

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO  
**THE GOVERNING COUNCIL**

**Thursday May 2, 2002**

MINUTES OF THE GOVERNING COUNCIL meeting held on Thursday, May 2, 2002  
at 4:30 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall.

Present:

Ms Wendy M. Cecil (In the Chair)	Professor Heather Munroe-Blum
Dr. Thomas H. Simpson, Vice-Chair	Dr. John P. Nestor
Professor Robert J. Birgeneau, President	Ms Rose M. Patten
Professor Mary Beattie	Mr. Kashif Pirzada
Dr. Robert Bennett	Ms Patricia Ricci
Professor Philip Byer	Dr. Joseph L. Rotman
Professor Jack Carr	Mrs. Susan M. Scace
Professor Brian Corman	Ms Heather Schramm
Professor W. Raymond Cummins	Professor Adel S. Sedra
Mr. Brian Davis	Mr. Amir Shalaby
The Honourable William G. Davis	Ms Carol Stephenson
Professor Sherwin Desser	Ms Wendy Swinton
Dr. Alice Dong	Professor John Wedge
Dr. Inez Elliston	Mr. Robert S. Weiss
Ms Susan Eng	Professor Donna Wells
Dr. Shari Graham Fell	Ms Geeta Yadav
Ms Shirley Hoy	
Professor David Jenkins	Mr. Louis R. Charpentier, Secretary of the Governing Council
Ms Françoise Ko	
Professor Brian Langille	
Ms Karen Lewis	<u>Secretariat:</u>
Mr. Gerald A. Lokash	Mr. Neil Dobbs
Professor Ian R. McDonald	Ms Cristina Oke
Mr. David Melville	

Absent:

Ms Mary Anne V. Chambers	Mr. Andrew Morgan
Dr. Claude Davis	Ms Jacqueline C. Orange
Professor Luigi Girolametto	The Honourable David R. Peterson
Mr. Paul V. Godfrey	The Honourable Robert K. Rae
The Honourable Henry N. R. Jackman	Mr. John H. Tory

In Attendance:

Mr. Mark Braun, Member-Elect, Governing Council  
Mr. Harmeet Gill, Member-Elect, Governing Council  
Professor Ellen Hodnett, Member-Elect, Governing Council  
Mr. Sean Mullin, Member-Elect, Governing Council  
Mr. Colm Murphy, Member-Elect, Governing Council  
Mr. Elan Ohayon, Member-Elect, Governing Council  
Mr. Chris Ramsaroop, Member-Elect, Governing Council  
Mr. Tim Reid, Member-Elect, Governing Council  
Mr. Felix P. Chee, Vice-President, Business Affairs

In Attendance (cont'd):

Professor Angela Hildyard, Vice-President, Human Resources  
Dr. Sheldon Levy, Vice-President, Government and Institutional Relations and Interim Vice-Provost, Students  
Professor Vivek Goel, Vice-Provost, Faculty  
Professor Derek McCammond, Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget  
Professor Carolyn Tuohy, Vice-President, Policy Development and Associate Provost  
Professor Ronald Venter, Vice-Provost, Space and Facilities Planning  
Professor Rona Abramovitch, Director, Transitional Year Program  
Mr. Lenny Abramowicz, Executive Director, Association of Community Legal Aid Clinics of Ontario  
Professor Carl Amrhein, Dean, Faculty of Arts and Science  
Dr. Mary Cone Barrie, Director, School of Continuing Studies  
Professor David Beach, Dean, Faculty of Music  
Mr. John Bisanti, Chief Capital Projects Officer  
Ms Sheila Brown, Controller and Director, Financial Services  
Professor Rorke Bryan, Dean, Faculty of Forestry  
Ms Kirby Chown, President, Faculty of Law Alumni Association Council  
Professor David Clanfield, Principal, New College  
Mr. Christopher Collins, President, Graduate Students' Union  
Professor Ron Daniels, Dean, Faculty of Law  
Dr. Beata FitzPatrick, Director of the Office of the President and Assistant Vice-President  
Professor Michael Fullan, Dean, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto (OISE/UT)  
Ms Maureen Giuliani, President, Graduate Students' Association, OISE/UT  
Ms Rini Ghosh, President, Arts and Science Students' Union  
Ms Georgina Gray, Director of University Events and Presidential Liaison (Advancement)  
Mr. Paul Holmes, Judicial Affairs Officer of the Governing Council  
Mr. Rocco Kusi-Achpong, President, Students' Administrative Council  
Ms Anne Lewis, Manager, Student Accounts  
Ms Lesley Lewis, Assistant Vice-Provost, Professional Faculties  
Mr. Robert Lord, Chair, University of Toronto Schools' Interim Board  
Professor Rhonda Love, President, University of Toronto Faculty Association  
Ms Mary McGee, Assistant Provost  
Professor Robert McNutt, Principal, University of Toronto at Mississauga  
Professor Roger Martin, Dean, Rotman School of Management  
Ms Vandra Masemann, University of Toronto Schools' Parents' Association  
Professor David Mock, Dean, Faculty of Dentistry  
Professor David Naylor, Dean, Faculty of Medicine  
Professor Ian Orchard, Principal-designate, University of Toronto at Mississauga  
Ms Catherine Riggall, Assistant Vice-President, Facilities and Services designate  
Mr. Clayton Ruby, Law Alumni Coalition  
Ms Emily Sadowski, President, Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students  
Ms Maureen Somerville, Chair, College of Electors  
Mr. Jorge Sousa, Past-President, Graduate Students' Union  
Mrs. Beverley Stefureak, Assistant Secretary of the Governing Council  
Professor Taz Venetsanopoulos, Dean, Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering  
Professor Deirdre Vincent, Acting Vice-Provost and Dean of Arts, Trinity College

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

**1. Senior Appointment: Interim Vice-President, Research and International Relations**

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT Professor Carolyn Tuohy be appointed as Interim Vice-President, Research and International Relations, from July 1, 2002 until December 31, 2002 or until the position is permanently filled.

