

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO  
**THE GOVERNING COUNCIL**

**Thursday, May 11, 2000**

MINUTES OF THE GOVERNING COUNCIL meeting held on Thursday, May 11, 2000  
at 4:30 p.m. in the Council Chamber, University of Toronto at Mississauga.

Present:

Ms Wendy M. Cecil-Cockwell (In the Chair)	The Honourable Robert K. Rae
Professor J. Robert S. Prichard, President	Professor Emmet I. Robbins
Professor Mary Beattie	Professor Wendy Rolph
Dr. Robert Bennett	Dr. Joseph L. Rotman
Mr. Brian C. Burchell	Professor Adel S. Sedra
Professor Jack Carr	Professor Kenneth Sevcik
Professor John R. G. Challis	Mr. Amir Shalaby
Professor W. Raymond Cummins	Mr. Terrence L. Stephen
Ms Shruti Dev-Nayyar	Ms Wendy Talfourd-Jones
Dr. Shari Graham Fell	Professor Ronald D. Venter
Professor Vivek Goel	Ms Nancy L. Watson
Mr. Ljupco Gjorgjinski	Dr. Alexander R. Waugh
Professor Brian Langille	Ms Judith Wilson
Mr. Gerald A. Lokash	Mr. Vilko Zbogor
Professor John T. Mayhall	
Professor Ian R. McDonald	Mr. Louis R. Charpentier, Secretary of the Governing Council
Mr. Ahmed Rafi Mian	
Professor Heather Munroe-Blum	
Dr. John P. Nestor	<u>Secretariat:</u>
Mr. Elan Ohayon	Ms Susan Girard
Ms Jacqueline C. Orange	Ms Margaret McKone
The Honourable David R. Peterson	
Mr. Kashif S. Pirzada	

Absent:

Mrs. Mary Anne V. Chambers	The Honourable Henry N. R. Jackman
The Honourable William G. Davis	Dr. Robert J. Kyle
Ms Wanda M. Dorosz	Ms Rose M. Patten
Mr. Paul V. Godfrey	Mrs. Susan M. Scace
Dr. Anne Golden	Mr. Robert G. Spencer
Mr. Peter A. Herrndorf	Mr. John H. Tory

In Attendance:

Mr. Fayez Quereshy, member-elect, Governing Council  
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  
Professor Carl Amrhein, Dean, Faculty of Arts and Science  
Ms Bonnie Croll, Assistant Dean, Faculty of Law  
Mr. W. G. Tad Brown, Finance and Development Counsel  
Mr. Irfan Dhalla, Vice-President External Affairs, Medical Society  
Dr. Beata FitzPatrick, Assistant Provost  
Ms Rivi Frankle, Director of Alumni and Development  
Ms Rebecca Dolgoy, University Affairs Commissioner, Students' Administrative Council  
Professor Wayne Hindmarsh, Dean, Faculty of Pharmacy  
Mr. Paul Kutasi, Vice-President, Students' Administrative Council  
Professor Robert McNutt, Principal, University of Toronto at Mississauga  
Professor David Naylor, Dean, Faculty of Medicine  
Ms Christine Oke, Assistant Vice-Provost, Professional Faculties  
Professor Peter Pauly, Associate Dean, Rotman School of Management  
Mr. Kasi Rao, Director of the Office of the President and Director of Government Relations  
Ms Maureen Somerville, Chair, College of Electors  
Mr. Paul Tsang, President, Graduate Students' Union

**1. Chairman's Remarks**

The Chairman announced that Mrs. Mary Anne V. Chambers had been acclaimed Vice-Chair of the Governing Council for another one-year term.

The Chairman welcomed Mr. Fayez Quereshy, a newly elected member of the Governing Council from the full-time undergraduate student constituency.

The Chairman reported that she had declined a speaking request from the Arts and Science Students' Union to address the Council regarding Dr. Kin-Yip Chun. She noted that her decision had been based on the length of the agenda and the number of speakers who would be addressing agenda items at the meeting.

**2. Principal's Remarks**

At the invitation of the Chairman, Principal McNutt introduced the many members of the University of Toronto at Mississauga who were in attendance. He then welcomed members of the Governing Council to the Erindale Campus, which enjoyed an enrolment of approximately 6400 part- and full-time undergraduate students, 200 doctoral and master's students and approximately 24,000 alumni. As well, UTM employed in excess of 400 faculty and staff members. The first class had been held in 1966 in what is now the City of Mississauga. The

**2. Principal's Remarks** (cont'd)

Honourable William Davis, then Minister of Education, had been instrumental in the creation of the campus.

The College had a history of distinguished leadership with Principals such as Tuzo Wilson, who had set an early standard for excellence, followed by Peter Robinson, Paul Fox, Desmond Morton, Peter Robson and Roger Beck. Principal McNutt had become Principal of UTM five years previously and was very proud to be a part of this group.

Members of the campus were excited about the prospect for growth and they very much looked forward to the adoption by the Governing Council of the *Framework for Enrolment Expansion at the University of Toronto*, which contemplated significant enrolment growth on the University's two suburban campuses. Two new buildings had been built and were now in operation. Both had been the cover feature in the April issue of Canadian Architect magazine. The campus had also been a recipient of provincial funding under the SuperBuild Growth Fund for a new building that was a joint initiative with Sheridan College. In conclusion, Principal McNutt noted that UTM, which was on the cusp of significant growth, was currently completing a master plan for the entire campus that would accommodate the expansion of its current complement of world-class faculty.

**3. Minutes of the Previous Meeting held on April 6, 2000**

The Chairman reported that a member had indicated that at the previous meeting that he had noted his intention to give a notice of motion concerning an expenditure of funding for an accessibility fund, which was not reflected in the Minutes. The Chairman stated that the Secretary's notes did not reflect this notice. She continued, however, that this notice of motion had been given at meetings of the Academic Board and of the Planning and Budget Committee, it would be considered by the Chair of the Planning and Budget Committee, and by the Agenda Committee of the Academic Board.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT the Minutes of the previous meeting, held on April 6, 2000, be approved.

**4. Business Arising from the Minutes of the Previous Meeting****Item 11 – Question Period – (b) Dr. Chun**

A member noted that there had been insufficient opportunity at previous meetings for members to adequately discuss the matter of Dr. Chun's complaint against the University. As well, a request from a member of the University community to address this matter at today's meeting had been declined. The member, therefore, provided notice of motion that the matter be designated as an agenda item for the next meeting of the Council, to be held on June 29.

