

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

REPORT NUMBER 321 OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

December 3, 1999

To the Governing Council,
University of Toronto.

Your Committee reports that it held a meeting on Friday, December 3, 1999 at 12:00 noon in the Board Room, Simcoe Hall, with the following members present:

Ms Wendy M. Cecil-Cockwell (In the Chair)	Mr. John H. Tory
Mrs. Mary Anne V. Chambers (Vice-Chair)	Ms Nancy L. Watson
Professor J. Robert S. Prichard, President	Dr. Alexander R. Waugh
Professor Jack Carr	
Ms Shruti Dev	Mr. Louis R. Charpentier
Dr. Robert J. Kyle	
Dr. John P. Nestor	<u>Secretariat:</u>
Professor Wendy Rolph	
Dr. Joseph L. Rotman	Ms Margaret McKone
Mrs. Susan M. Scace	

Regrets:

Professor Brian Langille

In Attendance:

Mr. Brian C. Burchell, Chair, University Affairs Board
Professor John T. Mayhall, Chair, Academic Board
Mr. Amir Shalaby, Chair, Business Board
Professor Adel S. Sedra, member, Governing Council, and Vice-President and Provost
Mr. Elan Ohayon, member, Governing Council
Ms Wendy Talfourd-Jones, member, Governing Council
Professor Michael G. Finlayson, Vice-President, Administration and Human Resources
Professor Carolyn Tuohy, Deputy Provost**
Ms Susan Bloch-Nevitte, Director, Public Affairs***
Mr. Kasi Rao, Director of the Office of the President and Director of Government Relations
Ms Patti Seaman, Secretary, Committee for Honorary Degrees*

* In attendance for item 1

** In attendance for item 7

*** In attendance for item 12

Vary the Agenda

The Chairman suggested that the Committee move its consideration of Report Number 40 of the Committee for Honorary Degrees to the beginning of the meeting as this item had to be considered by the Committee *in camera*. There were no objections to proceeding as suggested.

THE COMMITTEE MOVED *IN CAMERA*.

1. **Report Number 40 of the Committee for Honorary Degrees**

The President presented the Report on behalf of the Chancellor. He noted that, in arriving at its recommended slate of candidates, the Committee for Honorary Degrees had followed its usual procedures and practices. At the outset of the Committee's deliberations, there had also been a thorough review of the criteria for the granting of honorary degrees. He invited comments on procedure, noting that the Governing Council would be asked to consider each nominee individually, with each requiring the approval of a two-thirds majority of members present and voting.

The President noted the accidental omission of one nominee, recommended by the sub-Committee for the Committee for Honorary Degrees, but inadvertently dropped from the nominees forwarded to the full Committee. This nomination was non-controversial and he asked that the Executive Committee's endorsement of the recommendations of the Committee for Honorary Degrees include the addition of the nominee, following appropriate approval by the Committee for Honorary Degrees, either by fax or conference call. The Committee agreed to proceed as outlined.

A member drew attention to two minor corrections to the Report.

A member lauded the format of the Report and supporting documentation, which he found to be very useful.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED

to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation

THAT the recommendations contained in Report Number 40 of the Committee for Honorary Degrees, subject to the conditions listed above by the President, be approved.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

THAT Report Number 40 of the Committee for Honorary Degrees be considered by the Governing Council *in camera*.

The Chairman reminded members that the names of the nominees were strictly confidential until they received the approval of the Governing Council and until the President reported back on the disposition of the offers.

THE COMMITTEE RETURNED TO CLOSED SESSION.

2. Report of the Previous Regular Meeting

Report Number 319 of the regular meeting of the Executive Committee held on October 25, 1999 was approved.

3. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting

The Chairman noted that she was aware of two items of business arising from the October 25 meeting.

a) Notice of Motion: Task Force on Tuition Fees

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

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

The Executive Committee, at its previous meeting, had deferred its consideration of this motion because the mover of the motion had been unable to attend that meeting. The Chairman invited the member of the Governing Council, who was in attendance, to speak briefly to his motion.