**2. Senior Appointment: Assistant Vice-President, Facilities and Services**

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT the creation of the position of Assistant Vice-President, Facilities and Services be approved, effective May 13, 2002, and

THAT Ms Catherine Riggall be appointed to the position of Assistant Vice-President, Facilities and Services, effective May 13, 2002.

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL RETURNED TO OPEN SESSION.

**3. Chairman's Remarks**

**(a) Welcome**

The Chairman welcomed members and guests. She extended a particular welcome to the members-elect of the Governing Council who were or had planned to be in attendance: Mr. Mark Braun; Mr. Harmeet Gill, Professor Ellen Hodnett; Mr. Sean Mullin; Mr. Colm Murphy; Mr. Elan Ohayon; Mr. Tim Reid and Mr. Chris Ramsaroop. She also welcomed the Chair of the College of Electors, Ms Maureen Somerville.

**(b) Congratulations**

The Chairman congratulated Professor Heather Munroe-Blum on her appointment as Principal and Vice-Chancellor of McGill University, effective January 2003.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT the Governing Council of the University of Toronto recognize and express its appreciation for the exemplary work of Professor Heather Munroe-Blum over her eight years as Vice-President – Research and International Relations in achieving extraordinary advances for the cause of university research generally, in achieving major increases in support for university research in Canada, and in moving the University of Toronto forward in achieving its aspiration to be a leading international public research university.

### 3. Chairman's Remarks (cont'd)

#### (c) *In Camera* resolutions

The Chairman announced the resolutions approved by the Council during its *in camera* session. She congratulated Professor Carolyn Tuohy on her appointment as Interim Vice-President, Research and International Relations. She also congratulated Ms Catherine Riggall on her appointment as Assistant Vice-President, Facilities and Services, and invited Mr. Chee to introduce Ms Riggall.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Ms Riggall stated that she was excited at the opportunity of joining the University, and hoped that the service provided by her Division would be to the satisfaction of the University community.

#### (d) Speaking Requests

The Chairman reported that the Executive Committee had considered a number of speaking requests from individuals and groups within and external to the University. On the advice of the Committee, she had granted all the requests received prior to the Executive Committee meeting on April 24. After one speaker cancelled, she had also granted a request which had been received after the 24<sup>th</sup>. Other requests had been received after the 24<sup>th</sup> and were not granted, but the individuals had been invited to make a written submission to the Governing Council, if they so wished. The President of the Faculty Association had asked to speak prior to the meeting, and the request had been granted. The Chairman indicated that she would call upon each speaker at the appropriate time in the agenda.

#### (e) Length of Agenda

The Chairman noted that the agenda was a lengthy one, with 22 items for approval. She asked members' forbearance if it proved necessary to limit the time spent on each item in order to ensure fair consideration for the items at the end of the agenda.

#### (f) Vary the Agenda

With the consent of members, the order of the agenda was varied to allow consideration of the items for approval prior to the President's Report.

### 4. Minutes of the Previous Meeting

The minutes of the previous meetings held on April 5 and April 11, 2002 were approved.

### 5. Business Arising from the Minutes of the Previous Meeting

The Chairman recalled that there had been three items of business arising from the minutes of the meeting of April 5: a notice of motion, the matter of meeting disruption and its related costs, and ticketed seating. She informed members that the disposition of these matters was addressed in Report Number 347 of the Executive Committee.

A member gave the following notice of motion:

Be It Resolved that -- in accordance with section 2(18) of the *University of Toronto Act* which states that the meetings of Governing Council "shall be open to the public" and that "no person shall be excluded therefrom except for improper conduct;" -- Governing Council immediately terminate any system of ticketing for access to meetings of Governing Council or its Board and Committees, and

**5. Business Arising from the Minutes of the Previous Meeting (cont'd)**

that the Executive Committee's decision to implement a ticketing system be declared null and void.

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

Mr. Shalaby described the proposed tuition fee increases, explaining that, for more than half of students, tuition fees were regulated by the Province, and increases were limited to 1.96%. That increase would apply to most Arts and Science programs and undergraduate programs in Music, Nursing, Education, and Physical Education and Health. For a further 40% of students, fees were proposed to increase by 5%. For students who were now here and were continuing their programs next year, the fee increase was proposed to be either 1.96% in the fee-regulated programs or 5% in the other programs.

Mr. Shalaby indicated that, for about 10% of students, all of whom would be entering their programs in the coming year, fees would increase more substantially. Included in this group were the Master of Business Administration Program and the undergraduate program in Law, as well as programs in the Faculties of Dentistry and Applied Science and Engineering.

Mr. Shalaby reported that the Business Board had considered the tuition-fee schedule very carefully. It had reviewed the Enrolment Report, and determined that enrolment and applications continued to be very strong. The Board had also reviewed the annual report of the Vice-Provost, Students on Student Financial Support, and found that accessibility to the University had been maintained for potentially disadvantaged students in all categories including gender, parental income, parental education, ethno-cultural background, and reliance on Ontario Student Assistance Program.

Mr. Shalaby informed members that the Board had held a long and thoughtful debate on the tuition fee schedule. Representations had been heard from three student associations. Where fee increases were to exceed 5%, the Deans of the relevant faculties were present to answer questions. Board members were convinced that the increased fees took into account the requirements set out in the Tuition Fee Policy for fee differentiation, and that the increases were driven by academic planning.

