

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

Thursday, December 14, 2000

MINUTES OF THE GOVERNING COUNCIL meeting held on Thursday, December 14, 2000 at 4:30 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall.

Present:

Ms Wendy M. Cecil-Cockwell (In the Chair)	Dr. John P. Nestor
Ms Mary Anne V. Chambers, Vice-Chair	Mr. Elan Ohayon
Dr. Robert J. Birgeneau, President	Mr. Fayez A. Quereshy
Mr. Muhammad Basil Ahmad	Mrs. Susan M. Scace
Professor Mary Beattie	Professor Adel S. Sedra
Mr. Brian C. Burchell	Professor Chandrakant P. Shah
Professor Jack Carr	Mr. Amir Shalaby
Ms Jennifer Carson	Ms Wendy Talfourd-Jones
Professor Brian Corman	Professor Ronald D. Venter
Professor W. Raymond Cummins	Ms Nancy L. Watson
Mr. Brian Davis	Mr. Robert S. Weiss
Ms Susan Eng	Professor Donna Wells
Dr. Shari Graham Fell	
Dr. Anne Golden	Mr. Louis R. Charpentier,
Ms Naana Afua Jumah	Secretary of the Governing Council
Mr. Josh Koziembrocki	
Professor Brian Langille	<u>Secretariat:</u>
Ms Karen Lewis	Mr. Neil Dobbs
Mr. Gerald A. Lokash	Ms Susan Girard
Professor Ian R. McDonald	Ms Margaret McKone
Professor Heather Munroe-Blum	

Absent:

Dr. Robert Bennett	The Honourable David R. Peterson
The Honourable William G. Davis	The Honourable Robert K. Rae
Mr. Ljupco Gjorgjinski	Professor Emmet I. Robbins
Mr. Paul V. Godfrey	Dr. Joseph L. Rotman
Professor Vivek Goel	Professor Kenneth Sevcik
The Honourable Henry N. R. Jackman	Ms Carol Stephenson
Ms Jacqueline C. Orange	Mr. John H. Tory
Ms Rose M. Patten	

In Attendance:

Dr. Jon S. Dellandrea, Vice-President and Chief Development Officer
Professor Michael G. Finlayson, Vice-President, Administration and Human Resources
Dr. Sheldon Levy, Vice-President Designate, Government and Institutional Relations
Professor Carolyn Tuohy, Deputy Provost
Professor Robert G. White, Chief Financial Officer
Professor Paul Gooch, Vice-Provost

In Attendance: (cont'd)

Professor Derek McCammond, Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget
Professor Ian Orchard, Vice-Provost, Students
Professor Rona Abramovitch, Provost's Advisor on Pro-Active Faculty Recruitment
Ms Susan Addario, Director, Student Affairs
Ms Susan Bloch-Nevitte, Director, Public Affairs
Mr. Adam Bretholz, President, Students' Administrative Council
Ms Rivi Frankle, Director of Alumni and Development
Professor Michael Fullan, Dean, OISE/UT
Ms Cathy McCauley, Executive Assistant to the President, Director of Special Events and Associate Campaign Director
Ms Cristina Oke, Assistant Vice-Provost, Professional Faculties
Miss Janice Oliver, Assistant Vice-President, Operations and Services
Professor Douglas Perovic, Chair, Metallurgy and Materials Science
Mr. Kasi Rao, Director of the Office of the President and Director of Government Relations
Ms Maureen Somerville, Chair, College of Electors
Mr. Justin Saunders, University Affairs Commissioner, Students' Administrative Council
Mr. Jorge Sousa, President, Graduate Students' Union
Ms Mary Ward, Ombudsperson

1. Senior Appointments

The Chairman noted that, pursuant to Section 38 of *By-law Number 2*, the Executive Committee had determined that consideration of item 1 would take place *in camera*.

(a) Extension of Vice-President and Provost's Term

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT Professor Adel S. Sedra be re-appointed as Vice-President and Provost for a one-year extension, from July 1, 2001 to June 30, 2002.

(b) Appointment of Assistant Secretaries of the Governing Council

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT Ms Cristina Oke be appointed as an Assistant Secretary of the Governing Council, effective January 22, 2001.

THAT Ms Beverley D. Stefureak be appointed as an Assistant Secretary of the Governing Council, effective February 5, 2001.

THE COUNCIL MOVED INTO OPEN SESSION.

2. Chairman's Remarks**(a) Senior Appointment: Vice-President and Provost - Reappointment**

The Chairman announced that Professor Adel Sedra had been re-appointed as Vice-President and Provost for a one-year extension, from July 1, 2001 to June 30, 2002. She continued that

2. Chairman's Remarks (cont'd)**(a) Senior Appointment: Vice-President and Provost – Reappointment** (cont'd)

Professor Sedra had served the University with extraordinary dedication during his time as Provost and had provided President Birgeneau with tremendous support since he had assumed office. Over the next year, Professor Sedra's continued presence as Provost would be essential to the central administration's effective operation as the University moved to recruit a new Vice-President, Business Affairs, as well as a Vice-President, Human Resources. She noted that members of the Council were extremely grateful that Professor Sedra had accepted this extension of his term.