**4. Business Arising from the Minutes of the Previous Meeting** (cont'd)**Item 11 – Question Period – (b) Dr. Chun** (cont'd)

The Chairman responded that the motion would be discussed by the Executive Committee at its next meeting.

**5. A Framework for Enrolment Expansion at the University of Toronto****(a) Introduction**

The Chairman recalled that discussion of *A Framework for Enrolment Expansion at the University of Toronto (Framework)* had been adjourned at the previous meeting because there had been insufficient time remaining in the meeting. She continued that she had granted speaking privileges on this matter to Ms Rebecca Dolgoy, University Affairs Commissioner, Students' Administrative Council. She would invite Ms Dolgoy to address the Council after the matter had been introduced and after questions for clarification had been addressed.

Professor Mayhall introduced the proposal, noting that with the expected increase in demand for places at universities and colleges because of demographics and the impending "double cohort", it was important that the University plan for future enrolment growth in a coherent manner, looking at the size and shape of the University, campus by campus. The document before members provided a framework for considering plans for enrolment growth. The President had presented a brief overview of the *Framework* at the meeting of the Academic Board, which had been followed by extensive debate.

By means of a Power Point presentation, the President provided an overview of the highlights of the *Framework*. A copy of his presentation is attached hereto as Appendix "A".

Following his presentation, the President responded to a query regarding alternative sources of funding for enrolment expansion at the University. He emphasized that a fundamental condition of enrolment growth at the University was that expansion would not occur without the necessary operating capital and student funding support. In his judgement, the bulk of this support would have to come from the provincial government. The *Framework*, which included this provision, had been shared with government officials.

**(b) Address by a Non-Member: Ms Rebecca Dolgoy, University Affairs Commissioner, Students' Administrative Council (SAC)**

Ms Dolgoy addressed three areas in which SAC believed the University should concentrate its efforts as it sought to expand.

First, the University should maintain academic integrity. SAC asked that the University renew its commitment to the liberal arts. Also, while SAC supported the prospect that growth would take place mainly on the suburban campuses, it cautioned against an excess of co-op programs at the University of Toronto at Scarborough, which might lead the campus to be viewed as a vocational-training college rather than a university with interdisciplinary programs.

**5. A Framework for Enrolment Expansion at the University of Toronto** (cont'd)

**(b) Address by a Non-Member: Ms Rebecca Dolgoy, University Affairs Commissioner, Students' Administrative Council (SAC)** (cont'd)

Second, the University should seek to uphold the University experience. SAC asked that the University continue its efforts to increase non-academic space on campus (i.e. extra-curricular spaces and a multi-faith facility). Also, SAC endorsed the University's efforts to provide increased housing on campus. SAC advocated that all student housing be affordable to students.

Finally, Ms Dolgoy advocated that in achieving its enrolment growth objectives, the University should ensure that students did not bear the financial burden of enrolment growth. She encouraged the administration to continue to consult broadly as it proceeded with the implementation of the *Framework*.

**(c) Discussion**

A member of the University of Toronto at Scarborough responded to Ms Dolgoy's concern regarding that campus's co-op programs. He clarified that the existing co-op programs were among the most academically rigorous on the Scarborough campus and were structured so that students received specialist education similar to that offered in humanities disciplines on all of the University's campuses. He continued that if the Scarborough campus was to move to intensify its co-op programs, as was contemplated in the *Framework*, it should do so on the condition that the underpinnings of the liberal arts be strictly maintained.

A member noted that he had spoken in favour of the proposal in other fora because it was long overdue. However, the administration had previously indicated that the *Framework* was not predicated on the elimination of the 15-credit degree program. The document currently before members appeared to be contrary to this assertion. He, therefore, indicated that the document should be revised to eliminate section number 8, so that the issue of enrolment expansion could be separated from the elimination of the 15-credit degree. He believed that the coupling of the issue weakened the arguments for enrolment expansion within the *Framework*.

A member moved:

THAT section number 8 be removed from the *Framework for Enrolment Expansion at the University of Toronto*.

The President noted that the member's motion raised both a procedural and a substantive question. With regard to the substance of the motion, he recalled that the Governing Council had previously adopted the directions outlined in section number 8. Specifically, at its previous meeting, the Council had approved a resolution that the 15-credit BA and BSc degrees be discontinued on the St. George Campus, for students entering their programs commencing the academic year 2001-2002, and at the University of Toronto at Mississauga, at a time to be determined by the Vice-President and Provost and the Principal. No decision had been made at that time with respect to the 15-credit degree at the Scarborough campus. With

**5. A Framework for Enrolment Expansion at the University of Toronto** (cont'd)**(c) Discussion** (cont'd)

regard to procedure, the President sought a ruling from the Secretary of the Governing Council.

The Secretary of the Governing Council responded that the member's motion was tantamount to revisiting a decision that the Governing Council had already made. Under By-Law Number 2 of the Governing Council, this was not possible for another year. The motion was, therefore, out of order.

The member noted that he did not wish for the Council to revisit its previous decision. The inclusion of the information in section number 8 was misleading because it made certain assumptions that should not, in his view, be made.

The President responded that section number 8 was purely descriptive; it was not prescriptive. An assumption was being made based on certain projections. So, the force of the member's motion would be to revisit a decision already made. He believed there was a risk of misinterpretation should the section be removed.

A member moved:

THAT the decision of the Chairman be challenged.

The motion did not receive a seconder.

A member asked if the University had any long-range plans to participate in the City of Toronto's plans to develop the waterfront. The President responded in the affirmative; however, these plans did not have a direct bearing on the *Framework*. The University had been invited to collaborate on a number of City initiatives and Professor Munroe-Blum was the University's key person in these discussions.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT *A Framework for Enrolment Expansion at the University of Toronto*, dated March 2000, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 99 of the Academic Board as Appendix "E", be endorsed.

**6. Tuition Fee Schedules for Publicly Funded Programs**

The Chairman noted that she had granted speaking privileges on this matter to Mr. Irfan Dhalla, Vice-President, External Affairs, Medical Society and to Mr. Jorge Sousa, President, Graduate Students' Union. She noted that she would recognize these speakers after the matter had been introduced and after questions for clarification have been addressed.