At the invitation of the Chairman, the President commented that the majority of students at the University of Toronto were in regulated programs. He noted that 30% of the revenue from the proposed increase in tuition fees had to be spent on student financial aid. The remaining revenue from the proposed 5% increase in tuition fees in regulated and most deregulated programs was equal to inflation and would therefore not add purchasing power for the University. The revenue from the 1.96% increases, after the 30% set aside for student aid, meant that the University faced a loss of purchasing power. The President explained that it had been necessary to increase fees in some deregulated programs by more than 5%. For example, the Faculty of Dentistry ran one of the most expensive programs in the University. The proposed increase in tuition for the undergraduate program in law was the result of an open process of consultation and discussion, for which the President commended the Dean of Law. The President commented that he did not understand the argument that accessibility was decreasing as tuition fees increased. In his opinion, fixed tuition fees would widen the gap between rich and poor, as the rich would be saving money while the poor would not have the benefit of additional aid for the higher fees and other expenses, including living costs.

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

### **(b) Addresses by Non-Members**

The Chairman informed Council that representatives of five student groups had asked for the opportunity to deliver a joint address, and that the Executive Committee had recommended a ten minute presentation. A limit of three minutes had been recommended for all other speakers.

Mr. Jorge Sousa, immediate Past-President of the Graduate Students' Union, stated that it would be regressive and misguided for the Council to approve the proposed tuition fee schedule. He noted that, although the University had maintained its commitment to increasing funds available for student financial support, 75 per cent of graduate students did not receive bursaries. He expressed his concern that individuals were being prohibited from attending university because of the costs involved.

Ms Rini Ghosh, President of the Arts and Science Students' Union, outlined the increase in tuition in the Faculty of Arts and Science, from \$1,700 in 1991 to \$4,029 in 2001. She noted that there had been a decrease in the income of immigrants to Canada, and expressed her concern that rising tuition costs would decrease accessibility to university for children of immigrants.

Ms Emily Sadowski, President of the Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students, commented that the student groups had requested the opportunity of a joint presentation to indicate to the Governing Council that student groups were united in their opposition to proposed increases in tuition fees. She objected that the University was devoting \$5.4 million to paying the increased, deregulated cost for electricity and paying \$1 million to renovate the Council Chamber while only \$6,000 was being added to the bursary fund for part-time students. She noted that 25 per cent of the students in the Faculty of Arts and Science were part-time students and therefore not covered by the University of Toronto Advance Planning for Students (UTAPS) program. She suggested that the University develop a student debt policy to accompany the Policy on Student Financial Aid.

Ms Maureen Giuliani, President of the Graduate Students' Association of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto (OISE/UT), stated that funding packages were not yet available to all OISE/UT doctoral-stream students. The proposed increase in tuition fees for international students had been unexpected by students. Ms Giuliani expressed her view that continued increases in tuition fees would make university education a privilege for a few.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Lenny Abramowicz, Executive Director of the Association of Community Legal Clinics of Ontario (ACLCO), addressed the Council. He explained that the ACLCO represented 72 community clinics across the province. He highlighted the two primary concerns of the Association with respect to the proposed increased tuition for the Faculty of Law. The Association was concerned with the ability of the legal clinic system to recruit young lawyers whose debt load exceeded the annual salary that legal clinics could afford to provide. The Association also believed that the new tuition fee would prevent low-income members of the communities served by ACLCO from pursuing careers in law.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Clayton Ruby, representing the Law Alumni Coalition, addressed the Council. He commented that, in his view, the argument that it was necessary to increase tuition fees in the Faculty of Law in order to recruit and retain faculty members was not valid, as the number of faculty had increased from 33 to 57 over the past few years, while the number of faculty who had left was 7. Mr. Ruby also noted that "Strengthening Our

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

Community”, the Task Force Report on the Future of the Faculty of Law, reported an increase in students with a family income of less than \$80,000 as an indication of maintained accessibility, while the recent report of the Canadian Medical Association found that the number of students with a family income of less than \$40,000 who were enrolled in faculties of medicine in Ontario following the tuition fee increases had declined from 22.6% to 15%. The amount of \$40,000 was a far more appropriate benchmark for measuring accessibility for low-income families.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Ms Kirby Chown, President of the Law Alumni Association Council, spoke in support of the proposed tuition fee increases for the undergraduate program in law. She reported that members of the Law Alumni Association Council felt that the Faculty of Law currently offered a wide variety of programs and had a low faculty-student ratio. Members of the Law Alumni Association Council were satisfied that plans were in place to maintain accessibility and that the back-end debt relief program allowed students to pursue careers in low paying areas of law. Members of the Law Alumni Association Council were convinced that diversity within the Faculty had increased because of increases in student financial support. The impact of the proposed increases would be monitored by the Law Alumni Association Council to ensure that accessibility, diversity and career choices were unimpeded.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Professor Rhonda Love, President of the University of Toronto Faculty Association (UTFA), addressed the Council. She was concerned about a perception that increased tuition fees were being used directly to fund higher salaries for faculty in areas of strong market demand. She expressed concern that it had not been made clear that there was a policy that governed faculty salary increases.

The Chairman thanked the speakers for their remarks.

**(c) Discussion**

A member remarked that the impact of increases in tuition fees on accessibility remained unclear. He noted that 25 per cent of undergraduates were part-time students who did not qualify for financial support. He indicated that no data had been gathered on the financial needs of part-time students.

A member informed the Council that, with the permission of members, she would put forward a motion following the vote on the tuition fee schedule for publicly funded programs. The motion would call for a comprehensive accessibility and career choice review of the Faculty of Law before any additional increases in tuition were approved by the Council for the undergraduate program. Invited to comment, Professor Sedra said he had read the proposed motion carefully and agreed with its intent. However, the motion would only have relevance if the tuition fee schedule for publicly-funded programs was approved.