The member of the Governing Council noted that the establishment of a task force to examine the abolition of fees for post-secondary education would be an ideal forum for research, and for discussion and debate of post-secondary education, regardless of members' views with respect to fees. The task force could undertake research of an international nature and examine the different fee structures beyond Canada and the United States, raise members' consciousness, and inform future debates. Information gathered would also be valuable to members of the Governing Council when they considered annual enrolment reports. He continued that he had requested information concerning international fee structures from the administration; however, he had been informed that this information was not readily available. Many student groups on campus had lent their endorsement to the proposed motion, for the above reasons.

At the invitation of the Chairman, the President addressed the proposed motion. He did not believe the Executive Committee should endorse the proposed motion for many reasons. The University had an entire academic unit devoted to the type of research suggested by the member – OISE/UT. Information concerning tuition fee structures was readily available through a World Bank study. There existed many fora at the University where a debate concerning tuition fees could take place. He shared the member's view that research and debate of these matters was desirable for the University. He personally paid close attention to information concerning fee structures, not only in the United States but in other countries as well. While he agreed that research and debate on the issue were important, he did not agree that a Governing Council task force on the abolition of tuition fees for post-secondary education was appropriate. The appropriate level for tuition fees had been considered by the Governing Council in the very recent past and a policy had been established. Annual reports on tuition fees and financial support were made by the administration to governance. At these times, it was appropriate for governance to consider whether the right framework was in place. The creation of a task force to consider the abolition of tuition fees would send a confusing signal to the University community with respect to the Governing Council's position on tuition fees. Finally, the

President did not advocate the creation of a task force in the absence of Governing Council's support as it would be very time-consuming for him and his senior colleagues. He urged the member instead to pursue this debate with other groups, including the Graduate Students' Union and Hart House, and in scholarly fora within the University.

3. **Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting** (cont'd)

a) *Notice of Motion: Task Force on Tuition Fees* (cont'd)

In response to a member's inquiry, the President clarified that the University's *Policy on Student Financial Support*, approved by the Governing Council on April 30, 1998, required the administration to report annually on the implementation of the Policy and on accessibility. Similarly, the *Tuition Fee Policy*, also approved by the Governing Council on April 30, 1998, contained a monitoring clause requiring the administration, when presenting the annual Report on Enrolment, to comment on changes in tuition fees upon changes in enrolment. These annual reports would provide members of governance with an opportunity to review the effects of tuition fees, if any, and, where appropriate, to make recommendations for a change in direction.

A member spoke against the recommendation and its placement on the Governing Council agenda. It was not appropriate for a committee of the Governing Council to consider tuition fees beyond the University, as was suggested by the motion. He suggested that this issue was more appropriately dealt with by a Royal Commission rather than by any one post-secondary institution. No one institution could rightly consider the abolition of tuition fees in the present funding circumstances, in which operating revenue was directly tied to tuition fee revenue.

A member expressed reservations about the consideration of such a task force by the Governing Council at the same time the University was considering significant enrolment expansion.

The member responded to points raised. He had hoped that debate of the motion would have taken place at the Governing Council. While it was true that research on tuition fees was undertaken by academic divisions within the University, it would be very different if a committee of the Governing Council were to undertake and inform members of information. Not all members of Council were as knowledgeable of fee systems as were members of the senior administration. He noted that when the task force on tuition fees had consulted with members of the University community, it had informed the Graduate Students' Union that it was outside the scope of its mandate to consider the abolition of tuition fees. The member agreed with his colleague's suggestion that a Royal Commission should consider the matter; however, it would be helpful if the Governing Council could play a role in its establishment. He reiterated his hope that these matters could be discussed by the Governing Council.

A member commented that he did not support the motion for reasons already articulated. He agreed that the proper role of Council was to consider the annual reports on accessibility, as cited by the President.

