affairs Board until its January 11 meeting.

The Chairman continued that the discussion paper was before the Governing Council at this time so that members could provide their advice and guidance to the administration on the directions contemplated. Following its consultations with governance and the University community, the administration would draft a framework for enrolment expansion, which would be brought back to governance for approval.

She noted that she had received a request from a non-member - Mr. Chris Turner, an alumnus - to address the Governing Council on the suggestion within the discussion paper of the possible elimination of the three-year degree. Given that Mr. Turner had been granted permission to address the Academic Board and the fact that his deputation was reflected in the Board's Report, she had declined this request. She drew attention to Report Number 97 of the Academic Board (pages 3 - 4), which contained a detailed record of Mr. Turner's address.

The President noted that the Chairman's introduction had provided a complete summary of the process to date. The administration had been asked and had undertaken to provide a discussion paper on the issue of enrolment expansion. He believed this to be the single most important issue facing the University during the next few years. The discussion paper, authored by Deputy Provost Tuohy, Provost Sedra and him, was intended as a platform for community response.

5. ***Enrolment Expansion at the University of Toronto: Discussion Paper*** (cont'd)

The discussion paper had been published as a special insert in the *Bulletin* and had been made widely available across the University. The administration would continue its consultations throughout the month of January following which it would draft a framework for planning which would then be brought to governance for discussion and approval. He noted that the discussion paper's authors welcomed members' views.

(b) Discussion

Discussion ensued on the following aspects of the paper.

A member noted that he was in general agreement with the directions laid out in the paper. In particular, he strongly emphasized the underlying principle that expansion could happen only if it was on the University's terms (e.g. preserving the University's mission and its basic values). Expansion in any other way was not acceptable and should not be pursued.

The member then commented on three aspects of the discussion paper.

The notion that summer programs could be expanded to accommodate increased enrolment was a very good one. Even though the University currently had a very large summer program, the member believed that the University could increase it further. For example, the University should consider making the summer term equivalent in course weight to the fall and winter terms, moving towards a year-round three-term structure. This would allow students, particularly part-time students, greater flexibility in matching their course schedules to their personal needs. The member added that the University should also consider increasing its evening programs and offering courses on week-ends to use its infrastructure and physical resources to the maximum extent possible.

The member strongly supported the notion that the greatest participation of any enrolment increase should occur on the two suburban campuses. He did not believe that the St. George campus had the space to support significant expansion beyond what was currently planned. Even if space was available on the St. George campus, the University would have to consider the relatively lower costs of building academic and non-academic facilities in Mississauga and Scarborough compared to downtown Toronto. The member continued that if significant suburban campus expansion was to work, the University needed to establish a critical mass of students, faculty, courses and services at the Mississauga and Scarborough campuses. The member predicted that should this happen, the University of Toronto would not be a single university with three campus, but rather a University system with three relatively independent but cooperating institutions. While this transition would prove challenging, the member believed it would leave the University in a much stronger position overall.

Finally, the member cautioned that the University must be careful to ensure that an appropriate balance among disciplines was preserved as expansion occurred. Members had seen evidence quite recently of the government's attempts to change the balance (e.g. towards engineering and computer science) to various programs to meet what the government viewed as its own short-term and medium-term needs. The member believed that this pressure would continue and perhaps increase as significant enrolment growth occurred over the next several years. He urged that the University resist this pressure as it attempted to find the correct balance from its own long-term academic perspective.

A member noted that he agreed in principle with the idea of expansion and noted that the discussion paper was extremely well written. He added that he believed there were possibilities for expansion on the St. George campus which he would outline in detail in an e-mail communication to the administration. He continued that as the administration moved towards

5. ***Enrolment Expansion at the University of Toronto: Discussion Paper*** (cont'd)

electronic and distance education, there was a need to maintain a large student population. There was also a disparity in the programs offered, some of which needed an opportunity to grow. The member urged the authors of the discussion paper to consider consulting with neighbouring school systems on the feasibility of the restructured high school curriculum. It was important that the University be aware of the changes in its applicants as a result of this change. Finally, the member recalled that in 1997 the Provost had brought together a group of undergraduate and graduate students to discuss the teaching experience at the University. The member noted that a great number of the University's teachers were graduate students. The University needed to make sure that, as it contemplated expansion, it also provided professional development and improved teacher education for its teaching assistants. He believed the discussion paper should speak to the need for the enrichment of teaching. Finally, the member spoke in support of increasing the summer program, noting that this would help soften the blow of increased enrolment.