A member stated that, in his view, the approval of the tuition fee schedule represented one of the most important actions taken by the Governing Council. He stated that members of the Governing Council must consider whether the fee increases being proposed, combined with the student financial aid program, allowed the University to meet the guarantee of accessibility included in the Policy on Student Financial Support. Members also had to ensure that program quality was increased to the international standard to which the University aspired. The member expressed his concern about the number of submissions from Faculty of Law alumni that opposed the proposed fee increase, and remarked that, without the support of all its alumni, the Faculty would be unable to meet its aspirations. The member also highlighted

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

what he felt was a growing problem with middle-class accessibility that had not been adequately addressed.

A member presented a brief powerpoint presentation to argue that accessibility was not improving. He referred to a study published in the Canadian Medical Association Journal in April 2002, which indicated that rural, black and aboriginal students were under-represented in faculties of medicine, while higher income groups and children of highly educated parents were over-represented. He noted that there were few organized outreach programs for recruitment purposes that could reach the vulnerable under-represented groups who would benefit most from bursary assistance. He suggested that a review committee be struck by the Vice-President and Provost to re-examine the financial aid resources for deregulated programs.

A member expressed her discomfort with the proposed tuition fee increase for the undergraduate program in law, particularly in light of the number of letters received from alumni objecting to the increase.

A member noted that increases in tuition fees were being proposed for a number of professional faculties, in addition to the Faculty of Law. He expressed the concern that, by approving the proposed tuition fee increases, the Governing Council would be approving in principle the continuing increase of tuition fees for professional programs. He also raised the question of whether the Faculty of Law should be competing with the Law Schools of Harvard, Yale and Stanford, given the size of the endowments at those schools.

A member encouraged the Council to refer back the tuition fee schedule. In her opinion, high tuition did not equal excellence.

A member spoke against the increase and expressed concern at the number of members who abstained from voting at the Business Board.

A member spoke in favour of the increase, noting the provisions of the Policy on Student Financial Support which stated that no student offered admission to a program at the University of Toronto should be unable to enter or complete the program due to lack of financial means. In his opinion, the Faculty of Law alumni who had written and stated their intention of withdrawing their financial support from the Faculty should reconsider and direct their support to student financial aid within the Faculty.

A member expressed his concern about approving the tuition fee schedule because it included a combination of small and large increases. He accepted the need to increase tuition by the cost of inflation, but did not wish to support the larger increases.

A member commented that she would support the increase but only for one year. She encouraged an examination of the impact of the increased tuition fees on students from low and middle-income families.

A member spoke in favour of the proposed increase in tuition for the undergraduate program in law, noting that the Faculty had to secure as well as improve current programs while maintaining accessibility.

At the invitation of the Chairman, the Provost responded to the issues that had been raised by the speakers and by members. He indicated that by September 2003, guaranteed funding packages would be available for every doctoral-stream student at OISE/UT. He assured



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

### (c) Discussion (cont'd)

members that any faculty salary adjustments that were made within divisions would be consistent with current policy and practices. He noted that the University would work with the government to improve eligibility criteria for the Ontario Student Assistance Program (OSAP) so that OSAP would assist more students from middle-class families. He advised members that previous increases in tuition fees for professional programs had not resulted in a loss of applicants for, or accessibility to, those programs.

The President thanked all those present for a high-level debate. He stated his support of the motion concerning a review of accessibility and career choice in the Faculty of Law which would be put forward following the vote. He noted that the average debt load for full-time undergraduate students was less than \$7,000. He also noted that the funds available for undergraduate financial support had increased from \$5 million in 1996 to \$32 million in 2001. He admitted to being pre-occupied with the needs of the poor, and agreed that it was important to review OSAP criteria to increase access for students from middle-income families. As one example of outreach, he informed members that senior University administrators had been meeting with leaders in the Regent Park community to encourage students to aspire to enrolling in the University of Toronto, given the student financial support available.

A recorded vote was requested.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT the proposed tuition-fee schedules for publicly funded programs for 2002-03, copies of which are attached as Tables 1 and 3 of Appendix "A" to Report Number 117 of the Business Board, be approved.

In favour	25
Opposed	11
Abstentions	0

## 7. Accessibility and Career Choice Review

With the unanimous consent of members, a motion was added to the agenda.

The motion was intended to reflect the following assumptions:

- Governors were unified in their concern for accessibility and diversity in the student body. This concern was shared by the administration at all levels, and the tuition fee schedule and financial aid packages had been developed with these principles in mind, despite some expressed opinions that the proposals failed to meet these goals.
- Governors had a responsibility to monitor whether the proposals in fact met the shared goals and had a legitimate interest in being actively involved in the monitoring process. While the Accessibility and Career Choice Review, for example, would be carried out through the Provost's office, governors could expect to be involved in setting the criteria for selecting the expert consultants, selection of the performance indicators, and assessment of the findings. It was contemplated that the concerns raised in the various submissions would be addressed through this process and that all steps would

**7. Accessibility and Career Choice Review (cont'd)**

be completed in a timely manner to permit an orderly consideration of any future tuition fee increases.

- Government funding for post-secondary education had fallen dramatically and should be restored. The newly-elected Premier, in his leadership campaign promises, had committed to a matching program for student bursaries which presented the University generally, and the Faculty of Law in particular, with the opportunity to increase the proportion of public funding available and to use it to reduce tuition fees.

Professor Sedra, in seconding the motion, said he was pleased to support it. In response to a question, Professor Sedra said that the monitoring of career choices would have to determine whether the Faculty's previous fee increases had caused any steering effect.