A member also spoke against the member's proposal. She noted that she had served on the task force on tuition fees. The Graduate Students' Union had been well represented on that committee, which had discussed and debated the exact position now being put forward by the member.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

THAT the following motion **not** be placed on the agenda of the next Governing Council meeting:

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

The Chairman noted that the vote had been unanimous.

3. **Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting** (cont'd)

a) *Notice of Motion: Task Force on Tuition Fees* (cont'd)

At the request of the President, Mr. Charpentier clarified that the Executive Committee would report its disposition of the notice of motion to the next meeting of the Governing Council. In the event the member wished to pursue the matter further, his recourse would be to move a motion at the meeting of the Governing Council to have his motion added to the agenda. Such a motion required a 2/3 majority and was not debatable.

The President noted that the member's option had been clearly explained. Should the member decide not to accept the decision of the Executive Committee, but to exercise this option, he was under a strong obligation to advise the Chairman and the Secretary in advance of the meeting. The member responded that he would be happy to do so.

b) *Physical Accessibility: Request from a member to add the matter to the agenda of the Governing Council*

The Chairman recalled that the Executive Committee had received a request from a member of the Governing Council to add "Issues regarding physical accessibility at the University of Toronto" to the Governing Council's agenda. Following discussion, the Committee had determined that it would consider a written submission that identified particular issues and described the desired outcome or action. The Chairman reported that she had not received the requested written submission and invited the member of the Governing Council to speak briefly to his request.

The member of the Governing Council noted that he had been approached by several student organizations that wished to draw this matter to the attention of the Governing Council. He believed that the Governing Council could determine how it wished to proceed, following submissions from these groups. The member noted that the Secretary of the Governing Council had advised him that the University Affairs Board would be the proper forum for consideration of proposals related to the matter. Accordingly, the member had consulted with representatives of the Graduate Students' Union and the Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students, who had indicated they would be happy to address that Board.

The President responded that it was the role of the agenda group for the University Affairs Board to set the Board's agenda. The Chairman had previously requested that the member of the Governing Council provide a written submission that identified particular issues and that described the outcome or action he wished the Governing Council to consider. Given the absence of the requested information, the President did not believe that the Executive Committee should add the matter to the agenda of the Governing Council, nor should it refer the matter to the University Affairs Board. He suggested that the member prepare the previously requested information and submit it for consideration to the next meeting of the agenda planning group for the University Affairs Board. The member noted that it was not always possible for student members of Council to prepare written documents. The Chairman indicated that the member had been properly advised of the appropriate procedure for having

the matter considered by the University Affairs Board. She suggested that he consult with the Board Secretary as to the next meeting of the Board's agenda planning group.

3. **Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting** (cont'd)

b) *Physical Accessibility: Request from a member to add the matter to the agenda of the Governing Council* (cont'd)

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

THAT the issue of Physical Accessibility **not** be placed on the agenda of the next Governing Council meeting.

The President noted that, should the agenda planning group for the University Affairs Board decide to add this matter to that Board's agenda, the Chair of the Board could extend invitations to representatives of the three student groups to address the Board.

There were no other items of business arising from the previous regular meeting.

4. **Minutes of the Governing Council's Regular Meeting held on November 4, 1999**

Members received for information a copy of the November 4 minutes.

5. **Business Arising from the November 4 Governing Council Meeting**

There were no items of business arising from the November 4 meeting of the Governing Council.

6. **Academic Board Item for Confirmation**

The Chairman noted that the following recommendation arose from the December 2, 1999 meeting of the Academic Board.

Faculty of Nursing: Constitution - Amendments

Professor Mayhall noted that the amendments had passed without debate at the meeting of the Academic Board held the previous day.

A member noted that the Committee did not have a copy of the Report of the Academic Board meeting at which the proposal had been considered, as was customary when it confirmed the Board's recommendations. The Chairman regretted that this had not been possible given the Board's meeting had taken place only one day earlier.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE CONFIRMED

THAT the approval of the Faculty of
Nursing Constitution, revised November
1999, effective July 1, 1999.