## **6. Tuition Fee Schedules for Publicly Funded Programs** (cont'd)

### **(a) Introduction**

Mr. Shalaby introduced the proposal, noting that tuition fee increases came in various shapes and sizes; some were regulated, some were unregulated. The fee increases applied differently to continuing and incoming students as well as to Canadian and visa students. Generally the proposal before the Council recommended 2% or 3% increases for most of the regulated programs and 5% for new students in deregulated programs. For international students, fees were proposed to increase by the same dollar amount as domestic fees. The larger increases were proposed for some second-entry programs, which were not regulated. For many new students in deregulated programs, the increase was 5% (e.g. doctoral-stream graduate programs). In other cases, the proposed increase was larger: in Commerce, Computer Science, Dentistry, Law, Medicine, Pharmacy and the M.B.A. The tuition fee increases were guided by the University's *Tuition Fee Policy*, which called for differentiation. Fees should be higher for high-cost programs and for programs where graduates earned high incomes.

Mr. Shalaby noted that recommending tuition fee increases was not one of the most pleasant parts of being Chair of the Business Board. The only consolation was that the alternative was worse: tuition fee income would not flow to the academic divisions in support of their academic goals and the quality of education would deteriorate.

The foremost question in the minds of members of the Business Board had been the accessibility of programs and the impact on students. Data suggested that there had been no loss of accessibility and Mr. Shalaby was convinced that members of the Business Board had given this question due consideration. The twin to the University's *Tuition Fee Policy* was the *Policy on Student Financial Support*. For next year, the University had budgeted for almost \$65 million for student financial support, equal to about one third of revenues from tuition fees. Members of the Business Board had heard from Vice-Provost Ian Orchard, who had provided statistics showing that, in spite of the tuition fee increases of the last couple of years, enrolment by students from poorer families had not declined; it had increased. This was attributable to the University's *Policy on Student Financial Support*.

Invited by the Chairman to comment, the President responded to three questions that had been raised at the Executive Committee meeting.

First, why was it necessary to increase tuition fees? An increase in tuition fee revenue was required to avoid further reductions in the budgets of the University's academic divisions. The University was facing a deficit of approximately \$19 million in its operating budget for next year and the administration was attempting to find a combination of sources to significantly reduce or eliminate this deficit. Some budget reductions had been scheduled in the University's multi-year budget plan for next year and the administration was actively seeking to eliminate the need for further reductions in the coming year. The President noted that the total amount of increased net revenue from the proposed tuition fee increases was approximately \$5 million (i.e. income after 30% of the additional revenue derived from tuition fee increases was set aside to increase student financial support). With this revenue, the deficit for next year would be reduced to \$14 million. The President added that the University

**6. Tuition Fee Schedules for Publicly Funded Programs** (cont'd)**(a) Introduction** (cont'd)

had been making strong representations to the Government of Ontario to seek enhanced funding through the Provincial budget. Such activity had been the President's first priority over the past several weeks. The outcome, as members were aware, had not provided any growth or quality enhancement funding. However, it had provided some welcome assistance - i.e. a new research performance fund which should provide approximately \$10 million in base operating revenue to mitigate next year's deficit. Therefore the revenue derived from the recommended tuition fee increases and the new provincial support should ensure that the University did not have to make significant additional base budget reductions in divisional budgets.

Second, why were significant tuition fee increases recommended for particular programs such as Commerce, Computer Science, Dentistry, Law, Medicine, Pharmacy, and the Master of Business Administration? The President noted that these tuition fee increases were required for the relevant divisions to implement their academic plans. The strategy was to ensure that the offerings in each of these areas were the best in Canada and ranked with the best in North America. The Deans of these divisions had been challenged to develop academic plans that would achieve a quality that would enhance their division's competitive position relative to the top programs in North America. Significant progress was being made to achieve this goal in each of these divisions. The adoption of the recommended tuition fee increases would help to complete the repositioning of each of these programs.

Third, when would there be an end to significant tuition fee increases? With the exception of the Faculty of Law, where it was explicitly noted to the contrary, it was the judgement of the administration that the recommended fee increases in the professional programs were the increases required to move the University to a position of international competitiveness. It was, therefore, anticipated that the tuition fee increases in these programs would be at a relatively steady state in the future. He clarified that this did not take into account any unplanned challenges or needs. Only a one-year tuition fee increase had been recommended for the Faculty of Law because the Faculty was currently preparing a multi-year plan. It was anticipated that implementing that plan would require further tuition fee increases.

Finally, was access being compromised as a result of the tuition fee increases? In response, the President stated his belief that the University of Toronto had played an appropriate leadership role in Canada. The Governing Council had adopted a written guarantee that it would provide every student admitted to the University with sufficient resources on reasonable terms to complete his/her program of study. The funding for this guarantee was the first claim on all the budget resources at the University of Toronto and, therefore, the University would never be in the position of not being able to meet this obligation. The University had radically improved its expenditures on student financial support as it had increased tuition fees. This year, the University had doubled the size of the grants given to second-entry professional students (from \$2000 to \$4000) and it had increased the expenditures on student financial support to almost \$65 million per year (this compared to approximately \$12.5 million per year expended in 1990). The University had also committed to significant increases in graduate



**6. Tuition Fee Schedules for Publicly Funded Programs** (cont'd)**(a) Introduction** (cont'd)

student support as a result of recommendations contained in the draft report of the Task Force on Graduate Student Support chaired by Vice-Provost Orchard. The University continued to monitor whether the increases in tuition fees, combined with the strengthened financial aid, were undermining or decreasing accessibility to the University's programs. Documentation that had been filed with the Committee on Academic Policies and Programs this year had been distributed to members with their agenda packages. This information clearly indicated that accessibility had not only been maintained but in some instances had been increased.

**(b) Questions for Clarification**

Further information was provided in response to a number of questions for clarification.

**Master of Business Administration program tuition fees.** A member drew attention to a footnote in the proposed Schedule, which stated that MBA tuition fees would be \$20,000 for the 2001-02 entering cohort, \$23,500 for the 2002-03 entering cohort and \$25,000 for the 2003-04 entering cohort. Would the Governing Council's approval of the schedule include those tuition fees beyond 2001-02 identified in footnote. The President responded in the negative, noting that the proposed fee increases for 2002-03 and 2003-04 were being provided for information only. The administration had wished to provide complete disclosure of the proposed tuition fees that would result from the Faculty of Management's academic plan.

**Appropriate balance of tuition fee increases and government funding.** A member recalled that in the past an appropriate balance of program costs had been 30% - 35% from tuition fees and 65% - 70% from government support. He wondered if this was still the case. The President and Professor Sedra responded that tuition fee revenue currently contributed approximately \$200 million to the University's operating budget; government grants contributed approximately \$350 million (36% from tuition fees and 64% from the government). The University's total operating budget for next year was approximately \$760 million, of which \$220 million would be from tuition fee revenue (approximately 30% of the total). The administration believed the current mix was reasonable.