It was noted that, although the comments were focused on the Faculty of Law, the motion should be applied to all divisions with unusually large increases in tuition fees.

Several members spoke in support of the motion.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT there be no further substantial increase in tuition fees for the JD Program in the Faculty of Law until the Governing Council is satisfied that there has been no reduction in accessibility due to the 2002-03 tuition increase and no career distortion due to previous substantial increases based upon a comprehensive Accessibility and Career Choice Review to be conducted through the Provost's Office.

A member gave the following notice of motion:

Be It Resolved

THAT there be established a Faculty of Law Alumni Bursary Fund, designed to be eligible for matching funds from the Province of Ontario, if any, which, once it exceeds the annual alumni donations projected in the Strategic Plan, will be used to fund tuition fee rebates.

**8. Tuition Fee Schedule for Self-Funded Programs**

Mr. Shalaby explained that, for the self-funded programs, there was no government funding. Tuition fees were set at the level required to enable each program to recover its costs. For most of the self-funded programs, the increase was 5% or less. However, in three cases, there were larger increases. In the Executive M.B.A. (Global Option) the increase was 10% to cover the cost of the overseas component of the program. In the Master of Management and Professional Accounting, the proposed fee increase was 6.5% for domestic students.

In OISE/UT, the fee for the Institute for Child Study's laboratory school was proposed to increase by 8.9%. For the University of Toronto Schools (UTS), the increase proposed was 17.9%, which included the second phase of a levy to cover the cost of improved facilities for UTS.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Ms Vandra Masemann, a member of the UTS Parents' Association, addressed the Council. On behalf of the Association, she thanked the University

**8. Tuition Fee Schedule for Self-Funded Programs (cont'd)**

for its continued support of the school. She informed members of Council of the motions passed by the UTS Parents' Association at its meeting of April 18, 2002 stating objections to the proposed tuition fee increase, the rationale provided for the increase and the process used to arrive at the increase.

A member asked why the proposed tuition fee increase was necessary. At the invitation of the Chairman, Professor Michael Fullan, Dean of OISE/UT, replied that UTS was a self-funded laboratory school of the Faculty, and that the increase was necessary to cover the costs of reduced class size and increased faculty salaries. At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Robert Lord, Chair of the Interim Board of UTS, added that, in the opinion of the Board, the increase in tuition fees was necessary, in spite of the difficulties such an increase would create for parents.

A member asked why UTS received a subsidy from the University. At the request of the Chairman, Professor Sedra replied that UTS was part of OISE/UT, and the University provided space and an annual operating subsidy of approximately \$216,000 to the school.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT the proposed tuition-fee schedule for self-funded programs for 2002-03, a copy of which is attached as Table 2 of Appendix "B" to Report Number 117 of the Business Board, be approved.

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

It was duly moved and seconded,

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

The motion was carried with the necessary two-thirds majority.

**9. Budget Report 2002-03**

Professor Carr informed members that Professor Sedra had given a very comprehensive overview of the budget in his presentation to the Academic Board. There had been a very good discussion of the Budget at the Planning and Budget Committee but at the Board, members had asked no questions. A member of the Board had noted that the ease with which the Budget and other items on the Board agenda had been dealt with was in large part due to the trust the members had in the expertise in the Budget and Planning Secretariat - particularly in Professors Adel Sedra and Derek McCammond and Mr. Martin England.

Mr. Shalaby reported that, at the Business Board, both the President and Professor Sedra had reviewed the key budget assumptions and areas of risk, and had assured the Board that the assumptions were reasonable and the risks acceptable. The Business Board had accepted those assurances, and had concurred with the recommendation of the Academic Board that the Budget Report be approved.

Professor Sedra reviewed the highlights of the Budget Report, 2002-03 using a powerpoint presentation, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "A".

**9. Budget Report 2002-03 (cont'd)**

Among the highlights were the following:

- Full average funding for enrollment growth in undergraduate programs was assumed in the budget. However, to date, the University had received only 43 per cent of the funding promised by the provincial government. If the remaining funding did not materialize, a reduced budget would have to be brought forward.
- The budget is fiscally prudent, with conservative projections for expenditures, and some risk on revenue projections.
- A budget surplus was projected for 2003-04, necessary to reduce the cumulative deficit to the maximum permitted by the Governing Council policy, i.e. 1.5 per cent of operating revenue.

A member raised a point of order with respect to Section 2 (18) of the *University of Toronto Act, 1971* which required the meetings of the Governing Council to be open to the public.

It was duly moved and seconded,

THAT the meeting adjourn and that all decisions made be set aside.

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

A member raised a point of order with respect to Section 3 (14) of the *University of Toronto Act, 1971* concerning the function of the Executive Committee.

It was duly moved and seconded,

THAT no decision made in the meeting be considered to be in effect until a legal opinion had been sought with respect to Sections 2 (18) and 3 (14) of the *University of Toronto Act, 1971*.

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

A member asked whether there should be a review of the policy with respect to the maximum cumulative budget deficit allowed. In the member's view, the provision appeared to be violated regularly. Professor Sedra replied that the Governing Council had, in approving the Long-Range Budget Guidelines for 1990-91 through 1995-96, and subsequent Guidelines, approved cumulative deficits greater than 1.5 per cent within any planning period so long as the deficit was reduced to the permissible level by the end of the planning period.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT the proposed Budget Report for 2002-03, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 111 of the Academic Board as Appendix "B", be approved.

The following motions were presented as omnibus motions in appropriate groupings by Professor Carr.