7. **Enrolment Expansion at the University of Toronto: Discussion Paper**

The President recalled that both he and the Provost had signaled to governance that expansion of enrolment would be a central, defining issue for the University as it went forward. They had undertaken last spring to present a discussion paper on the subject which would raise the critical issues that the administration believed the University should consider.

(a) Consultation Process. This discussion paper, authored by the Provost, the Deputy Provost and himself, had been brought to the Planning and Budget Committee and to the Academic Board, at its meeting the previous day. Both fora had engendered very good discussion. The advice of the University Affairs Board would be sought in early January and the President was considering whether the discussion paper should also be discussed by the Business Board. He welcomed members advice on this. The paper had twice been discussed with the group of Principals and Deans, and had also been discussed with the group of Principals, Deans, Academic Directors and Chairs, and with the group of President and Vice-Presidents. The administration would publish the paper campus wide and invite comments from all members of the University community. Discussion was also being encouraged at the divisional level. As well, copies of the discussion paper had been sent to leaders of student and employee groups. The President hoped that members of the Governing Council would offer their advice.

(b) Approval process. Following discussion of the paper by the Governing Council, the President, Provost and Deputy Provost would prepare a recommendation on to how to proceed in light of debate (i.e. a specific recommendation for size and distribution of enrolment across the University's three campuses). He anticipated that the administration's position brief would be available by early February, at which time it would be brought to governance, through the Planning and Budget Committee, for approval.

(c) Timing and rationale for discussion paper. The discussion paper had been undertaken at this time because there would be growth in the university system and the University had to determine its future. Earlier this year it had been hoped that a clearer articulation of governmental policy would allow for an appropriate university response. However, the government process for allocating funding in support of enrolment expansion was not yet known and would most probably be sporadic over the next few years. The University should, therefore, proceed to develop an overall plan for the next decade that was consistent with its mission and would form the basis for its thinking and action. Should circumstances change in future due to governmental initiatives, amendments could be considered.

(d) Executive Committee discussion. A member asked if the position paper was premised upon additional resources in support of enrolment expansion. Also, if the University chose not to expand, would it contemplate a redistribution of its students across the three campuses?

The President responded that the University's position was that adequate operating and capital funding was a necessary condition for expansion. That is, in the absence of adequate resources, the University would not grow. In the event the University did not grow, a significant rebalancing of enrolment across the three campuses, as the member had suggested, would be extremely difficult because the University would not receive funding for capital facilities on campus. The President recalled an interesting point raised at the Academic Board meeting the

previous day. If the University chose not to increase its undergraduate programs on the St. George campus - an option supported by some members of the University community - it might be possible to rebalance the current enrolment among the various colleges on the St. George campus. For example, the east side of campus was under-populated when compared to the west side, as was

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

evidenced by student traffic. There were, therefore, interesting possibilities for re-balancing enrolment on the St. George campus in the absence of growth.

A member spoke in support of the direction contemplated in the discussion paper. She suggested that in the absence of growth, the administration seek to address faculty:student ratios and the class size of first-year courses. The member lauded the inclusion of best practices within the discussion paper; however, she cautioned that "best practices" appeared to vary across programs. While the discussion paper noted that costs varied from program to program, there might also be productivity and efficiency issues that varied from program to program and should, therefore, be reflected in any review undertaken. She also urged selective enrolment across programs (e.g. centres of excellence for specific programs and a greater emphasis on co-op programs). With regard to differentiation, she urged collaboration on certificate and diploma programs with community colleges. The member also urged a clearer definition for the term "character of the University". She noted that the assumption that changing workplace requirements would lead to increased enrolment did not appear to be substantiated within the discussion paper. In conclusion, while she supported the discussion paper, she did not wish for the government to argue against the need for additional resources because it believed the University was not operating as effectively or as efficiently as possible. The University should, therefore, be in a position to state that it had undertaken various reviews and plans.