**Commitment to continuing students.** In response to a query, the President confirmed that the University would continue to make a commitment to students entering the University that their fees would increase by no more than 5% per year for the usual length of their full-time program and for four years for doctoral programs. The larger of the proposed tuition fee increases therefore applied only to incoming students.

**Ruling on conflict of interest for various members.** A member noted that section 27 of By-Law Number 2 of the Governing Council pertained to conflict of interest of members in voting. He asked if the Vice-Chair of the Governing Council and the Vice-Chair of the Business Board, who also served as executives of major banks, were in conflict of interest situations and should, therefore, abstain for discussion and voting on the issue. Specifically,

**6. Tuition Fee Schedules for Publicly Funded Programs** (cont'd)**(b) Questions for Clarification** (cont'd)

tuition fee increases would lead to great debt loads of students, which would be of benefit to banks.

The Secretary of the Governing Council said that following the member's reasoning on conflict of interest of members, student governors should not be permitted to vote on tuition fee increases given that they would be directly affected.

The member countered that the 1993 Report of the Task Force on University Accountability, which had included broad consultation, had stated clearly that students should be permitted to vote on tuition fee increases.

The President noted that the issue of whether students should be eligible to vote on tuition fee increases had been before the Executive Committee on numerous occasions. He believed that it was the advice of the University's Counsel that if he were formally asked for an opinion as to the interpretation of By-Law Number 2 on this point, he would be obliged to advise the Chairman that students should not be eligible to vote. The Executive Committee, on the President's advice, had, therefore, never formally sought this opinion. With respect to the assertion that officers of financial institutions, which may or may not be involved in the student-loan business, had a conflict of interest, the President noted that past judgement of the Executive Committee had been that this was not the case.

The member responded that there was clearly a perception by students that executive members of banks were in a conflict of interest situation when voting on tuition fee increases. He asked the Chairman for a ruling on the matter.

The Chairman ruled that the Vice-Chairs of the Governing Council and the Business Board were not in conflict of interest and were, therefore, eligible to vote on the proposed tuition fee schedule.

**Accessibility.** A member posed a series of questions. Did the administration have information concerning the average debt loads of students enrolled in those programs where large tuition fee increases proposed? Did the University consider socioeconomic background in its accessibility surveys? If so, what did these statistics indicate? Finally, the member asked if it would be appropriate to consider separately the proposed tuition fee increases for those programs where increases in excess of 5% were being recommended because of high-program costs.

The President and Professor Orchard responded. The administration very much shared student concerns about accessibility. Accordingly, the University had undertaken surveys to assess the impact of the University's *Policy on Student Financial Support*. This evaluation of accessibility included a regular, professional survey of students by the Hitachi Research Centre at the University of Toronto at Mississauga. In 1999, the Centre had surveyed students in undergraduate programs with regulated fees and in the programs with deregulated fees

**6. Tuition Fee Schedules for Publicly Funded Programs** (cont'd)**(b) Questions for Clarification** (cont'd)

(Dentistry, Law, MBA, Medicine and Pharmacy). The current year's survey also assessed accessibility for students in undergraduate programs and professional faculties. The surveys compared the demographic characteristics of (a) students in the upper years of their programs, who were not affected by the major increases in tuition fees, and (b) students in first year, who were facing those fee increases. With respect to ethno-cultural background, the 1999 survey found that the proportion of students who identified themselves as being from non-European backgrounds had increased, notwithstanding higher tuition fees, from 37% in the upper years to 46% in first year. The preliminary results from the recently completed survey indicated that the proportion had increased further to approximately 50%. With respect to family income, the proportion of students from families with incomes under \$30,000 had increased from 15% in the upper years in 1999, to 18% in first year in 1999, to approximately 20% currently in first year. The survey also monitored the current debt load being carried by students as well as expected debt load upon graduation and it found no significant change. All indications were that the combination of higher tuition fees, along with more financial assistance to needy students, was not reducing accessibility. On the contrary, more students from non-European and from low-income families were attending the University. With respect to the suggestion that the question be divided, with a separate vote on the proposed tuition fee increases in excess of 5%, the matter had been considered and rejected at the Business Board meeting. This position had been reiterated at the Executive Committee meeting.

**(c) Addresses by Non-Members**

The Chairman invited Mr. Jorge Sousa, Graduate Students' Union, to address the Council. Mr. Dhalla urged the Council not to raise the tuition fee for medical students to \$14,000 per year but instead to freeze it at \$11,000. He noted that he and his colleagues were not pleading on their own behalves; the large increase would become effective with students entering the program in the forthcoming year. Rather, he and his colleagues believed their request was in the best interests of the University. He referred members to two handouts which had been distributed with members' agenda packages: "A Call to Freeze Medical Tuition" and "Snapshot of the Future: Anticipated Debt of the Medical Class of 2003". Mr. Dhalla noted that the document titled 'A Call to Freeze Medical Tuition' had been presented at the Business Board meeting on May 1, and rather than repeat the presentation made there, he referred members to the Report of the Business Board meeting.

Mr. Dhalla cited four reasons for his request.

- First, the best applicants would choose to attend other universities. Medical tuition fees were already higher at the University of Toronto than at any other university in Canada. The highest fees elsewhere were at the University of Western Ontario, where they had been frozen at \$10,000. The previous year's fee increase had already had a negative effect. While the Council had been told that increased fees had not affected yield rates in the Faculty of Law, the rate of acceptance of offers of admission had declined in the Faculty of Medicine. The data were included with the document from

**6. Tuition Fee Schedules for Publicly Funded Programs** (cont'd)**(c) Addresses by Non-Members** (cont'd)

- the Medical Society. This problem could only become worse when tuition fees became 40% higher than those at other universities, as they would be with the proposed increase to \$14,000.
- Second, tuition fees were already too high in light of available student aid.
- Third, accessibility to the undergraduate medical program would be further compromised. The Canadian Medical Association had issued a statement that high tuition fees would adversely affect "not only current and potential medical students, but also the Canadian health care system and public access to medical services. High tuition fees may create an imbalance in admissions to medical school by favouring those who represent the affluent segment of society." While the University was blind to socioeconomic status in making offers of admission, tuition fees could be raised to only a certain level before social class became an implicit consideration.
- Fourth, tuition fees had been increased so quickly that there had been insufficient time to assess the consequences.