- 10. Academic Priorities Fund: Allocation - Faculty of Dentistry, *Raising Our Sights Plan***  
(Arising from Report Number 111 of the Academic Board (April 11, 2002))

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT allocations from the Academic Priorities Fund of \$167,300 in base and \$125,000 OTO for the Faculty of Dentistry, as described in the memorandum from the Vice-President and Provost dated February 6, 2002 which is attached to Report Number 111 of the Academic Board as Appendix "D", be approved.

- 11. Academic Priorities Fund: Allocation - Faculty of Information Studies, *Raising Our Sights Plan***  
(Arising from Report Number 111 of the Academic Board (April 11, 2002))

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT an allocation of \$60,000 in base and \$107,000 OTO for the Faculty of Information Studies from the Academic Priorities Fund, as described in the memorandum from the Vice-President and Provost dated March 7, 2002 which is attached to Report Number 111 of the Academic Board as Appendix "E", be approved.

- 12. Academic Priorities Fund: Allocation - Office of Teaching Advancement**  
(Arising from Report Number 111 of the Academic Board (April 11, 2002))

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT an allocation of \$182,948 in base funding from the Academic Priorities Fund for the Office of Teaching Advancement, as described in the memorandum from the Vice-President and Provost dated March 7, 2002 which is attached to Report Number 111 of the Academic Board as Appendix "F", be approved.

- 13. Academic Priorities Fund: Allocation - University of Toronto at Mississauga**  
(Arising from Report Number 111 of the Academic Board (April 11, 2002))

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT an allocation of \$1,952,000 in base funding from the Academic Priorities Fund for the University of Toronto at Mississauga, as described in the memorandum from the Vice-President and Provost dated March 7, 2002 which is attached to Report Number 111 of the Academic Board as Appendix "G", be approved.

**14. Academic Priorities Fund: Allocation - University of Toronto at Scarborough, University of Toronto at Mississauga and Faculty of Arts and Science: Computer Science Program, Commerce, Management and Business Programs**  
(Arising from Report Number 111 of the Academic Board (April 11, 2002))

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT the base allocations from the Academic Priorities Fund for quality improvements in the following undergraduate programs, as described in the memorandum from the Vice-President and Provost dated March 7, 2002 which is attached to Report Number 111 of the Academic Board as Appendix "H", be approved:

- (i) \$682,684 to the Faculty of Arts and Science for expenditure on the Commerce Program,
- (ii) \$567,394 to the University of Toronto at Mississauga for expenditure on the Commerce and Management Programs,
- (iii) \$911,434 to the University of Toronto at Scarborough for expenditure on the Bachelor of Business Administration Program,
- (iv) \$298,095 to the University of Toronto at Scarborough for expenditure on the Computing Science programs.

**15. Academic Priorities Fund: Allocation - Miscellaneous *Raising Our Sights* Plans**  
(Arising from Report Number 111 of the Academic Board (April 11, 2002))

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

- (i) THAT the following allocations from the Academic Priorities Fund, as described in the memorandum from the Vice-President and Provost dated March 7, 2002 which is attached to Report Number 111 of the Academic Board as Appendix "I", be approved:
  - a) A base allocation of \$70,800 to the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto (OISE/UT) to match increased SSHRC fellowships;
  - b) A one-time-only allocation of \$99,000 to the Asian Institute subject to approval of its establishment;
  - c) A base allocation of \$480,191 for salary and benefits in unfunded academic/librarian positions described in the memo of March 7, 2002.
- (ii) THAT base allocations from the Academic Priorities Fund in 2002-03 and 2003-04 to protect the Transitional Year Program from budget cuts be approved.

**16. Enrolment Growth Fund: Allocations - 2001-02**  
(Arising from Report Number 111 of the Academic Board (April 11, 2002))

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT the following allocations, as described in the memorandum from the Vice-President and Provost dated March 7, 2002 which is attached to Report Number 111 of the Academic Board as Appendix "J", be approved from the Enrolment Growth Fund to the divisions to accommodate the 2001-02 enrolment expansion.

(i) one-time-only funding in 2001-02 of:

Library	\$500,000
Faculty of Arts and Science	\$3,446,881
University of Toronto at Scarborough	\$1,081,164
Faculty of Pharmacy	\$329,251
Faculty of Nursing	\$164,929
Faculty of Applied Science & Engineering	\$705,311

(ii) base funding in 2002-03 of:

Library	\$500,000
Faculty of Arts and Science	\$3,381,534
University of Toronto at Mississauga	\$669,728
University of Toronto at Scarborough	\$1,364,175
Faculty of Pharmacy	\$493,876
Faculty of Nursing	\$247,393
Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering	\$881,576

**17. Capital Project: University of Toronto at Scarborough - Management Building - Revised Project Planning Report**

(Arising from Report Number 111 of the Academic Board (April 11, 2002))

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

- (i) THAT the revised Project Planning Report for the UTSC Management Building, as described in the memorandum from the Vice- Provost, Space and Facilities Planning dated March 7, 2002 which is attached to Report Number 111 of the Academic Board as Appendix "K", be approved in principle.
- (ii) THAT the revised project scope of 2436 nasm in total on a site adjacent to the existing Humanities Wing be approved at an estimated cost of \$15.53 million (2003 dollars) excluding campus improvements.
- (iii) THAT the funding sources to construct the Management Building and advance the project will be allocated as follows:
  - a) Allocation of \$14.37 million from the Phase I enrolment growth income that will be available to UTSC, and
  - b) External contributions by donors and others support through UTSC in the amount of \$1.16 million.