In response to the member's question concerning the workplace requirements and anticipated changes, Professor Tuohy noted that these were Council of Ontario Universities (COU) projections. They took into account some notion of changing workplace requirements. She believed it was recognized that these were the softest areas of the COU projections.

Professor Sedra responded to the member's comments. He noted that it was important to separate the issue of expansion from the effectiveness and efficiency of the University. The University had undertaken a major planning exercise and extensive reviews of its programs over the past four years. The issue of funding in support of expansion was quite separate. With regard to the suggestion that the University seek increased collaborations with community colleges, the University was very interested in collaborative programs with community colleges in niche areas. A collaborative program between the University of Toronto at Mississauga and Sheridan College had recently been established and the University was exploring a potential collaborative effort with Centennial College. The University was not interested in wholesale articulation agreements with community colleges. This was inconsistent with the mission of the University. He agreed that enrolment expansion should occur only under the right circumstances and that it presented a wonderful opportunity to elevate the quality of the two suburban campuses.

Professor Tuohy emphasized that the prospect of adequately funded enrolment expansion changed the parameters of the planning process. It did not do away with the need for the planning process. In finding efficiencies through the planning process, the administration had been able to make various incremental changes. It had however always been functioning within a given envelope. The parameters of this envelope now had the prospect of shifting in a way that made it possible to implement change on a scale that had not previously been possible.

The Chairman thanked members for their comments.

8. External Appointments**a) The Addiction and Mental Health Services Corporation**

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

THAT Dr. C. David Naylor be appointed as the University of Toronto representative to the Board of Trustees of The Addiction and Mental Health Services Corporation for a three-year term.

b) University of Toronto Press Incorporated

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

THAT the following voting members and directors be re-appointed to the University of Toronto Press Inc. for 1999-2000:

Mr. Terrence Stephen (Chair)
Mr. Kendall Cork
Mr. Bryan Davies
Dr. Wendy K. Dobson
Ms Alison Fisher
Professor Roberta Frank
University Professor Martin L. Friedland
Professor Roger Martin
Mr. George Meadows
Ms Carole Moore
Mr. Roger Parkinson
Mr. Robert White
Mr. David Wilson

The President noted that the Board of Directors for the University of Toronto Press Incorporated was currently undertaking a review of its operations. The corporation had been performing very well during the past few years and it was in a good position to undertake a review at this time.

9. Endowed Chair Naming

The Chairman noted that members had received a copy of a memorandum to members of the Governing Council from the Committee Secretary concerning the William G. Davis Chair in Community College Leadership at the University of Toronto. She clarified that normally these approvals were delegated to the Committee on Namings; however, in this instance the naming was in recognition of a third party, who was both a public figure and a member of the

Governing Council. For this reason, the Executive Committee, acting on behalf of the Governing Council, was asked to approve the naming.

The President noted that a member had requested clarification as to whether the title should specify that the naming was in recognition of Community College Leadership **Studies**. He asked that members approve the recommended naming on the understanding that he would clarify this point with the Dean of OISE/UT.

9. **Endowed Chair Naming** (cont'd)

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

THAT a new endowed chair in Community College Leadership at OISE/UT be known as the William G. Davis Chair in Community College Leadership at the University of Toronto.

10. **Report on Namings**

Members received for information a report for the period October, 1998 to November, 1999, containing the following approved namings:

Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce Chair in Youth Employment at the University of Toronto
Chancellor Henry N. R. Jackman Distinguished Professors Program in the Humanities at the University of Toronto
The Newcourt Chair in Structured Finance at the University of Toronto
The Rose Family Chair in Palliative Medicine at the University of Toronto
Shirley A. Brown Memorial Chair in Women's Mental Health Research
The Heart and Stroke Foundation of Ontario Chair in Cardiovascular Research at the University of Toronto
The Canadian National Chair in Strategic Management at the University of Toronto
L. Lau Chair in Electrical and Computer Engineering at the University of Toronto
Bell Canada Chair in Multimedia at the University of Toronto
The Bonham Centre for Finance at the Joseph L. Rotman School of Management
Bell Emergis Chair in Software at the University of Toronto
Bell Emergis Chair in Information Systems at the University of Toronto
Bell Emergis Chair in Computer Engineering at the University of Toronto
Bell Emergis Chair in Human Computer Interaction at the University of Toronto
Bell Emergis University Labs at the University of Toronto
Shirley A. Brown Memorial Chair in Women's Mental Health Research
Goldring Chair in Canadian Studies at the University of Toronto
The Donald and Audrey Campbell Chair in Immunology at the Hospital for Sick Children
Manny Rotman Chair in Marketing
Dr. Barnett and Beverley Giblon Professorship in Family and Community Medicine at the University of Toronto
Hannah Chair in the History of Medicine at the University of Toronto
The Earle W. McHenry Chair in Nutritional Sciences at the University of Toronto
Heart and Stroke Foundation of Ontario Chair at the University of Toronto
CIBC Wood Gundy Children's Miracle Foundation Chair in Child Health Research at the Hospital for Sick Children
Frank Iacobucci Chair in Capital Markets Regulation
Marvella Koffler Chair in Breast Research at Mount Sinai Hospital

TD Bank Financial Group Chair in Child and Adolescent Psychiatry at The Hospital for Sick Children

S.D. Clark Chair in Sociology at the University of Toronto

The Bahen Information Technology Centre

The Dusan and Anne Miklas Chair in Engineering Design at the University of Toronto

The Manulife Financial Chair in Financial Services at the University of Toronto

10. **Report on Namings** (cont'd)

The Wharton Chair in Head and Neck Surgery at the Princess Margaret Hospital
The Wharton Chair in Reconstructive Plastic Surgery at the Princess Margaret Hospital
The Bartley-Smith/Wharton Chair in Head and Neck Radiation Oncology at the Princess Margaret Hospital
The Derek Harwood-Nash Chair in Medical Imaging at The Hospital for Sick Children
The Robert M. Filler Chair in Paediatric Surgery at The Hospital for Sick Children
The Rubinoff/Gross Chair in Orthopaedic Oncology at Mount Sinai Hospital
The Raymonde and Cecilia Sacklyn Chair in Applied General Psychiatry at Mount Sinai Hospital
The R. R. Tasker Chair in Stereotactic and Functional Neurosurgery at The Toronto Hospital
The J. Gerald Scott/David G. Whitmore Chair in Haematology and Gene Therapy Research at The Toronto Hospital
University of Toronto Dr. David Chu Program in Asia-Pacific Studies
University of Toronto Dr. David Chu Professorship in Asia-Pacific Studies
University of Toronto Dr. David Chu Community Network
University of Toronto Dr. David Chu Distinguished Leaders Program
Bell Canada University Labs Chair in Software at the University of Toronto
Bell Canada University Labs Chair in Information Systems at the University of Toronto
Bell Canada University Labs Chair in Computer Engineering at the University of Toronto
Bell Canada University Labs Chair in Human Computer Interaction at the University of Toronto
Bell Canada University Labs at the University of Toronto
Koffler Ecology Centre at Joker's Hill (east section of the Joker's Hill property)
Joker's Hill, the Koffler Endowment (west side of the Joker's Hill property)
The CIBC World Markets Children's Miracle Foundation Chair in Child Health Research
The Helen and Paul Phelan Chair in Drama
The William C. Graham Chair in International Law and Development
The OHTN Chair in HIV/Aids Research.

11. **Reports for Information**

Members received for information copies of the following Board Reports:

Report Number 96 of the Academic Board; and
Report Number 101 of the Business Board.

The Chairman noted that Report Number 87 of the University Affairs Board would be distributed with the mailing for the Governing Council.