(b) Senior Appointments: Assistant Secretaries of the Governing Council

Also, the Chairman was very pleased to announce the appointment of two Assistant Secretaries to the Governing Council.

Ms Cristina Oke, currently the Assistant Vice-Provost, Professional Faculties, and Ms Beverley Stefureak, currently Secretary of the Board and Executive Assistant to the President at Lakehead University, had been appointed effective January 22, and February 5, 2001 respectively.

(c) Terrence R. Stephen

The Chairman informed the Council, with great regret, of the recent death of Governing Council member and former Vice-Chair of the Business Board, Mr. Terrence R. Stephen. The Chairman continued that Mr. Stephen was an alumnus of the University of Toronto, graduating from Victoria College in 1972, with a degree in History and Political Science. Following graduation, he joined Price Waterhouse and became a Chartered Accountant. Early in the Government of Premier David Peterson, Mr. Stephen was seconded as Special Advisor to the Provincial Treasurer. His impact on public policy in Ontario had been a very substantial one. One of Mr. Stephen's enduring legacies had been the establishment of a new framework for public-sector pensions in Ontario.

The Chairman continued that Mr. Stephen's impact on the University of Toronto was also substantial, and very valuable. He had served on the Victoria University Board of Regents for four years. Then, in 1990, he was appointed as a co-opted member of the Business Board and was subsequently appointed as a member of the Governing Council. He had served as Vice-Chair of the Business Board for four years and had made important contributions to the University in this capacity, both through the Board and behind the scenes. Mr. Stephen was the founding Chair of the Board of the University of Toronto Press Inc., a position he held until his death. The Chairman concluded that the Business Board, and the University of Toronto as a whole, owed a profound debt of gratitude to Mr. Stephen. He would be greatly missed.

The Council observed a minute's silence in memory of Mr. Stephen.

(d) Awards

The Chairman drew members' attention to an announcement of Order of Ontario Recipients for 2000 that had been placed on the table. Among the recipients for the province's highest and most prestigious honour were three members of the University of Toronto faculty: President Emeritus J. Robert S. Prichard, Dr. Robert Freedom and Dr. Lap-Chee Tsui.

The Chairman also reported that Ms Naana Jumah, member of the Governing Council, had been awarded a Rhodes Scholarship.

2. Chairman's Remarks (cont'd)**(e) Welcome**

The Chairman welcomed those members of the College of Electors who were in attendance.

(f) Requests to Address the Governing Council

Finally, the Chairman noted that at its December 4, 2000 meeting, the Executive Committee had considered two requests to address the Council on matters not on today's agenda. The Chairman reported that she had declined these requests and drew members' attention to Report Number 330 of the Executive Committee for an account of that Committee's deliberation.

The Chairman continued that subsequent to the Executive Committee meeting, she had received two additional speaking requests. The Graduate Students' Union (GSU) had asked to address the Council on the subject of Bill 132, the recently proposed legislation that would allow for the introduction of private for-profit and not-for-profit degree-granting institutions. Given that this matter was not on today's agenda, given the length of the agenda and the fact that this request had arrived after the Executive Committee meeting, she had declined to grant this speaking request and had instead invited the GSU to make a written submission to the Council. She drew attention to a memorandum from GSU President Jorge Sousa that had been placed on the table.

The Chairman noted that she had also received a request from the Students' Administrative Council (SAC) to address the Council on three matters on the agenda. She had granted this speaking request and would recognize the appropriate SAC representatives at the appropriate points in the meeting.

The Chairman recalled that prior to the Council's previous meeting, she had granted permission to the GSU to address the Council on the annual report of the Ombudsperson. There had been insufficient time for consideration of the annual report at the last meeting and it was, therefore, to be considered by the Council at today's meeting. However, the GSU had since withdrawn its request to address the Council on this matter.

3. Minutes of the Previous Meeting held on October 19, 2000

The Minutes of the previous meeting held on October 19, 2000 were approved.

4. Business Arising from the Previous Meeting**(a) Notices of Motion**

The Chairman recalled that a member had given notice of two motions at the previous meeting. The Executive Committee had considered both at its December 4, 2000 meeting.

She drew attention to the Report of the Executive Committee meeting – pages 4 and 5 – which contained an account of the Committee's discussion of the motion to restore full funding to the Office of the Ombudsperson. This motion had been withdrawn by its mover given that a review of the Office was to take place in the current academic year.

With respect to the notice of motion that the *Code of Student Conduct* be repealed, the Secretary of the Governing Council had reported that the Vice-Provost, Students, would be contacting members of the University Affairs Board regarding a special committee of that Board which would provide advice on specific ways that the *Code* could be amended to enable it to better realize its stated objectives. The Secretary had also advised the

4. Business Arising from the Previous Meeting (cont'd)**(a) Notices of Motion (cont'd)**

Executive Committee that policy considerations with respect to non-academic discipline fell within the responsibility of the University Affairs Board and that any re-consideration of policy in this area should commence with that Board. In light of this information, the Executive Committee had formally declined to place this motion on today's agenda.