A member noted that he welcomed the opportunity for growth on the suburban campuses. As most governors were aware, there were stresses on these campuses that had been building for a number of years. These could be relieved with appropriately staged growth. The suburban campuses stood the most to gain from enrolment expansion; however, if expansion was not undertaken properly, these campuses also stood to lose the most. Should the suburban campuses grow by large numbers, the nature of those institutions would be quite different. Currently, each of these campuses had an enrolment larger than that of Trent University. The member hoped that these campuses would continue to be part of the University of Toronto rather than three separate universities broadly linked. He cautioned that there were many hidden issues that had to be dealt with as the University contemplated enrolment expansion on the suburban campuses. For example, the administrative structure of the Scarborough campus was very different than that of the departmental structure in the Faculty of Arts and Science on the St. George campus. He noted that there was a huge nexus of inter-related problems related to enrolment expansion (e.g. three-year degree, the need for increased faculty and building expansion). To date, there was no clear timeframe from Queen's Park to satisfactorily address these issues. The member continued that there were also some issues which needed to be resolved at this time rather than later. Should the University determine that it would not significantly expand its enrolment, there was a need to ease some of the stresses that currently existed in the tri-campus arrangement. In particular, he welcomed the comment within the discussion paper that noted that expansion of the suburban campuses "could allow for genuine three-campus planning in a way that has not proved possible within the existing configuration." He hoped that the Governing Council would take seriously the opportunity to undertake some much-needed three-campus planning as the University entered this time of growth.

A member urged that as the University planned for expansion, it undertake to simultaneously rationalize its programs and offerings, as had been set out in previous planning papers. He hoped that the opportunity for expansion would not delay the cooperative efforts of Ontario universities to rationalize and re-sort their programs. The member also urged that the University take the opportunity for expansion to restore the physical infrastructure of the University's three campuses. Members of the Business Board were aware that existing infrastructure and deferred maintenance suffered during times of new construction. Finally, the member urged that the University hedge its risks should the anticipated enrolment growth of government funding not materialize.

A member noted that Mr. Turner had in his deputation addressed the two main concerns for part-time students: length of time to completion and financial resources. Many students were unaware of the length of time required to complete programs on a part-time basis. The member estimated that approximately 25% of the anticipated growth in future enrolment would be for part-time studies. If the three-year bachelor's degree were eliminated, as was contemplated in the

5. ***Enrolment Expansion at the University of Toronto: Discussion Paper*** (cont'd)

discussion paper, part-time students who could only complete the equivalent of one full-credit course each year would take twenty years to complete their degree (10 years if two full-credit courses were completed per year). She believed the University's very valuable part-time programs would suffer as a result. The member expressed her appreciation to Mr. Turner for his intervention on behalf of part-time students.

A member concurred with many comments made by his colleague who had first addressed Council on this issue this evening. He too believed that the summer session was not exploited to the degree it could be, despite the fact that it was among the largest programs in North America. To do this effectively, the Faculty of Arts and Science would have to introduce many more term courses as opposed to full-year courses. It was extremely difficult for students enrolled in the summer term to complete a 26-week course in six weeks. He also believed the summer session could be used much more effectively if there was a much larger selection of term courses. This was also true of the winter session, especially for part-time students. The potential for elimination of the three-year degree to have a term or semester system would provide more flexibility for part-time students. If the University was to continue to offer part-time programs, changes were required in the Faculty of Arts and Science to allow and encourage part-time students to complete their degrees in a more timely fashion.

The member also implored his colleagues not to allow physical development of the St. George campus to eliminate existing green spaces. The University had little green space left and to further deplete these spaces would be tragic and would be a horrible legacy for future students. The member urged that as growth was implemented, the University follow the recommendations of the Open Space Plan, adopted by Council earlier in the year.

A member noted that there had been very good discussions of the paper at the Planning and Budget Committee and the Academic Board, including the question of quality versus access. The member argued that these were not competing objectives and he urged that both were absolute necessities to enrolment expansion. He recalled that another issue raised in these fora had been the current need for improved transportation (e.g. shuttle bus) between the St. George and Scarborough campuses. This was a pressing need, regardless of enrolment expansion and the member urged that a solution be sought at this time. The member continued that in terms of the University's efforts in seeking best-practice models, it should seek to compare itself not only to the United States but also to universities outside of North America. He hoped that international data he had previously requested would soon be available. The member expressed concern at the prospect of the changing nature of programs and the formula for distribution of divisional allocations as a result of enrolment expansion. Finally, the member commented on the prospect of the elimination of the three-year degree. This had been discussed a great deal in previous fora; however, the member believed it to be independent of the issue of enrolment growth and had proved a distraction from some key issues. He suggested that the issues of enrolment expansion and the elimination of the fifteen-credit program be considered separately, especially given the many testimonials on the matter.