12. **Report of the President**

The President noted that he had invited Ms Susan Bloch-Nevitte to attend this portion of the meeting. He then reported on the following matters, noting that he would report on government relations at the meeting of the Governing Council.

(a) Hong Kong Convocation

The Chairman and the President would be attending a University convocation ceremony to be held in Hong Kong in early December. This event was held every other year to allow recent graduates and their families, who had been unable to do so, to participate in a convocation

12. Report of the President (cont'd)

ceremony. Various other alumni-related and recruitment events would also be held in Hong Kong. The Provost would serve as Acting President while the President was away.

The President noted that he raised this matter with the Executive Committee because a member of the Governing Council had requested information about the Convocation ceremony. The President had responded to the request, noting that the estimated budget would be similar to the last Hong Kong Convocation in 1997. He noted that honorary graduates and other leaders in Hong Kong were invited to attend the Convocation. These ceremonies were well received and were an important element in the University's overall standing in Hong Kong.

(b) Labour Relations

The administration was in negotiations with the majority of its union groups, most of which would be in a position to strike following no board reports in the weeks ahead. There was, therefore, a very real possibility that one or more strikes would take place on campus in the near future. Professor Michael Finlayson and his negotiation team, in consultation with the Management Board, were doing a very good job in dealing with the situation. The President expressed his appreciation to Professor Finlayson for his leadership in this area.

The President continued that the position taken by CUPE 3902, representing the teaching assistants, had been completely unreasonable and unjustifiable. The union had sought an 80% pay increase. Consequently, the administration was preparing for a strike by this group.

However, the administration was devoting a great deal of effort to ensuring it was prepared in every way possible to protect undergraduate students who receive valued services from teaching assistants. Appropriate contingency plans had been developed for December and would be adapted as needed for the month of January. In the event of a strike by this union, the administration would seek to ensure the University continued to operate. Deans and Chairs were offering a great deal of assistance and support. The President cautioned that, in the event of a strike, the administration would have to make some difficult choices in early January. Specifically, course offerings would have to be restructured in the first few days of the new term in the absence of teaching assistants. This included the transfer of teaching assistant responsibilities to faculty. In essence, this would end the teaching assistant contracts for the remainder of the term. This would not be a punitive action but would be done to ensure no serious consequences to students enrolled in those courses. The President was pleased that the teaching assistant union had made a decision not to picket while undergraduate students were writing examinations. When the picket lines were put into place, there would be real disruptions to the University; however, the administration would seek to minimize these where possible.

The President hoped that a successful resolution would be found, avoiding the need for a strike. He was optimistic that if possible, such an outcome could be achieved under the leadership of Professor Finlayson.

(c) Campaign

The Campaign continued to be very successful. New major gifts were imminent and the Dr. Dellandrea and his colleagues continued to do an excellent job.

12. Report of the President (cont'd)**(d) Transition to the next President**

The President would work with the President-designate, Dr. Robert J. Birgeneau, to ensure a smooth transition to July 1. Dr. Birgeneau had already met with members of the senior administration and with Deans and Principals. Dr. Birgeneau had resigned his position as Dean of Science at Massachusetts Institute of Technology effective January 1, 2000 so that he could spend time acquainting himself with the various aspects of the University. Interim arrangements had been made for Dr. Birgeneau's accommodation at Massey College. The President had assigned, on an 0.5 FTE basis, Dr. Chris Cunningham in his office to provide administrative support to Dr. Birgeneau; this support would be increased if the need arose. The President noted that he would do everything he could to ensure a smooth transition to the new President.

The President and his senior colleagues would continue their momentum during the six months to ensure the University stayed on course.

(e) Sweatshops

The President recalled that he had previously briefed members on this issue, which was receiving widespread attention on University campuses across North America. While clothing and products that carried the University's name and/or crest (e.g. sweatshirts, tee shirts, shoes, etc.) were typically manufactured in Canada, they were sometimes manufactured in the developing world. Questions had been raised as to whether the University had a responsibility and obligation to be aware of and monitor the conditions under which these items were made. In some instances, these items were acquired by the University directly from the manufacturer, in other instances, the University acquired the items from suppliers who were sub-licensed from the manufacturer.