**18. Capital Project: Sidney Smith Infill - Revised Project Planning Report**  
(Arising from Report Number 111 of the Academic Board (April 11, 2002))

A member noted that the motion was passed by the Planning and Budget Committee on the understanding that other alternatives would be pursued. At the invitation of the Chairman, Professor Venter replied that alternatives were still being investigated.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

- (i) THAT the revised Sidney Smith Infill project, as described in the memorandum from the Vice- Provost, Space and Facilities Planning dated March 7, 2002 which is attached to Report Number 111 of the Academic Board as Appendix "L", be approved in principle,
- (ii) THAT the revised Sidney Smith Infill project be undertaken at a cost of \$3,075,000, and
- (iii) THAT the funding sources for this project be approved as follows:
  - a) An allocation of \$875,000 from the Faculty of Arts and Science
  - b) The allocation of \$1,289,000 from the University Investment Infrastructure Fund previously approved be increased by \$711,000 to a total allocation of \$2,000,000 and
  - c) An allocation of \$200,000 from the funds available to the Accommodation and Facilities Directorate.

**19. Capital Project: University of Toronto at Scarborough - Academic Resource Centre - Change of Scope - Project Planning Report**  
(Arising from Report Number 111 of the Academic Board (April 11, 2002))

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

- (i) THAT the March 2001 revisions to the Academic Resource Centre at the University of Toronto at Scarborough, as described in the memorandum from the Vice- Provost, Space and Facilities Planning dated March 7, 2002 which is attached to Report Number 111 of the Academic Board as Appendix "M", be approved in principle.
- (ii) THAT project scope of 4571 net assignable square meters (nasm) of new space and 1286 nasm of renovated space at a cost of \$22,560,000 be approved, with the funding sources as follows:

SuperBuild Funds/Centennial Lease*	\$10.30 million
Allocation from the Phase I enrolment expansion at UTSC	11.99
Institutional Contribution, UTSC	1.20
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$23.49 million</b>
Encumbrance: *Due Diligence costs	(0.080)
Encumbrance: ATOP	(0.100)
Encumbrance: *Soil Remediation	(0.500)
Encumbrance: *Traffic Improvements	(0.250)
<b>Funds available to support the Project</b>	<b>\$22.56 million</b>



**20. Capital Project: University of Toronto at Mississauga, Phase I - Allocation for Capital Projects**

(Arising from Report Number 111 of the Academic Board (April 11, 2002))

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

Subject to Governing Council approval of any individual project costing over \$2-million and approval by the Accommodation and Facilities Directorate of individual projects costing less than \$2-million, and subject to quarterly reports by the Vice-Provost, Space and Facilities Planning, on the progress of the Phase I plan to expand the University of Toronto at Mississauga,

- (i) THAT funding of \$26.1 million plus interest from the Enrolment Growth Fund allocation(s) to the University of Toronto at Mississauga, as described in the memorandum from the Vice-Provost, Space and Facilities Planning dated March 7, 2002 which is attached to Report Number 111 of the Academic Board as Appendix "N", be approved for the following capital projects for the Phase I expansion of the University of Toronto at Mississauga, [the projects to be financed, with principal and interest repaid over time by the University of Toronto at Mississauga from its Enrolment Growth Fund allocations, deriving from enrolment expansion]:

Phase I: Communication, Culture and Information Technology  
Phase I: Vertical Expansion of the Centre for Applied Bioscience & Biotechnology [CABB]  
Phase I: Kaneff Building Expansion  
Phase I: Collegeway Stage 1  
Phase I: Basement for the CABB  
Phase I: North Building/ Classroom Renovation  
Phase I: Collegeway Stage 2  
Phase I: South Building Renovation  
Phase I: Library Improvements

- (ii) THAT authority be delegated to the Vice-President and Provost and the Principal of the University of Toronto at Mississauga to allocate this funding to individual projects costing less than \$2-million.

**21. Capital Project: University of Toronto at Scarborough, Phase I - Allocation for Capital Projects**

(Arising from Report Number 111 of the Academic Board (April 11, 2002))

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

Subject to Governing Council approval of any individual project costing over \$2 million and approval by the Accommodation and Facilities Directorate of individual projects costing less than \$2 million, and subject to quarterly reports by the Vice-Provost, Space and Facilities Planning, on the progress of the Phase I plan to expand the University of Toronto at Scarborough,

**21. Capital Project: University of Toronto at Scarborough, Phase I - Allocation for Capital Projects (cont'd)**

- (i) THAT funding of \$28.98 million plus interest from the Enrolment Growth Fund allocation(s) to UTSC, as described in the memorandum from the Vice-Provost, Space and Facilities Planning dated March 7, 2002 which is attached to Report Number 111 of the Academic Board as Appendix "O", be approved for the following capital projects for the Phase I expansion of the University of Toronto at Scarborough, [the projects to be financed, with principal and interest to be repaid over time by the University of Toronto at Scarborough from its Enrolment Growth Fund allocations, deriving from its enrolment expansion]:

Phase I: Academic Resource Centre [ARC]

Phase I: Management Building

Phase I: Renovation to Arts and Science Facilities

Phase I: Infills for Offices and other Facilities

Phase I: Renovations: Delivery Services

Phase I: Roads, Landscaping and Bridge

- (ii) THAT authority be delegated to the Vice-President and Provost and the Principal of the University of Toronto at Scarborough to allocate this funding to individual projects costing less than \$2-million.

**22. University Infrastructure Investment Fund: Allocation: Office of Teaching Advancement and Resource Centre for Academic Technology**  
(Arising from Report Number 111 of the Academic Board (April 11, 2002))

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT an allocation of \$460,000 from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund towards the complete cost of the establishing the Office of Teaching Advancement and the upgrading of the Resource Centre for Academic Technology facilities, as described in the memorandum from the Vice-Provost, Space and Facilities Planning dated March 7, 2002 which is attached to Report Number 111 of the Academic Board as Appendix "P", be approved.