Mr. Dhalla then presented new information that had become available since his presentation to the Business Board. The Medical Society at the University of Toronto had recently realized that there was an absence of public data regarding medical student debt. Anecdotally, the Student Affairs office had informed the Society that one third of students would graduate with six-figure debts; however, when Mr. Dhalla had presented this figure to the Business Board, its veracity had been called into question. Therefore, last week the Medical Society had undertaken a survey of the first-year medical class. The results had been surprising and were presented in the handout titled "Snapshot of the Future: Anticipated Debt of the Medical Class of 2003." Mr. Dhalla cited some results, noting that 35% of his classmates expected to graduate with a debt exceeding \$80,000. Of those who had begun medical school with no debt whatsoever, over half would graduate with a debt greater than \$80,000 and one third with a debt greater than \$100,000. Also troubling was the information concerning gender. 36% of men had no debt after their first year; only 16% of women were in the same enviable situation. 15% of the men in Mr. Dhalla's class would graduate with a debt greater than \$ 100,000; 26% of the women in his class would graduate with a six-figure debt. Nationwide, women now represented over half of all medical students. Yet, at the University of Toronto, only 38% of Mr. Dhalla's classmates were women. Was the poor female representation related to the high tuition charged? No one knew, and to the Medical Society, this was a problem. No one knew the consequences of raising tuition to \$14,000, a full 40% higher than the University's nearest competitor and three times what the Ontario Student Assistance Program recognized when lending money. The University of Western Ontario and Queen's University had both frozen medical tuition for next year and the University of Toronto could do so as well. Therefore, the Medical Society urged members of the Governing Council to refer the tuition motion back to the administration, with the instruction that it freeze medical student tuition for one year.

**6. Tuition Fee Schedules for Publicly Funded Programs** (cont'd)**(c) Addresses by Non-Members** (cont'd)

The Chairman invited Mr. Jorge Sousa, President, Graduate Students' Union, to address the Council. Mr. Sousa asked members of the Council not to approve the proposed tuition fee increases. He noted that Report Number 105 of the Business Board contained a very good rationale for the need for tuition fee increases. However, the rationale did not take into account the impact of tuition fee increases on students during the past ten years. In the past two years alone, tuition had increased by 42%. This did not include ancillary fees, the development of which included student involvement. The GSU had sought to assess the impact of tuition fees on graduate students and had requested information from the School of Graduate Studies concerning retention rates for the past ten years. They had been informed that this information, along with other information that had been requested, was not available. It was only recently that information had been gathered as a result of the Task Force on Graduate Student Support. However, tuition fee increases had been recommended for the past ten years. Mr. Sousa questioned the rationale of providing radical increases in student financial support while also increasing tuition fees. He added that the creation of new buildings on campus appeared to be a higher priority for the administration than increasing student financial support. It was difficult to reconcile the millions of dollars that had been spent by the University on infrastructure given increased debt loads of students. In response to Professor Orchard's comments concerning increased accessibility, Mr. Sousa countered that student debt had also increased. Also, he questioned the proportion of graduate students who had responded to the surveys cited. Mr. Sousa noted that members of the Council had paid far less for their graduate education and he urged them to call for a freeze in tuition fees.

**(d) Discussion of the Proposal**

Several members spoke against the proposal.

- While the University did have financial aid programs, students who were forced to resort to government and University financial aid programs would incur huge amounts of debt.
- Increased tuition fees could prove to be a barrier to accessibility, with an undetermined number of potential applicants deciding not to apply to the University because of potential debt loads.
- Despite the guarantee that students' tuition would increase by no more than 5% during the normal course of their program, there was a perception among potential applicants that their tuition fees would increase astronomically during the course of their programs.
- Although the University offered financial support programs, one of the first things that applicants would research would be the tuition fees. The proposed fees could lead to "sticker shock" and lead potential applicants to seek admission elsewhere.

**6. Tuition Fee Schedules for Publicly Funded Programs** (cont'd)**(d) Discussion of the Proposal** (cont'd)

- Debt loads incurred by students as a result of increased tuition could lead them to:
  - choose their career paths based solely on economic considerations so that they could repay their loans; and/or
  - choose higher-paying career paths in the United States so that they could repay their loans.
- The need to pay such high fees and to incur so high a level of debt was causing students to resort to food banks to survive.
- In the past, students had been able to use the proceeds of their summer employment to meet the full cost of their tuition for the following year. This was no longer possible given increasing tuition fees.
- The proposal did not enjoy the support of any of the University's major student organizations.
- The University was faced with a fiscal versus a social responsibility given the potential for a deficit in next year's budget. A member advocated that the University take a more planned approach and factor the deficit into its long-range budget so as to ameliorate the need for increased tuition fees.
- The University had a very large endowment fund. In the current constrained financial circumstances, it would be preferable to spend down some of that endowment rather than impose the proposed tuition fee increases.
- While Professor Orchard had undertaken surveys to assess the impact of increased tuition on accessibility, these surveys had been undertaken only for the past two years. However, large fee increases had commenced in 1992-93 and it would be more productive to assess the affects of accessibility on students since that time.
- The need to pay high fees and to incur so high a level of debt, combined with living in a city with one of the highest real estate markets in the country, was causing many students severe anxiety. This was becoming a serious problem among students. The top two prescription drugs reimbursed under the Students' Administrative Council's drug prescription plan were anti-depressants.

**6. Tuition Fee Schedules for Publicly Funded Programs** (cont'd)**(d) Discussion of the Proposal** (cont'd)

- While Professor Orchard had cited surveys to argue that tuition fee increases had not affected accessibility, a member countered that the design of surveys and the interpretation of survey results was highly subjective and the results could be interpreted in many ways. Also, the survey results did not indicate how many students had not applied to the University because they feared high tuition and unmanageable debt loads.
- It was unreasonable to charge high, differentiated fees for any first-year program. Students entering the University after Grade 12 should not be expected to make decisions that would involve their need to take on enormous debt.
- Moving to rely so largely on tuition fees represented an unacceptable Americanization of public education. The University should also examine European models of education.

Other members spoke in support of the proposal

- The Provost responded to several points. He reiterated that the University's financial aid guarantee was administered centrally. It was not, therefore, based on the availability of funds in any one faculty. With respect to Postgraduate Medical Trainees, the question of tuition fees for this group had been of considerable interest to the Council over the past two years. It was proposed to set that fee at zero for the next few years. Professor Sedra noted that data concerning retention rates was published by the administration every year in its performance indicators, which were brought forward to the Governing Council for information. He would be happy to provide these data to the Graduate Students' Union upon request. He reiterated the University's commitment to incoming students that their tuition fees would increase by no more than 5% per year during the normal length of their studies. Finally, for those students graduating from divisions such as Medicine and Law who chose to pursue relatively low-paying careers in the public service area, the University had special programs of debt reduction.
- Professor Orchard's statistics on accessibility had provided assurance to members that the University was monitoring the effects of increased tuition on accessibility.
- While it was unfortunate that the University had been forced to raise its tuition fees, the problem was counterbalanced by the increase in funding to the University's financial aid programs. The University was providing valuable leadership in this area. A member cautioned, however, that the administration should seek to ensure that people did not fall into the cracks.