It had been advocated that universities should, at the time of licensing, require the licensee to adhere to certain minimum terms and conditions of employment (e.g. minimum hourly wages) for the people who were producing the items, to be accountable for their compliance (i.e. reporting, monitoring and investigation), and to be subject to termination of the license if the licensee failed to comply with the above. This was a model that had been adopted by many universities in the United States. While this issue fell outside the realm of the University's academic mission, it was being argued that the University did have a responsibility in this area given that the manufactured products bore its name. The President was inclined to agree.

Accordingly, the President had asked Dr. Jon Dellandrea, who would be responsible for the administration of any policy on licensing the University might adopt, to review the issue and report back with a recommendation. Dr. Dellandrea had convened a task force on the subject and had made an initial recommendation that the University proceed as has been suggested, following the "American approach". The President had reported on this probable direction at the last meeting of the Executive Committee. Since that time, the President had been contacted by a member of the Committee, who had experience in labour standards and trade. The member had been in touch with representatives of non-governmental organizations

(NGOs), who had recommended that the University focus its efforts on employer values rather than on imposing North-American working conditions on developing countries.

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

(e) **Sweatshops** (cont'd)

As a result of the member's intervention, the President was now of the following view:

1. He believed there was a sufficiently close nexus between the issue and the University's affairs that it was appropriate to impose conditions on the University's licensees.
2. As a first step, the University should insist that each of its current licensees provide disclosure on where its products were manufactured. Such disclosure would form the basis for the renewal of contracts.
3. The above information would be available to members of the University community.
4. Conditions that would apply to licensees should not be those of the "American approach" (i.e. the licensee being required to adhere to certain minimum terms and conditions of employment for the people who were producing the items), but rather, should focus on the process by which employees were represented, including the right to free association and the right to organize collectively.
5. A forum should be convened to gain further advice and input on the issue.
6. A policy recommendation would be made to the Governing Council before the end of the current academic year.

The President would seek the advice of the Governing Council at its next meeting.

Discussion ensued, with members lending their support to the proposed new direction. Comments included the following.

- It was important to maintain flexibility in any conditions imposed. Rather than trying to establish rules and regulations, the University should instead focus on process, including resolution mechanisms. Check and balance systems should be in place to ensure the desired objectives were met.
- Ensuring workers' rights to collective bargaining as a requirement for licensees would be harmful on some countries, including China, which did not have trade unions. Instead, conditions should be acceptable to the countries in which the products were manufactured and the standard should be whether the purchase of these manufactured items hurt developing countries.
- The University should consider applying its requirements not only to products that bore the University's name, but also to the supplies it purchased (e.g. coffee and paper).
- Many exporting companies within developing countries had requirements for suppliers similar to those now being contemplated by the University. These companies could be potential suppliers in future.

Following discussion, it was agreed that the President would provide his advice to the Governing Council in written form. Debate of the proposed direction and ensuing policy revision would commence with the University Affairs Board, which had jurisdiction in this area.

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

(f) **Miscellaneous**

A member asked that the report on the status of negotiations between the University and the teaching assistants be designated as a separate item on the agenda of the next Governing Council meeting. The President responded that he would be happy to make this matter part of his report to Council. Following his update on this matter, he would provide members with an opportunity to comment.

THE COMMITTEE MOVED *IN CAMERA*.

The President consulted with members on a matter.

THE COMMITTEE RETURNED TO CLOSED SESSION.

13. **Date of Next Meeting**

The Chairman reminded members of the Committee's next meeting on Monday, January 24, 2000 at 7 p.m.

14. **Other Business**

Members did not raise any other items of business.

The meeting adjourned at 2:00 p.m.

Secretary

Chairman

January 29, 2000