**23. University Infrastructure Investment Fund: Allocation - Governing Council Chambers and Board Room Restoration, Refurbishment and Renovation**  
(Arising from Report Number 111 of the Academic Board (April 11, 2002))

A member commented that he hoped the Council Chamber and Board Room would be used more, once the renovations were completed. At the invitation of the Chairman, the Secretary replied that one of the reasons for the proposed renovations was to make the two rooms more suitable for broader year-round use.

**23. University Infrastructure Investment Fund: Allocation - Governing Council Chambers and Board Room Restoration, Refurbishment and Renovation (cont'd)**

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT an allocation of \$1,593,000 from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund for the complete cost of the restoration, refurbishment and renovation of the Council Chamber and the Board Room in Simcoe Hall, as described in the memorandum from the Vice- Provost, Space and Facilities Planning dated March 7, 2002 which is attached to Report Number 111 of the Academic Board as Appendix "Q", be approved.

**24. University Infrastructure Investment Fund: Allocation - Alumni Hall, University of St. Michael's College**  
(Arising from Report Number 111 of the Academic Board (April 11, 2002))

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT an allocation of \$300,000 from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund toward the renovation of Alumni Hall in the University of St. Michael's College so as to provide a significant teaching facility for programs within the Faculty of Arts and Science, as described in the memorandum from the Vice- Provost, Space and Facilities Planning dated March 7, 2002 which is attached to Report Number 111 of the Academic Board as Appendix "R", be approved.

**25. School of Graduate Studies: Establishment of Risk Management Institute**  
(Arising from Report Number 111 of the Academic Board (April 11, 2002))

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT the establishment of the Risk Management Institute, within Division III of the School of Graduate Studies, as described in the memorandum from the Vice- Provost, Planning and Budget dated February 26, 2002 which is attached to Report Number 111 of the Academic Board as Appendix "S", be approved effective immediately.

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

It was duly moved and seconded,

THAT the time of adjournment be extended to 7:40 p.m.

The motion was carried with the necessary two-thirds majority.

**26. Designation of Program for Purposes of Governing Council Elections**  
(Arising from Report Number 106 of the University Affairs Board (March 26, 2002))

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT the Transitional Year Program and the Millie Rotman Shime Academic Bridging Program be designated by the Governing Council as programs of post-secondary study at the University under clause 1 (1) (l) of the *University of Toronto Act, 1971* for the purposes of Governing Council elections.

**27. Policy on Approval and Execution of Contracts and Documents: Interim Updates**  
(Arising from Report Number 347 of the Executive Committee (April 24, 2002))

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT the proposed revisions to the Policy on Approval and Execution of Contracts and Documents, as outlined in the memorandum from the Secretary of the Governing Council dated April 23, 2002 which is attached to Report Number 347 of the Executive Committee as Appendix "A", be approved.

**28. Address by Non-Member**

The Chairman invited Mr. Rocco Kusi-Achpung, President of the Students' Administrative Council (SAC), to address the Council. Mr. Kusi-Achpung said that, as President of SAC, he served all full-time undergraduate students of the University. He commented on two particular concerns – the maintenance of excellence and accessibility in the face of increased tuition fees, and rising transportation costs which affected students. He invited the University's senior administrators to enter into consultation with students, particularly those in the Faculty of Physical Education and Health to develop appropriate athletics facilities for the University. He also encouraged the creation of a student center on the St. George campus.

The Chairman thanked Mr. Kusi-Achpung for his remarks and wished him well in his new position.

**29. Report of the President**

In light of the time, members agreed to forego the President's Report.

**30. Reports for Information**

The Governing Council received the following Reports for information

- Report Number 111 of the Academic Board (April 11, 2002)
- Report Number 117 of the Business Board (April 8, 2002)
- Report Number 106 of the University Affairs Board (March 26, 2002)
- Report Number 346 of the Executive Committee (April 11, 2002)
- Report Number 347 of the Executive Committee (April 24, 2002)

**30. Reports for Information (cont'd)**

**(a) Add to Agenda**

It was duly moved and seconded,

THAT the following motion be added to the agenda:

Be It Resolved

THAT President Birgeneau strike a working group with student groups to work on student issues, with representatives from the Arts and Science Students' Union (ASSU), Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students (APUS), Graduate Students' Union (GSU), Students' Administrative Council (SAC), Scarborough College Students' Union (SCSU), Erindale College Student Union (ECSU), and Student Governors.

The vote was taken on the motion to add to the agenda.  
The motion was defeated.

It was duly moved and seconded,

THAT the following motion be added to the agenda:

Be It Resolved

THAT Governing Council meetings be adjourned, if necessary to accommodate for attendance, and reconvened at a larger venue.

The vote was taken on the motion to add to the agenda.  
The motion was defeated.

It was duly moved and seconded,

THAT the following motion be added to the agenda:

Be It Resolved

THAT Governing Council strike a committee to monitor career choice, brain-drain of recent graduates, and debt-load.

The vote was taken on the motion to add to the agenda.  
The motion was defeated.

A member commended the University's administration for stating publicly that no additional students would be accepted by the University unless the promised additional government funding was provided.

It was duly moved and seconded,

THAT the time of adjournment be extended to 7:50 p.m.

The motion was carried with the necessary two-thirds majority.

**31. Date of the Next Meeting**

The Chairman reminded members that the next regular meeting of the Governing Council was scheduled for **Monday, June 3** at 4:30 p.m.

**32. Question Period**

A member gave the following notice of motion:

That, for next year's tuition fee schedule and budget, any proposed increases in excess of 5% be considered separately.

**33. Other Business**

The Chairman encouraged members to participate in the June Convocations.

The meeting adjourned at 7:50 p.m.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Secretary

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chairman

May 15, 2002