(b) Item 5 – Business Arising from the Previous Meeting – Appointment to the Executive Committee

A member recalled that at the previous meeting, the Council had been addressed by the President of the Graduate Students' Union (GSU) concerning the lack of graduate student representation on the Executive Committee. The member continued that the discussion that had preceded the Council's resolution at its September meeting concerning an appointment to the Executive Committee had taken place *in camera*. There was provision within the Council's *By-Law Number 2* for the Executive Committee to permit the inclusion of the *in camera* minutes of this meeting in the regular minutes. Given the significance of this decision to certain University constituencies, the member asked that the Executive Committee consider the inclusion of the Council's September discussion concerning an appointment of the Executive Committee within the regular minutes of Council. Also, the member provided notice of motion that an *ex officio* seat be created on the Executive Committee to address his concern about shared seats. Such *ex officio* members would be able to participate in Executive Committee discussions, however, they would not have voting rights.

The Secretary of the Governing Council responded that the Executive Committee would be asked to consider the member's request concerning the *in camera* minutes at its next meeting. With respect to the member's notice of motion, the Secretary of the Governing Council reported that the Executive Committee was set out in full in the *University of Toronto Act* and was not subject to alteration. The member responded that he believed it was within the mandate of the Executive Committee to include additional non-voting members in its meetings. He also believed there would be benefit in revisiting the *University of Toronto Act*. The Secretary of the Governing Council noted that the Executive Committee would consider the member's request and notice of motion at its next meeting.

(c) Item 13 – Other Business – Member's Notice of Motion concerning the Code of Student Conduct

A member recalled that he had provided a notice of motion at the previous meeting that the *Code of Student Conduct* be repealed. The Report of the Executive Committee indicated that the Committee had formally determined that this motion not be placed on the Council's agenda for today's meeting. This decision had been based in part on information provided to the Executive Committee concerning a special committee of the University Affairs Board that was being created to review the *Code of Student Conduct*. The member noted that at the time this information had been provided to the Executive Committee he had been unaware of the mandate and scope of the special committee and had, therefore, withdrawn his motion from consideration. This was not indicated in the Report. Since that time the member had received additional information concerning the special committee and was not satisfied that his concerns would be addressed. He, therefore, requested that his motion be reintroduced for consideration.

4. Business Arising from the Previous Meeting (cont'd)**(c) Item 13 – Other Business – Member’s Notice of Motion concerning the *Code of Student Conduct* (continued)**

The Secretary of the Governing Council responded that the Executive Committee had formally declined to place the member’s motion on the agenda of Council. He did not recall the member having withdrawn his motion at the Executive Committee and undertook to consult with the Secretary of the Executive Committee and report back to the member.

(d) Item 3 – *Code of Student Conduct*: Two Recommendations for Expulsion

A member recalled the decision of the Council at its previous meeting to confirm recommendations from the President for the expulsion of two students. These recommendations had arisen from decisions of hearing officers appointed under the *Code of Student Conduct*. The member did not believe the students had received proper notification that the Council would be considering their expulsions and, therefore, provided notice of motion that the expulsions be reconsidered by the Council.

The Secretary of the Governing Council noted that a two-thirds majority of members present and voting would be required for the Council to reconsider a decision made within the past twelve months.

(e) Item 10 – Reports for Information – Employment Equity Reports – Distribution

A member recalled that at the previous meeting he had requested that the Council consider the annual Employment Equity Report because it contained important information. Given that the University would be hiring a substantial number of faculty within the next few years, it was important that the Council consider the Report and provide advice to the Provost. Therefore, the member provided notice of motion that the Employment Equity Report be placed on agenda of the next meeting of the Council.

5. Ombudsperson: Annual Report and Administrative Response

The Chairman recalled that there had been insufficient time at the previous meeting for the Council to consider the Annual Report of the Ombudsperson and the Administrative Response. She welcomed Ms Mary Ward, Ombudsperson and invited her to introduce her report.

The Ombudsperson noted that her annual report covered the period from July 1, 1999 to June 30, 2000. It provided a statistical summary of the caseload for the year as well as comparisons with the previous three years, updated issues discussed in previous annual reports, and highlighted specific cases and issues from the current year that warranted attention or comment. She welcomed members’ comments and questions.

Discussion ensued on the following aspects of the annual report and administrative response.

A member recalled the Council’s decision in June, 1996 to decrease the base budget for the office. This decision had been made in part because of the various equity offices that had been created over the past decade. He asked the Ombudsperson if she considered the revised level of resources to be sufficient.

The Ombudsperson recalled that she had addressed the issue of the various equity offices in her previous year’s report. She continued to work closely with the various offices where appropriate. She noted that increased resources would enable her to spend more time on individual cases and permit more speedy resolutions.

5. Ombudsperson: Annual Report and Administrative Response (cont'd)

In response to a member's inquiry, the Chairman noted that the Committee to review the Office of the Ombudsperson would be struck in the new year.