A member congratulated the authors of the discussion paper for their recognition of the problems facing the two suburban campuses and for acknowledging that there was an opportunity associated with enrolment expansion to address the problem. He recalled that development of these campuses had been arrested shortly after their creation. He welcomed the opportunity presented in the discussion paper to strengthen academic programs. He added that these campuses were an integral part of the University of Toronto and that faculty wished for this to continue. Finally, the member agreed that enrolment expansion could only be contemplated with adequate funding. It would be a disaster to increase funding with insufficient or marginal funds.

5. Enrolment Expansion at the University of Toronto: Discussion Paper (cont'd)

(c) **Address by a Non-Member: Mr. Chris Borst, Graduate Students' Union**

Recognized by the Chairman, Mr. Borst noted that he had previously addressed the Planning and Budget Committee and the Academic Board on this matter. He referred members to the reports of these meetings for a record of the discussion. He wished to address two points.

First, the issue of rationalization had been raised and there was a possibility of shifts in the divisional distribution of enrolment. The GSU was extremely concerned at this prospect. In particular it was contemplated that a larger proportion of students would move to the suburban campuses. At the Scarborough campus, one third of its current growth was planned to be in the area of management studies. The GSU was concerned that a consequence of enrolment growth on that campus would lead to a shift in enrolment away from studies in the arts and sciences to professional studies.

Secondly, while the GSU was in general support of the directions outlined in the discussion paper, it wished to stress the necessity of increased public funding, not only for increased enrolment but also for quality improvements and enhanced accessibility. This was all the more essential given that the University was already under funded. The GSU cautioned against additional government funding in support of specific enrolment expansion by program, as had been the case with the Access to Opportunities Program, which had been directed at doubling enrolment in computer science and high demand areas of engineering including electrical and computer engineering. The GSU stressed that such programs were a risk to accessibility.

In conclusion, Mr. Borst asked the Governing Council to commit to ensuring growth in public funding for all the University's academic programs.

6. Report of the President

The President apologized that he would be unable to stay until the completion of the meeting as he had an appointment with the Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities to press the case raised by the previous speaker. In his absence, Provost Sedra would act as President.

(a) **Matters Arising from the Previous Meeting**

Maclean's Ranking. The President recalled that at the previous meeting he had reported on the imminent release of the annual ranking. Since that time, the ranking had been released, with the University of Toronto ranking first for the sixth year in a row. As well, the University had ranked first in three of the four reputational indices. The latter was a significant tribute to Ms Sue Bloch-Nevitte and the University's Public Affairs staff.

Relocation of Organizations housed at 44 St. George Street. This matter had been raised by a member at the previous meeting. Vice-Provost Orchard had since advised the President that it was the judgement of Student Affairs that these organizations should be housed, if possible, within one building. Student Affairs was presently working with the Planning Office to find a suitable location.

Cost of Temporary Student Residences. The President recalled that a member had asked about the total cost to the University (hotel costs, shuttle buses, TTC passes, additional residence dons, etc.) as a result of the delay in completion of the Graduate/Second-Entry Residence. Vice-Provost Orchard had advised that the estimated cost for this year would be approximately \$1.3 million.

6. Report of the President (cont'd)

Review of Construction Delay. The University continued to experience difficulty with the construction process at the Graduate/Second-Entry Residence. Professor Finlayson was initiating a review of the project to see if there were systemic issues to be addressed as the University embarked on a period of significant construction during the next five years. This review would include an assessment of tendering, project management, and contracting.

Investments. At the last meeting, the President had, in response to an earlier request, reported that the University had no investments in companies located in East Timor. As a result of further follow-up, he was now aware of a University investment of \$6,300, through a pooled fund in the OISE/UT pension plan, in a company located in Indonesia. The President continued that the University also held numerous international index funds. As such, the University held indirect investments in companies located throughout Asia.

The President recalled that at the previous meeting he had referred to a publication outlining the investments of various companies. At that time, he had believed it possible to further identify the University's indirect investments through this source. He had since learned that this list identified products manufactured in various countries rather than the location of company investments. This listing had, therefore, not provided the insight being sought. The President noted that he had the listing, should any member wish a copy.