**6. Tuition Fee Schedules for Publicly Funded Programs** (cont'd)

**(d) Discussion of the Proposal** (cont'd)

- While reasonably comfortable with the proposed tuition fee increases, a member noted that he believed they were in fact at the upper threshold and he would not support future increases beyond inflation or the permissible limit of 5% for certain programs.
- A member refuted suggestions that it was not possible to increase accessibility while also increasing tuition fees and maintaining enrolment levels. He noted that the biggest deterrent to attending university was not the tuition fee but rather the opportunity cost (i.e. the loss of potential income). The proposed increases in tuition fees did not represent a large percentage of the program costs. He supported the University's policy of ensuring that those who could afford to pay did so and that a portion of the increase in tuition fee revenue was allocated to ensure that those who could not afford to pay for their education received assistance. This policy allowed for increased program quality while ensuring accessibility. For those programs where large tuition fee increases were proposed, the income prospects of the graduates were high. Where such graduates wished to pursue low-paying public-service careers (e.g. Doctors Without Borders), the University had a debt remission policy in place.
- As part of its financial aid programs, the University offered excellent counseling services. More work should be done to ensure that those students in financial need were aware of these existing programs.

It was duly moved and seconded,

THAT the question be divided, with a separate vote on the proposed tuition fee increases in excess of 5%.

Three members requested a recorded vote.

The vote was taken on the motion.

The motion to divide the question was defeated, with 8 votes in favour and 22 votes against.

A member moved to refer the schedules back to the administration because the Budget Report had not yet been reviewed by the Governing Council. Given that tuition made up 36% of the University's revenue, consideration of the schedules was out of context and inappropriate in the absence of the Budget Report.



**6. Tuition Fee Schedules for Publicly Funded Programs** (cont'd)

**(d) Discussion of the Proposal** (cont'd)

It was duly moved and seconded,

THAT the proposed tuition fee schedule for publicly funded programs be referred back to the administration.

Three members requested a recorded vote.

The vote was taken on the motion.

The motion to refer back was defeated, with 8 votes in favour and 22 votes against.

The question was put on the main motion. Three members requested a recorded vote. The motion was carried, with 24 votes in favour and 9 votes against.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT the proposed tuition fee schedules for publicly funded programs for 2000-01, copies of which are attached to Report Number 105 of the Business Board as Tables 1 and 3 of Appendix "A", be approved.

The Chairman stated that a motion would be required to extend the time of adjournment.

It was duly moved and seconded,

THAT the time of adjournment be extended to 7:20 p.m.

The motion was carried.

**7. Tuition Fee Schedule for Self-Funded Programs, 2000-2001**

Mr. Shalaby noted that the self-funded programs, by definition, received no government support. Therefore, tuition fees were set at the level required to enable each program to recover its own cost. For a number of these programs, tuition fees were normally paid by employers. Some of these fees were for full-time programs; others were for individual courses.

**7. Tuition Fee Schedule for Self-Funded Programs, 2000-2001** (cont'd)

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT the proposed tuition fee schedule for self-funded programs for 2000-01, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 105 of the Business Board as Table 1 of Appendix "B", be approved.

**8. University of Toronto Trademark Licensing Policy****(a) Introduction**

The Chairman noted that she had granted speaking privileges on this matter to Ms Sonia Singh, Students' Against Sweatshops. She would recognize Ms Sonia after the matter had been introduced and after questions for clarification have been addressed.

The Chairman continued that some concerns have been expressed about the *Code of Conduct for Licensees* (the *Code*), the mechanism for administering the *University of Toronto Trademark Licensing Policy* (the *Policy*). While it was the *Policy* and not the *Code* that was before members for approval, if members had strong concerns regarding the *Code*, proper procedure would be for a member to refer the *Policy* back to the University Affairs Board with specific directions.

Mr. Burchell introduced the proposal. He noted that members have received two documents relating to this matter: the proposed *Policy*, which was before the Governing Council for approval, and the proposed *Code*, which was before members for information only as it represents the guidelines for administering the *Policy*. The *Policy* defined a set of principles for use of the University name, trademark and images, and it addressed the issue of how licensees and contractors operated their workplaces. The overarching intent of the *Policy* was to avoid having the University's good name applied to goods made in sweatshops conditions in North America and abroad.

The *Policy* had several key components:

- The *Policy* recognized that the University had a responsibility to ensure non-exploitive manufacturing conditions for products that bore the University's name, trademark or image.
- The *Policy* delegated to the President responsibility for establishing a code of conduct for licensees and mechanisms to implement and monitor complaint resolution.
- The *Policy* stipulated that the code of conduct should, at a minimum, set standards for compensation and working hours, and should require that licensees provide a safe and healthy work environment and respect the right of employees to freedom of association and collective bargaining.

**8. University of Toronto Trademark Licensing Policy (cont'd)****(a) Introduction** (cont'd)

- Finally, the *Policy* provided for reporting to the University Affairs Board on any changes to the *Code* and its implementation and complaint resolution.

Mr. Burchell continued that the *Policy* had been in development for well over a year. The details of the administration's consultations were recorded in the Reports of the University Affairs Board and Executive Committee.

Mr. Burchell said that at its last meeting, the University Affairs Board had heard from representatives of the University of Toronto Faculty Association and from Students' Against Sweatshops. Both organizations had urged approval of the *Policy*. At the Executive Committee meeting members had expressed three main concerns. First, it had been argued that the labour standards outlined in the *Code* would not in fact help those workers it sought to assist. Such initiatives eliminated third-world jobs rather than assisted third-world workers. Second, it had been argued that it would be difficult for the University to ensure that contractors were in compliance with the *Code*. These first two concerns related to the *Code*, which had been characterized by the administration as a "living" document. It was appropriate that governance make its views known to the President, who could amend the *Code* at any time. Third, concern had been expressed that the *Policy* would migrate to other areas such as purchasing and investments, which might be a breach of governors' responsibilities to "act in the best interests of the University". Mr. Burchell clarified that the *Policy* currently before the Governing Council pertained solely to the area of licensing, and, as such, he believed it had no repercussions for the fiduciary responsibilities of governors. If there was an interest in similar policies for other areas, separate policies would have to be brought forward and debated based on their individual merits.