In response to an inquiry, the Ombudsperson said that students who approached her office were often concerned about the nature of the complaint process. Her immediate priority was to alleviate this concern and find an early resolution.

Invited by the President to comment, the Provost noted that the administrative response had sought to address the points raised in the Ombudsperson's annual report. Several points that had received attention had been ongoing and illustrated the University's continuing progress in addressing and resolving areas of concern. He specifically drew members' attention to those recommendations in follow-up to previous years' annual reports and the administrative action taken.

In response to a question concerning graduate student supervision, the Vice-Provost, Students reported that the School of Graduate Studies had rescheduled the Higher Education Data Sharing (HEDS) survey, and expected to administer it this fall through its Office for Graduate Education Research (OGER). OGER expected as well to begin this fall or winter with the administration of an exit survey for Ph.D. recipients, which would gather students' opinion about their graduate experience. Once in place, this survey would be issued routinely to all students completing the Ph.D. program. The President of the Graduate Students' Union had indicated that the GSU might be interested in collaborating with the administration on this project.

A member expressed concern about the use of special "letters of agreement" for residence behaviour issues. The Ombudsperson had recommended that this be tabled for discussion at campus-based professional development meetings. The member asked about the status of this initiative. Invited to respond, the Director of Student Affairs reported that management of individual residences was a divisional responsibility. The Office of Student Affairs had undertaken to conduct research into best practice and legal implications. Also, the issue would be addressed by the special committee of the University Affairs Board that had been struck to review the *Code of Student Conduct*.

6. Report of the President

The President reported briefly on the following matters.

(a) Government Relations: Provincial

The University continued to work with senior government officials to develop a strategy to accommodate increased enrolment growth at the undergraduate level. This was the single most important issue currently facing Ontario's universities. By the year 2005 it was estimated that the number of students seeking entrance to Ontario's universities would increase by approximately 25,000. While some of these students would be accommodated at other Ontario universities, many would seek admission to universities within the Greater Toronto Area. The University of Toronto wished to accommodate this increased demand and continued to work with the government. At present there was insufficient space to house the increase in enrolment growth on the St. George campus and, therefore, significant enrolment growth was contemplated for the Mississauga and Scarborough campuses. However, significant capital expansion and an increase in the operating budget would be required.

6. Report of the President (cont'd)**(a) Government Relations: Provincial (cont'd)**

Construction projects on campus were in various stages of development. The management and financing of these projects was proving to be challenging. Further exacerbating the financing of these projects were escalating construction costs, which were increasing by approximately 1% per month.

Over the next five years, the University would have to replace many of its faculty members as a result of retirements. This would prove a major challenge given the very competitive market at present. This also pointed to the need for a renewed emphasis on graduate education since that was the pool from where the next generation of faculty would come from.

The President reported on a recent meeting with the newly appointment Deputy Minister, Mr. Kevin Costante, who was being very helpful in assisting the University in its dialogue with the Province.

The University had received 55 awards this year in three rounds of competition under the Premier's Research Excellence Awards. The University had received 113 awards in total since program had started in 1998, which represented 37 percent of total awards in Ontario.

(b) Government Relations: Federal

The President had met recently with the Prime Minister, the Right Honourable Jean Chrétien, and with Tory leader, the Right Honourable Joe Clark, who had visited the St. George campus.

Recent meetings had also included Mr. Mel Cappe, Clerk of the Privy Council and Secretary of the Cabinet, the Honourable Herb Gray, Deputy Prime Minister, and various heads of granting councils. A continuing theme of these discussions had been the need for the federal government to pay the full cost of research. Currently, Canada was the only country that did not provide funding for research infrastructure. At present, this cost was provided from the University's operating budget. Approximately 30% of the cost of research went towards overhead costs. The University would continue to advocate that this cost be borne by the federal government.

(c) Senior Administration

The President outlined the following changes to the senior administration.

- Mr. Robert White, Chief Financial Officer, would be retiring on January 31, 2001;
- Professor Michael Finlayson's term as Vice-President, Administration and Human Resources, would end on June 30, 2001;
- A search was underway for the new position of Vice-President (Business Affairs). This position might include the portfolio of Chief Financial Officer;
- A search would be undertaken soon for the new position of Vice-President (Human Resources);
- The President would soon be filling the recently vacated positions within his Office;
- The term for Professor Adel Sedra, Vice-President and Provost, had been extended by one year to June 30, 2002;
- The Deputy Provost, Professor Carolyn Tuohy, and the Vice-Provost, Students, Professor Ian Orchard, had both agreed to extensions in their terms. The President would bring a recommendation for Professor Tuohy's appointment to the next meeting of the Governing Council. Professor Tuohy would now be reporting jointly to the President and to the Provost; and

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

- Searches for the Deans of the Faculties of Applied Science and Engineering, Nursing, Dentistry, Law, Forestry, the Director, School of Continuing Studies, and the Chief Librarian were underway.