The President continued that a member had requested information concerning possible University investments in Talisman Energy. He had been advised that through a combination of direct investment in Talisman and the University's indexed investments through the TSE, the University presently had \$7.8 million of investments in Talisman Energy. He clarified that this investment had been determined by the University's investment managers, rather than as a result of direct investments by the University.

(b) Federal Government Relations

21st Century Chairs of Research Excellence Program. The University continued to be attentive to the implementation of this program.

Federal Budget. The University continued to advocate the case for increased transfer payments to the provinces to pay the full indirect costs of federally supported research. Also, as had been the case for the past two years, the University continued to support increasing the capital gains exemption for charitable gifts. The Report of the Finance Committee, issued this week, referred favourably to arguments made by Professor Munroe-Blum and the President during an appearance before the Finance Committee four weeks ago.

(c) Provincial Government Relations

Operating Grant Support. The University continued to focus most of its energies on obtaining an increase in operating grant support for current enrolment and for enrolment growth. As had been the case the previous year, applications from high school students to the University appeared to have increased this past year by an additional 6%. The University was faced with increased enrolment and had to have a significant increase in provincial support to be in a position to honour the province's commitment to accommodate every willing, motivated and qualified student. The President would continue his efforts in making this case to the provincial government, which included a meeting with the Minister later this evening. It was expected that a decision would be made by January 15 as to the level of transfer payments to universities for September, 2000. The University had advised the government that early disclosure of this information was imperative to permit each Ontario university to make overall enrolment decisions and issue offers of admission to applicants.

6. Report of the President (cont'd)

Growing Ontario's Innovation System: The Strategic Role of University Research. Earlier in the week the Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities, The Honourable Dianne Cunningham, and the Minister of Energy, Science and Technology, The Honourable Jim Wilson, had released *Growing Ontario's Innovation System: The Strategic Role of University Research*, which had become known as the Munroe-Blum report. The President urged members to read the document, copies of which had been placed on the table. The President continued that he hoped to bring forward a motion endorsing the report at the Governing Council's next meeting. A resolution seeking endorsement of the directions and principles reflected in the report would be brought to the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs, the Planning and Budget Committee, the Academic Board and finally to the Governing Council for approval. The President expressed his gratitude to Professor Munroe-Blum for her service to the province and for her report, which he believed would serve Ontario's universities well.

(d) Municipal Government Relations

Development Process. The President recalled the University's endeavours during the past few months to develop the Centre for Information Technology. As a result, the University had employed Mr. Stan Makuch, a noted and distinguished municipal lawyer and former professor of law at the University, to facilitate the University's dealings with the City in the forthcoming development projects.

"Basement" Apartments. The President noted that the City had passed a new by-law which would permit home owners to have a second suite or basement apartment in their homes to ease current housing pressures. This was of great importance to the University given the pressure for student housing, particularly in the areas surrounding each of the University's three campuses, two of which fell within City boundaries. Subject to instruction to the contrary by the Governing Council, the University would support this by-law, which had been adopted but remained the subject of debate. The President believed there to be a close nexus between this issue and the University's interests; however, he invited governors who disagreed to advise him of their views.

Toronto District Heating Corporation. The President congratulated Mr. Robert White for the sale, earlier in the afternoon, of the University's interests in the Corporation.

City of Mississauga. The President added that the University was working closely with the City of Mississauga to obtain municipal support for the expansion plans on that campus. He was very encouraged by the discussions with the municipality to date.

(e) Policy on Licensing of the University of Toronto Name: Sweatshops

The President referred to the Report of the Executive Committee for its discussion of what was known as the "sweatshop" issue. The issue concerned whether the University should attach any conditions to its licensees when it licensed apparel manufacturers and others to put the University of Toronto logo on clothing and other items. A concern being raised across North American universities was that the working conditions for some factory workers in the developing world who were employed to create this apparel were unacceptable.

There had been a movement urging that the universities attach minimum conditions of employment to their licenses to ensure that anyone producing apparel that would carry the university's logo would be obliged to meet these conditions. This had proven to be a difficult issue for the University of Toronto. The administration had engaged in consultations and had received advice. Professor Brian Langille, an expert on international labour relations, had

6. Report of the President (cont'd)

provided a great deal of guidance and the matter had been discussed with the Executive Committee.

As a result of its consultations, the administration had come to the following conclusions.