In conclusion, Mr. Burchell noted that many members of the University Affairs Board had stated that, if this *Policy* was approved, they would be able to wear University of Toronto sweatshirts with pride. If approved at this evening's meeting, the *Policy* would be the first one of its kind to be adopted by a Canadian university.

**(b) Address by a non-member: Ms Sonia Singh, Students Against Sweatshops (SAS)**

Invited by the Chairman to address the Council, Ms Singh noted that as a member of Students Against Sweatshops, she had participated in the task force on licensing, which had developed the proposed *Policy* and the accompanying *Code*.

She stressed the importance of this policy document. First, it was remarkable that the *Policy* had been developed in cooperation with faculty, students and the administration. Although the administration and SAS had had differences along the way, SAS was pleased to endorse the *Policy* and the *Code*. The agreement of all members of the task force on the content and necessity of both documents, echoed by the President and the entire University Affairs Board, was worth celebrating. Ms Singh expressed her gratitude to members of the task force for

**8. University of Toronto Trademark Licensing Policy** (cont'd)**(b) Address by a non-member: Ms Sonia Singh, Students Against Sweatshops (SAS)**  
(cont'd)

their contributions. She particularly acknowledged the contributions of Professors Len Brooks and Lee Benson from the Rotman School of Management for their considerable efforts.

Ms Singh addressed the significance of the *Policy* in a larger context. While hundreds of schools in the United States had passed similar codes, if this *Policy* was approved by the Governing Council today, the University of Toronto would become the first school in Canada to adopt a code of conduct for university licensees. The University's leadership on this issue would affect organizations and institutions across Canada. Several Canadian universities had been awaiting the University of Toronto's adoption of the *Policy*, before passing their own. Church and labour groups, non-governmental organizations, high schools, political parties, businesses, manufacturers and retailers had also been monitoring the process. In passing this *Policy*, the University had the opportunity to lead the way and make history in Canada.

Ms Singh continued that, more importantly, the *Policy* had the potential to positively affect the lives of workers producing University of Toronto clothing internationally and in Canada. The student movement in the United States had shown that university codes were setting precedents for the global garment industry as a whole. SAS's consultations with workers and worker groups in the United States had confirmed that the approval of the *Policy* could truly make a difference.

In response to the concerns of a member of the Executive Committee that had been recorded in that Committee's Report, Ms Singh stressed that the University must take into consideration the effects of its actions on workers internationally. Essentially this was what the proposed *Policy* attempted to do. The argument that labour standards harmed workers in the south was one that was usually made by sweatshop factory owners, and their northern customers. However, this position was not echoed by the majority of labour rights experts and academics that had been present at the University's forum on licensing. In fact, many forum participants had signed an open letter urging the University to pass a code with living wage language. This position had also been echoed in SAS consultations with workers and worker rights groups. It was true that workers were asking for employment. But as a women's group from Nicaragua had stated: "Empleo Si, Pero Con Dignidad!"; "Employment Yes, but with Dignity!" The *Code* was an important tool for workers to achieve this aim, especially through the provision of the rights to collective bargaining and freedom of association.

Ms Singh continued that through the process of developing the *Policy* and *Code*, students and faculty had developed considerable expertise in these issues. They had had the opportunity to consult with many experts in the field, students and faculty at other universities, groups involved in the national task force, and groups working in the south, and as well as garment workers. These consultations would be crucial to the determination of how the *Code* would be monitored effectively.

**8. University of Toronto Trademark Licensing Policy** (cont'd)**(b) Address by a non-member: Ms Sonia Singh, Students Against Sweatshops (SAS)**  
(cont'd)

In conclusion, Ms Singh noted that at the April 18 University Affairs Board meeting, SAS had requested that a task force or working group be constituted with students, faculty, and administration to address the implementation and monitoring of the *Code*. Four University Affairs Board members had spoken to this issue and had stressed the importance of active student and faculty involvement, beyond the once a year opportunity articulated in section nine of the *Policy*. President Prichard had taken these recommendations under advisement. SAS was interested in seeing how this task force will be structured and looked forward to working with the University in the very near future.

**(c) Discussion**

A member disagreed with the University's involvement in what was really a social issue. He did not believe it was the University's role to put restrictions on trade. Also, he questioned whether the adoption of the *Policy* by the University would in fact benefit workers, as the affect could lead to the elimination of trade with developing nations. Demonstrations at the World Trade Organization conference held recently in Seattle attested to the fact that workers did not wish for trade restrictions. The member added that the *Code* would not be enforceable.

A member echoed the previous member's latter assertion. While he supported the adoption of the *Policy*, he believed there would be problems in implementing the *Code*.

A member spoke in support of the proposal, noting that he was happy to see the level of community input that had gone into the creation of the *Policy* and *Code*. This represented a model for development of future policies. While the member agreed that there might be some problems with the *Code*, he believed that these could be addressed as the *Policy* was implemented.

The President clarified that if the *Policy* was approved by the Governing Council, the accompanying *Code* would come into effect. He did not advocate changes to the *Code* at this time. Should members disagree with the *Code*, the appropriate course of action would be to refer the *Policy* back to the University Affairs Board with directions that the administration develop an amended version of the *Code*.

In response to a member's assertion that the University should not take a position on social policy issues, Mr. Burchell pointed out that there was precedent in this area. In its contracts with non-union builders, the University required that wage rates and benefits should be those set out by the Metropolitan Toronto Fair Wage Officer. In addition, the University's investments were subject to the University's statement on *Social and Political Issues With Respect to University Investment*, which had been created as a result of the University community's dissatisfaction with University investments in South Africa during the Apartheid era. Also within this rubric was the University's *Policy on Naming*, which provided that no

**8. University of Toronto Trademark Licensing Policy** (cont'd)**(c) Discussion** (cont'd)

naming would be approved or continued that would call into serious question the public respect of the University.

In response to member's query, the President clarified that revisions to the *Code* could only be made by the President. If governance was unsatisfied with it at any time, it could offer advice to the President through the University Affairs Board.

The question was put on the motion to approve the *University of Toronto Trademark Licensing Policy*. Three members requested a recorded vote. The motion was carried, twenty-four votes in favour, three votes against and one abstention.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT the University of Toronto Trademark Licensing Policy, dated April 11, 2000, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 91 of the University Affairs Board as Appendix "A", be approved.

The President acknowledged the efforts of Jon Dellandrea and Tad Brown in bringing the *Policy* and *Code* to fruition.

It was duly moved and seconded,

THAT the time of adjournment be further extended to 7:30 p.m.

The motion was carried.