(d) Meetings with University Community

In his continuing meetings with various constituencies within the University community, the President had met with the University College Council, the Faculty of Arts and Science's Dean's Advisory Board, the Faculty of Dentistry's Faculty Council, chairs and directors within the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering, and the Chair's Advisory Board of the Department of Metallurgy and Materials Science.

(e) Capital Projects

The John and Edna Davenport Chemical Research Building had officially opened on November 27, 2000. The opening ceremonies had been followed by a reception in the 3rd floor atrium and tours of the facility.

The Bahen Centre for Information Technology was scheduled to be officially opened in March 2002.

The process of selecting architects was underway for capital projects at Woodsworth College, University of Toronto at Scarborough, University of Toronto at Mississauga and New College.

(f) University of Toronto Faculty Association

Negotiations were underway between the University and the University of Toronto Faculty Association. The pension fund was a critical part of these discussions. Mr. Ken Burkett had been appointed Mediator and mediation was scheduled for mid-April.

(g) The Campaign

The University campaign continued to make progress, with over \$775 million in pledges received to date.

Recent gifts to the University had resulted in the following naming recognitions: the Chancellor Rose and Ray Wolfe Chair in Holocaust Studies, the May Gluskin Chair in Canadian History, the Frank Gehry International Visiting Chair in Architectural Design, the President's Chair in Education and Knowledge (OISE/UT), the June Callwood Programme in Aboriginal Law, and the CCMF Centre for Integrative Thinking at the Joseph L. Rotman School of Management.

(h) Maclean's Ranking

For the seventh consecutive year, the University of Toronto had been ranked first medical/doctoral universities in the annual Maclean's magazine university ranking. The University also held the number one position in the overall reputational ranking among the fifteen research-intensive universities in its category. As well, the University had ranked top for its reputation under best overall and leaders of tomorrow, and second under most innovative and highest quality. The challenge now was to claim the University's place amongst the best public research universities in the world.

7. Capital Project: Bahen Centre for Information Technology: Change in Scope

Professor Carr noted that the proposal concerned a change in the scope of the Bahen Centre for Information Technology by shelling-in the sixth floor at a cost of \$5.2 million, adding 1,900 net assignable square meters (nasm), and expanding the chiller facilities at a cost of \$2.27 million. Two other factors affecting the cost of the project were inflation escalation and the complexity of the site, particularly the need to include a historically designated building. The cost of the building had increased from \$88 million to just over \$104 million and the space had increased by 3,000 nasm to just over 19,000. The sources of funds were outlined in Professor McCammond's memorandum and included an allocation from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund to construct the shelled space.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

- (i) THAT the revised scope of the Bahen Centre for Information Technology of 19,300 net assignable square meters (nasm) be approved;
- (ii) THAT the revised project cost of \$104.63-million and the revised funding sources, outlined in Professor McCammond's memorandum of October 10, 2000, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 102 of the Academic Board as Appendix "A", be approved; and
- (iii) THAT an allocation of a \$5.197-million from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund to construct 1,900 nasm of shelled space, be approved.

8. Capital Project: OISE/UT and University of Toronto Schools at 371 Bloor Street West - Users' Committee Report

Professor Carr reported that this project called for the improvement and modernization of the building that was the home of the former Faculty of Education at 371 Bloor Street West. The renovated building would accommodate the increased enrolment of the University of Toronto School (UTS) and the current needs of OISE/UT programs. The project also included building a new athletic wing. The cost of the project, about \$23 million, would be covered by UTS fundraising, OISE/UT, and an allocation from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund (UIIF).

Professor Carr continued that discussion at both the Planning and Budget Committee and the Academic Board had focused on the role of UTS with respect to the University's mission and whether it should be subsidized by the University. Some members had suggested UTS was a private high school. In response, the Dean of OISE/UT had noted that UTS was a research facility and he had outlined the ways in which UTS was an integral part of OISE/UT.

8. Capital Project: OISE/UT and University of Toronto Schools at 371 Bloor Street West - Users' Committee Report (cont'd)

It was duly moved and seconded,

- (i) THAT the Users' Committee Report of the University of Toronto Schools and OISE/UT at 371 Bloor Street West, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 102 of the Academic Board as Appendix "D", be approved in principle;
- (ii) THAT the project cost of \$23,240,000 be approved and that implementation begin when the private funding has been raised; and
- (iii) THAT \$3.5-million be allocated from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund when the private funding has been raised.

Invited to address the Council, Mr. Adam Bretholz, President, Students' Administrative Council (SAC), noted SAC's concern with the use of University funds for renovations to UTS. He questioned whether the new facilities would benefit members of the University community rather than only high school students enrolled at UTS. He hoped that a similar subsidization would also occur for a multi-faith facility.

A discussion ensued during which several members noted that while they were in support of much of the proposal they were concerned that monies from the UIIF were being used to subsidize UTS, which was considered by some to be comparable to a private high school. Uncertainty was also expressed as to the level of academic integration between OISE/UT and UTS. Members suggested that if a precedent was being set (i.e. the UIIF was being used to subsidize services that were not part of the University's academic mission), the UIIF should be a source of funding for additional non-academic ventures, such as a multi-faith facility as well as athletic facilities at the Scarborough and Mississauga campuses, which were in a similar state of disrepair.