- The University should require each company licensed to use the University's logo to disclose to the University where the apparel was manufactured.
- Disclosure of the above was necessary for the renewal of the company's license with the University. A listing should be publicly available.
- The University would, through a process of consultation over the next couple of months, work towards conditions that would be included in contracts with licensees. This would be done in consultation with non-governmental organizations sensitive to the situation in developing countries. That is, the University did not wish simply to adopt normal Canadian labour law standards and stipulate that this must be respected in the developing world. This might hurt rather than assist the interests of workers. The University would focus not on particular terms and conditions of employment but rather on procedure and process (e.g. the rights of free association, the right to collective bargaining and the right to negotiate freely).

The administration hoped to bring forward a policy recommendation to governance before the end of the academic year.

(f) Miscellaneous

Y2K Preparedness. The President believed the University to be well prepared for Y2K. An administrative plan for dealing with the first few days of January would be implemented by Miss Oliver, Assistant Vice-President, Operations and Services.

Hong Kong and Taiwan Trip. The Chairman, the President and various colleagues had recently returned from a week in Hong Kong, and, in the President's case, Taiwan. A very successful convocation had been held in Hong Kong and the President expressed his appreciation to the Chairman for her participation in the event, as well as in other numerous alumni-related events overseas.

Magazine Essay. The President drew attention to a one-page essay on liberal education that had appeared in the UofT Magazine, a copy of which was attached to the outline of his President's Report.

Transition Planning. The President and his Office were in the process of developing with Dr. Birgeneau a process of transition for the new President.

United Way Campaign. The President noted that Dr. Golden had advised that the University's campaign was going extremely well this year under the leadership of Professor Doug Perovic, Chair, Department of Metallurgy and Materials Science in the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering.

Holiday Season and the New Century. The President expressed holiday wishes to governors on behalf of all members of the University. He invited members to stop by his Office after the meeting to receive small tokens of appreciation from the University's divisions.

6. **Report of the President** (cont'd)

(g) **Employee Relations**

Unions. The administration was devoting a great deal of time to negotiation of salaries and benefits agreements with 14 of its unions. Agreements with two unions had been reached within the past two weeks. The President expressed his gratitude to Professor Finlayson for his leadership on this front.

The President hoped that agreements could be reached with the unions, many of which would be in a position to strike in January.

Administrative Staff / United Steelworkers of America. One of the outstanding settlements concerned a first collective agreement between the University and the United Steelworkers of America, the newly elected union representing about 2,400 members of the administrative staff. Professor Finlayson and his colleagues were working hard to achieve a settlement that would reflect both the interests of the University as well as those of its administrative staff. They were guided in their endeavours by continuing consultation with the University's academic leadership.

Teaching Assistants / CUPE 3902. The President continued that some members had indicated a special interest in the status of the University's negotiations with CUPE 3902, the union representing the University's teaching assistants. The President said that, while he would be happy to report on this matter, negotiations should be undertaken at the bargaining table and not at Governing Council. Also, contractual relations with employee groups were exclusively within the responsibility of the Business Board and it would, therefore, be improper for Council to intervene in this area.

The President proceeded to brief members on this matter. Over the course of the fall, a number of issues had been raised by CUPE 3902, including graduate student support, tuition fees, and financial aid. These aligned very much with the planning document *Raising our Sights*, in which the case had been made for multi-year financial aid packages for graduate students. The President and the Provost had agreed that a forum should be created for the discussion of work being undertaken by the School of Graduate Studies, issues raised by the teaching assistants, and similar initiatives. Accordingly, the Task Force on Graduate Student Financial Support, to be chaired by Vice-Provost Orchard, would be established shortly. The President believed that this task force would provide very useful guidance to the University as well as an opportunity for principled discussion of graduate student issues, including those raised by CUPE 3902. The administration did not believe it was appropriate for these issues to be discussed in negotiations with CUPE 3902, as they pertained to all graduate students, only a minority of whom held teaching assistant positions.

The administration continued to be guided in these negotiations by the overarching principle that it place the interests of its students first. The President emphasized his continued belief that the University should never require a strike to determine the University's final position. The University had an obligation to its students to do everything within its power to ensure that its final position was placed on the table prior to a strike. This was a position that had guided past negotiations, had been followed in these negotiations, and would continue to guide the administration and Professor Finlayson and his team.

Finally, the University was obliged to have in place contingency plans to protect the interests of its students in the event of a labour disruption. The President was very pleased that there had been no need to implement contingency plans developed for the month of December. The Provost, working with the University's academic leaders, would develop similar contingency

6. Report of the President (cont'd)

plans for the month of January. While some had charged this was unfair labour practice, the President disagreed. The University had an obligation to its students to ensure that they received their education.