**9. Ancillary Operations: Indemnification for Directors of Incorporated Ancillaries**

Mr. Shalaby noted that Section 27A of By-Law Number 2 protected members of the Governing Council against the costs of any law suits arising from their activities as governors. Some years ago, the Governing Council had extended that protection to the volunteers, and others, who served on the Board of the University of Toronto Press Incorporated. The current proposal was to protect the people who served on the Boards of the University's other incorporated ancillary operations -- the Innovations Foundation and the new Asset Management Corporation. The appointees to these Boards were "approved and nominated" by the Executive Committee. However, there were limits to the protection granted: the Directors could still be held liable in the case of willful neglect or willful default of their duty. The risk being assumed by the University was a small one because the Directors were covered by the University's "errors and omissions" liability insurance coverage.

**9. Ancillary Operations: Indemnification for Directors of Incorporated Ancillaries**  
(cont'd)

A member noted that while he supported the indemnification of those people who served on the University's Boards, he had grave concerns with respect to the decentralization of the University's investment management. He urged that the Council revisit this direction.

The President clarified that the proposal before members addressed the indemnification of the University's volunteers on the Innovations Foundation and the new Asset Management Corporation. It was not appropriate for the Council, as the previous member had suggested, to revisit the decision made to create the new Asset Management Corporation.

In response to a member's question, the President noted that the proposal did not apply to the Board of the University's CIUT radio station.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT for incorporated business ancillary operations established by the Governing Council ("ancillaries"), when the appointment of Directors is approved by the Governing Council or the Executive Committee thereof,

Except in respect of an action by the ancillary to procure a judgment in its favour, the University will indemnify and save harmless every director of the ancillary and the heirs, executors and administrators and the estate and effects of each of them respectively, from time to time and at all times, from and against all costs, charges and expenses whatsoever (including amounts paid to settle an action or satisfy a judgement and fines and other monetary penalties) that such a person sustains or incurs in or about any civil, criminal or administrative action, suit or proceeding that is brought, commenced or prosecuted against him or her, for or in respect of any act, deed, matter or thing whatsoever, made done or permitted by him or her, in or about the execution of the duties of his or her office, except such costs, charges or expenses as are occasioned by his or her own willful neglect or willful default and except to the extent that any such person is indemnified under a policy or contract of insurance or indemnity with respect to any such costs, charges or expenses.

## **10. Report of the President**

The President reported briefly on the following matters.

- On behalf of the Governing Council, the President extended the University's gratitude to Professor Munroe-Blum for her report titled *Growing Ontario's Innovation System: The Strategic Role of University Research*, which would play a central role in shaping research in Ontario.
- The provincial government had announced its intention to permit private universities in Ontario. Given the absence of a clear mandate from the Governing Council on this subject, the President had refrained from issuing a comment and/or response. Subject to advice to the contrary, he would continue to take no position on this issue, other than to advocate that private universities receive no public funding, that there be no rip-offs from provincial student-aid programs, and that a clear and transparent process existed for measuring quality. The President also noted that the University of Toronto's central focus was to ensure strong public funding for public universities.
- Further to the announcement of the Canada Research Chairs (CRC) Program, the University of Toronto had been notified of its allocation of Chairs, which totaled 251 (50% for junior chairs – 50% for senior chairs). The President explained that this allocation had been based on the most recent grant awards information. Future allocations, beyond 2000-2001, were expected to increase as data on research grant awards to universities was updated each year. The University could begin to nominate candidates for these Chairs as soon as it had submitted to the CRC Program a Strategic Research Plan. Funding for each Chair would begin to flow to the University once the Chair candidates had been approved through a rigorous peer-review process and had taken up their appointments. President-Designate Robert Birgeneau had been consulted and the administration would be issuing a paper, which established a framework for allocation of the Chairs.
- The Provost and the Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget were actively leading the University's efforts to develop a budget report for 2000-2001. Given the recently announced provincial budget, there were many challenges to overcome. The administration's goal was to stay the course with minimal disruption to academic plans.
- The President continued to work with President-Designate Birgeneau to ensure a smooth transition. Also, the Deputy Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities had organized a dinner to introduce President-Designate Birgeneau to government officials.
- The President noted both he and President-Designate Birgeneau were in agreement that the University should create a new position for Vice-President, Government and Institutional Relations. An advisory committee would be appointed in the near future and it was hoped that an incumbent could be found for this very important position by July 1, 2000.



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

- The President had received the draft of Professor Orchard's Task Force on Graduate Student Financial Support. Pursuant to the recommendations in the report, the President intended to incorporate into the Budget Report, 2000-2001 significant increases in funding for graduate students.
- The President drew attention to the list of upcoming convocation ceremonies that was attached to the outline of his report outline. He noted with sadness that the conferring of an honorary degree on Daniel G. Hill would take place in a private ceremony at Mr. Hill's home due to his ill health.
- The Campaign continued to proceed well under the leadership of Dr. Dellandrea. A determination would be made in the early fall as to whether the Campaign goal should be further extended. At present, the Campaign was schedule to end in 2002.
- At a consortium of eighteen universities from around the world, held recently in Shanghai, discussions had taken place regarding distance education initiatives. This posed exciting possibilities and the participant universities might soon be in position to announce a memorandum of understanding that would lead the process of consultation.

**11. Reports for Information**

Members received the following reports for information.

Report Number 104 of the Business Board – March 27, 2000

Report Number 324 of the Executive Committee – May 1, 2000

**12. Date of the Next Meeting**

The Chairman reminded members that the next meeting would take place on Thursday, June 29, 2000 at 3:30 p.m. She noted that the start time for this last meeting of the academic year had been moved forward by one hour to provide sufficient time for the Council to complete its business.

**13. Question Period****(a) Dr. Chun**

A member asked for an update on the matter of Dr. Kin-Yip Chun's grievance against the University. Also, would there be an opportunity for members of the Council to discuss the very substantive report that had been distributed to members?

With respect to the latter point, the Chairman noted that the member would have to provide a notice of motion for the Executive Committee to determine whether the matter should be added to the agenda. With respect to the status of the case, the President responded that the University had made its submission to the Ontario Human Rights Commission, following

**13. Question Period** (cont'd)

**(a) Dr. Chun** (cont'd)

which it had been invited by the Commission to participate in a conciliation process. After taking advice on the matter, the administration had indicated that it would participate. This was in line with the administration's long-standing commitment to pursue every reasonable opportunity to settle the dispute. Regrettably, Dr. Chun's counsel had indicated that Dr. Chun would not be a participant.

The meeting adjourned at 7:50 p.m.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Secretary

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chairman

June 19, 2000