Invited to comment, Dean Fullan drew members' attention to the Report of the Academic Board, which contained an account of his briefing to the Board. He later clarified that the annual transfer of funds from the University to OISE/UT was \$218,000. Also, the UTS building, which was currently in a state of disrepair, was used as a laboratory for teachers in the Teacher Education Program.

A member spoke in support of the motion, echoing the Dean's comments regarding the state of the building and the important role UTS served within OISE/UT.

It was duly moved and seconded,

THAT the motion be divided so that section (iii) be considered by the Council separately.

The vote was taken on the motion to divide.
The motion was defeated.

The vote was taken on the main motion.
The motion was carried.

A member asked if the students of U.T.S. could use other pools in locations near the school, such as Hart House or the Athletics Centre, and, if they could, why a separate pool at U.T.S. was necessary. The Dean undertook to provide additional information to the Council concerning the use of the pool within U.T.S.

9. Budget: University Infrastructure Investment Fund - Allocation to Faculty of Architecture, Landscape, and Design Building, Phase 3 Renovations

Professor Carr recalled that in 1998, the Council had approved a Users' Committee report for the renovation of Architecture building. The total cost had been just under \$10 million and it was to proceed in phases as funding was available. The first two had been completed and the third phase - the renovation of the exhibition hall and the installation of bay windows - was ready to proceed. The cost was \$690,000. The Faculty had raised half of that amount and the Provost had agreed, in response to the Faculty's plan, to match the donation with an allocation from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT \$345,000 be allocated from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund for Phase 3 renovations to the Faculty of Architecture, Landscape, and Design building.

10. Ontario SuperBuild Renewal Program / Ontario Facilities Renewal Fund / Accommodation and Facilities Directorate Infrastructure Plan for 2000-2001

Professor Carr noted that the Academic Board was recommending the approval of a plan to spend just over \$12 million on infrastructure projects. The projects included upgrades to classroom and research labs, improved campus communication networks, physical plant renewal, deferred maintenance and physical accessibility projects. Funding for physical accessibility projects had also been received from the Students' Administrative Council and its advice would be sought on the list of projects to be undertaken.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT Schedule A to Professor McCammond's memorandum of October 26, 2000, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 102 of the Academic Board as Appendix "F", for allocations totaling \$12,062,110 be approved as the University's SRP/OFRF/AFD Infrastructure Plan for 2000-01.

11. Capital Project: New College Residence Expansion - Users' Committee Report

Professor Carr noted that the Academic Board was recommending approval in principle of a new New College residence, at the corner of Willcocks Street and Spadina Avenue. It would be a dormitory-style residence housing 280 students and 7 dons. The proposed cost was just over \$22 million and would be financed by \$750,000 from New College, a 25-year mortgage to be repaid from fees and a yearly allocation from the Academic Priorities Fund (APF) for a period of eight years. The funds for the APF allocation were set aside in the 2000-2001 Budget Report, approved last spring.

Mr. Burchell reported that the University Affairs Board was asked to offer its advice on capital projects that fell within its terms of reference (e.g. including athletics facilities, parking garages and residences). The Board's consideration of the proposal before members had included:

- the residence design,
- the process for approval of residence fees,
- the style of the residence contemplated,

11. Capital Project: New College Residence Expansion - Users' Committee Report
(cont'd)

- consultations with neighbours,
- and the physical accessibility of the new residence.

The University Affairs Board had had a thorough discussion of the proposal and had ultimately lent its unanimous endorsement to the recommendation of the Academic Board.

Mr. Shalaby noted that the Business Board 's responsibility with respect to Users' Committee Reports was to examine the business plan. The Board, by its concurrence, advised the Governing Council that the revenue for the project would be sufficient to balance its expense.

Mr. Shalaby continued that Miss Oliver had advised the Business Board that the University's Controller had reviewed the business plan carefully and had been satisfied that the project was viable. He was pleased, therefore, to report that the Business Board concurred with the recommendation before the Council.

In response to a member's question concerning the roles and jurisdiction of the various boards in considering capital projects, the Chairs of the Business and University Affairs Boards noted that each board considered those aspects of the project that were within its terms of reference. The project was then forwarded to the Governing Council, along with the reports of these discussions, for overall consideration. The Secretary of the Governing Council undertook to distribute to members a copy of document produced recently in the Secretariat concerning the life cycle of a capital project.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

- (i) THAT the Users' Committee Report of the New College Student Residence Expansion, proposing a 11,355 gross square meter building on site 5 of the St. George Campus, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 102 of the Academic Board as Appendix "B", be approved in principle;
- (ii) THAT the project cost of \$22,400,880 be approved;
- (iii) THAT the sources of funding, \$750,000 from New College, and a 25-year mortgage for the remainder to be repaid from residence fees and an allocation from the Academic Priorities Fund, be approved; and
- (iv) THAT the base funding of up to \$352,000 be allocated from the Academic Priorities Fund to New College for a period of eight years, the allocation to be reviewed at that time.