The President departed the meeting to honour a commitment at Queen's Park involving university issues. The Provost assumed his chair and responded to members' questions.

A member commented that there was also a United Way Campaign at the University of Toronto at Mississauga, under the stewardship of Principal McNutt. He understood that it too was proving to be quite successful this year.

A member posed several questions.

Dr. Chun. The member regretted that the President was not present to update members on the status of Dr. Chun's case against the University. The member requested that the President provide such an update at the Council's next meeting.

Occupants of 44 St. George Street. The member recalled a previous decision to relocate the African Student Society and others from their present location within 44 St. George Street, a site previously contemplated for demolition to make way for the new Centre for Information Technology. Given that this site was designated as historical and that it would now be incorporated into this development project, the member suggested that there was no longer a need to relocate these groups. He sought clarification of the administration's intentions.

Investments in East Timor and Burma. The member suggested that mistakes had been made in the University's investments, which were contrary to the principles of the University's policy on *Social and Political Issues with Respect to University Investment*. He asked what steps would be taken to ensure that these mistakes were corrected (i.e. divestment from unethical investments) and what steps would be taken in future to ensure that this did not happen again.

Policy on Use of University of Toronto Name – "Sweatshop" Issue. The member was pleased to hear that the administration was pursuing this and that there were to be consultations. He continued that he understood there had been an agreement between the administration and the student groups involved as to a policy statement outlining specific conditions for dealing with this issue. He wondered why this document had not been made public.

"Basement" Apartments. The member was pleased to hear of the University's involvement in this issue. He urged that it (a) continue with its efforts, and (b) act as an advocate for its students living off-campus to ensure adequate housing standards were maintained.

Professor Sedra responded to several points raised. The University continued in its negotiations to find a solution to the dispute with Dr. Chun. If members wished, he would provide an update at the next meeting. The University was in the process of finding an alternative location for the African Students Union. He clarified that there was still need to relocate the occupants as there would be disruption during the construction of the Centre for Information Technology. As well, it might make sense to use the building for a function that was germane to the CIT. He was not aware of the mistakes in investments to which the member had referred. He would be happy to hear further from the member on this and to respond at the next meeting. Finally, Professor Sedra responded that the University's endorsement of basement suites did not mean that it would be able to guarantee their suitability for students.

7. Reports for Information

The Chairman noted that members have received the following reports for information.

- Report Number 96 of the Academic Board – October 21, 1999
- Report Number 97 of the Academic Board – December 2, 1999
- Report Number 101 of the Business Board – October 25, 1999
- Report Number 88 of the University Affairs Board – November 1, 1999
- Report Number 320 of the Executive Committee – November 30, 1999
- Report Number 321 of the Executive Committee – December 3, 1999

8. Date of the Next Meeting

The Chairman reminded members that the date of the next meeting was Thursday, February 10, 2000. Weather permitting, the meeting would be held on the Mississauga campus.

The Chairman noted that it was 6:57 p.m. and that three minutes remained before Council would require a motion to extend the time limit for the meeting

9. Question Period

No questions were raised.

10. Other Business

(a) Elimination of Three-year Degree

A member noted that the *Discussion Paper on Enrolment Expansion* indicated that the restructuring of the high school curriculum from five years to four years had implications for the three-year degree and that this degree should therefore be eliminated. However, there were no corresponding plans to increase the four-year degree to five years. If the University chose to maintain the four-year degree, he suggested that there would in fact be no problem with the flow of students from high school to undergraduate programs to graduate programs. The three-year degree had never been an instrument for going from an undergraduate to a graduate program. The question had, therefore, been raised as to the value of a three-year degree. The President's essay, attached to the outline of his report, was very timely. There was a certain value to the three-year degree: it provided a liberal education; it was used by students who wished to apply to law schools; it also served as a "career launcher" for students applying to computer science and commerce. Finally, on the issue of recognition, the member suggested that the offering of the three-year degree program recognized and spoke to the University's commitment to liberal education.

The Chairman noted that it was 7:00 p.m. and that pursuant to By-Law Number 2, sections 11 and 65, a motion would be required to extend the length of the meeting.

It was duly moved and seconded,
THAT the time of adjournment be extended to 7:10 p.m.

The motion failed.

The meeting adjourned at 7:00 p.m.

Secretary
February 22, 2000

Chairman