12. Capital Project: University of Toronto at Mississauga Residence Phase 7 - Users' Committee Report

Professor Carr noted that this item concerned a Users' Committee Report, which proposed the seventh residential project at the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM). It would provide suite-style accommodation for 192 students. The proposed cost was just over \$14 million and would be financed by \$40,000 from UTM, a 25-year mortgage to be repaid by fees and an annual allocation from the Academic Priorities Fund for a period of eight years.

12. Capital Project: University of Toronto at Mississauga Residence Phase 7 - Users' Committee Report (cont'd)

Mr. Burchell reported that the University Affairs Board's deliberation of this project had focused on accessibility and the type of student population at UTM, which was drawn primarily from small towns within Ontario. The University Affairs Board had had a thorough discussion of the proposal and had ultimately lent its endorsement to the recommendation of the Academic Board.

Mr. Shalaby reported that the Business Board had received assurance that the business plan had been reviewed carefully by the University Controller, and it concurred with the recommendation for approval of the Users' Committee report.

A member noted that he had addressed the issue of subsidization of various projects at the Planning and Budget Committee and he would not, therefore, repeat his concerns. He supported the building of residences on all campuses as they were an important factor in the recruitment and retention of students. However, the Academic Priorities Fund had been created from a tax on divisional budgets. He hoped that the administration would take great care to ensure that divisions were not unfairly disadvantaged as a result of the allocation of funds from the APF.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

- (i) THAT the Users' Committee Report of the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM) Student Residence proposing a 7278 gross square meter building on the U.T.M. Campus, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 102 of the Academic Board as Appendix "C", be approved in principle;
- (ii) THAT the project cost of \$14,059,095 be approved;
- (iii) THAT the sources of funding, \$40,000 from the Parking Ancillary, and a 25-year mortgage for the remainder to be repaid from residence fees and an allocation from the Academic Priorities Fund, be approved; and
- (iv) THAT the base funding of up to \$100,000 be allocated from the Academic Priorities Fund to UTM for a period of eight years, the allocation to be reviewed at that time.

13. Business Board Terms of Reference with Respect to Investments

The Business Board had proposed some "housekeeping" changes with respect to its terms of reference to reflect the establishment of the University of Toronto Asset Management (UTAM) Corporation and UTAM's assumption of responsibility for the University's investments. The revisions also reflected the fact that the University's pension plans were now regulated by a body called the Financial Services Commission of Ontario, which had replaced the former Pension Commission of Ontario.

A member voiced his opposition to the proposal, noting that there was no provision for the Council to deal with the matter of ethical investments. He recommended that the Council examine the issue of ethical investments in the near future. A member countered that there was a policy entitled *Social and Political Issues with Respect to University Investment*, which provided a mechanism for dealing with social and political issues with respect to University investments.

13. Business Board Terms of Reference with Respect to Investments (cont'd)

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT the proposed revised section 4.1(b) of the Business Board terms of reference, concerning investments, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 108 of the Business Board as Attachment 2 to Appendix "A", be approved.

14. Governing Council Elections: Web-based Voting / Teaching Staff Constituencies / Election Guidelines 2001**(a) Web-based Voting**

Mr. Burchell noted that the University Affairs Board had considered three proposals from its Elections Committee pertaining to the Governing Council Elections. The first proposal sought to conduct the 2001 election for undergraduate student representatives on the Governing Council solely by web-based voting. This was a move also being undertaken by the Students' Administrative Council, which conducted its election concurrent with the Governing Council election. Mr. Burchell continued that University Affairs Board members had expressed some concern that the elimination of the traditional ballot-box voting system would lead to a decline in voters. Members had also expressed concern about access to terminals during the election. In response, an amendment had been made to the motion at the University Affairs Board meeting requiring a review of the 2001 election process with a report being made to that Board.

It was duly moved and seconded,

THAT the 2001 election for undergraduate student representatives on the Governing Council be conducted by web-based voting; and

THAT a review of the 2001 election process be undertaken with a report being made to the University Affairs Board at its November meeting at which time the method for conducting the election of undergraduate student representatives on the Governing Council by web-based voting would be reconsidered.

Several members applauded the move toward greater use of information technology, however, they expressed concern that the polling stations previously located in high traffic areas would be eliminated, thereby decreasing the potential for participation. A member noted that recounts of ballots cast on the web would not be possible, and asked how technical problems would be resolved. Concern was also expressed as to the level of security for electronic voting. Mr. Burchell responded that with the provision of web-based voting, there were now over 30 locations (1,100 individual PCs) at which students could vote. When web-based had been introduced the previous year, the Students' Administrative Council (SAC), which ran its elections at the same time as those for the Governing Council, had not yet been ready to move to web-based voting. SAC had indicated that it would run its elections this year in partnership with the Governing Council, by web-based voting. Voter turnout was, therefore, expected to increase this year. He continued that the University Affairs Board had been assured that last year's voting process had been monitored and there had been no attempts to hack into the system. A security provision was built into the web-based voting program, which had successfully prohibited students from voting twice. Ms Talfourd-Jones, Chair of the Elections Committee, added that under web-based voting, the voting period took place over an extended period of time. There was, therefore, greater accessibility. There were also plans to increase the advertising of the elections process to ensure greater awareness.

14. Governing Council Elections: Web-based Voting / Teaching Staff Constituencies / Election Guidelines 2001 (cont'd)**(a) Web-based Voting (cont'd)**

A member noted that the University Affairs Board had amended the motion to include a provision for a review of the 2001 election process with a report being made to the University Affairs Board. This would provide a mechanism for ensuring the process was working and that accessibility issues were assessed. He echoed previous concerns that the nostalgia of the voting process would be lost with the elimination of polling stations. Also, many students decided to cast a vote while in the vicinity of a polling station. The member asked if the motion could be further amended to provide for temporary electronic voting stations in those areas in which the ballot boxes had been traditionally located. The Secretary of the Governing Council noted that an amendment to the motion would not be required as the Chief Returning Officer would take the member's suggestion under advisement. He would report back on the feasibility of the suggestion at the next meeting.

A member added that students should be included in the review process. Ms Talfourd-Jones noted that the Elections Committee, which would oversee the review, included student representation.

A member suggested that the report to the University Affairs Board on the 2001 election process include a measurement of the effectiveness of web-based voting on participation and involvement, as well information concerning the integrity of the program as well as an assessment of privacy issues.

It was moved that consideration of the proposal be deferred.

There was no seconder to the motion to defer.

The vote was taken on the main motion. The motion was carried.

(b) Teaching Staff Constituencies

Mr. Burchell noted that the second set of motions sought to address an imbalance in the distribution of teaching staff seats on the Governing Council for the following reasons:

- The basis on which the 12 seats were evenly divided in 1972 between the Arts and Science constituencies and the other constituencies had altered significantly enough to justify a change;
- The transfer several years ago to the University of employment contracts for teaching staff of the federated universities had resulted in a three-person constituency; and
- The Faculty of Information Studies currently shared a constituency with a OISE/UT, a large multi-departmental faculty, rather than similar small/single department professional faculties.

The proposed changes rectified an imbalance within the teaching staff constituency and did not lead to an increase in faculty seats overall.

Invited to address the Council, Mr. Justin Saunders, University Affairs Commissioner, Students' Administrative Council, drew members' attention to the need to revisit the distribution of student seats on the Council owing to increased enrolments. A member noted that the proposal before members did not concern a change to the overall composition of the Governing Council.

14. Governing Council Elections: Web-based Voting / Teaching Staff Constituencies / Election Guidelines 2001 (cont'd)

(b) Teaching Staff Constituencies (cont'd)

The Chairman concurred, noting that any change in the distribution of seats on the Governing Council would require an amendment to the *University of Toronto Act*. Mr. Saunders encouraged members to read the Report of the University Affairs Board, which contained an account of his intervention concerning the need for increased student representation on the Council. A member noted that when a proposal came forward to the Council for consideration, members had a responsibility to examine its overall impact on the University community. He therefore believed Mr. Saunders' intervention to be relevant.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT Constituency IA for members of the teaching staff who have their major appointments in the federated universities be disestablished and the remaining members of that constituency be assigned to the appropriate Arts and Science constituencies;

THAT the number of seats in Constituency III be increased from 2 seats to 3 seats; and

THAT the teaching staff members in the Faculty of Information Studies be moved from Constituency VI to Constituency V.

(c) Election Guidelines 2001

Mr. Burchell noted that the final resolution sought approval of the Election Guidelines for 2001, which incorporated the above changes.

It was duly moved and seconded,

THAT the Election Guidelines 2001, amended to reflect all the above changes, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 94 of the University Affairs Board as Appendix "C", be approved.

A member noted that he wished to refer the proposal back for further consideration of the advertising of elections. Mr. Burchell responded that the Guidelines incorporated the two previously approved proposals. The advertising of elections was an administrative action that would be undertaken by the Chief Returning Officer. The Secretary of the Governing Council added that in the absence of the approval of the Guidelines it would not be possible to send out the call for nominations for the upcoming election.

It was duly moved and seconded,

THAT the Election Guidelines be referred back to the administration.

The vote was taken on the motion to refer. The motion failed.

The vote was taken on the main motion. The motion was carried.

15. Reports for Information

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

Report Number 102 of the Academic Board (November 16, 2000)

Report Number 108 of the Business Board (November 20, 2000)

Report Number 93 of the University Affairs Board (August 10, 2000)

Report Number 94 of the University Affairs Board (November 7, 2000)

Report Number 330 of the Executive Committee (December 4, 2000)

(a) Report Number 330 of the Executive Committee

A member reiterated his earlier comment that at the Executive Committee meeting he had withdrawn his notice of motion concerning the *Code of Student Conduct*.

16. Date of the Next Meeting

The Chairman reminded members of the next meeting of the Council scheduled for Thursday, February 8, 2001.

The meeting adjourned at 7:25 p.m.

Secretary

January 23, 2001

Chairman