

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL
REPORT NUMBER 356 OF
THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Monday, February 3, 2003

To the Governing Council,
University of Toronto.

Your Committee reports that it held a meeting on Monday, February 3, 2003 at 5:00 p.m. in the Boardroom, Simcoe Hall, with the following members present:

Dr. Thomas Simpson (In the Chair)
Professor Robert J. Birgeneau, President
Dr. Robert Bennett
Mr. Brian Davis
Ms Susan Eng
Dr. Shari Graham Fell
Professor David Jenkins
Professor Brian Langille
Professor Ian McDonald
Mr. David Melville
Mr. Sean Mullin
Ms Rose Patten

Dr. Joseph Rotman

Regrets:

Mrs. Susan M. Scace
Mr. Louis R. Charpentier

Secretariat:

Mr. Neil Dobbs
Ms Cristina Oke

In Attendance:

Professor W. Raymond Cummins, Chair, Academic Board and Member of the Governing Council

Dr. John Nestor, Chair, University Affairs Board and Member of the Governing Council

Mr. Amir Shalaby, Chair, Business Board and Member of the Governing Council

Professor Brian Corman, Vice-Chair, Academic Board and Member of the Governing Council

Professor Shirley Neuman, Vice-President and Provost and Member of the Governing Council

Mr. Felix Chee, Vice-President, Business Affairs (not present for item 3)

Professor Angela Hildyard, Vice-President, Human Resources (present for item 12)

Dr. Sheldon Levy, Vice-President, Government and Institutional Relations (present for item 7 (d))

Mr. John Bisanti, Chief Capital Projects Officer (present for item 13)

Dr. Beata FitzPatrick, Assistant Vice-President and Director, Office of the President

On motion duly moved and seconded,

IT WAS RESOLVED

THAT, pursuant to sections 28 (e) and (f) of By-Law Number 2, consideration of agenda items 1, 2, 3 and part of 4 take place *in camera*, with the Board Chairs and Vice-Chair, Mr. Chee, Professor Neuman, and Dr. FitzPatrick admitted to the meeting to facilitate the work of the Committee.

The Chair indicated that he would report on one matter of business arising from the *in camera* portion of the October 18, 2002 meeting prior to the President's Report.

1. Senior Appointment

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED

to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation contained in the Memorandum from the Vice-President and Provost dated January 23, 2003.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

THAT pursuant to Section 38 and 40 of By-Law Number 2, the recommendations be considered by the Governing Council *in camera*.

2. Naming: University of Toronto at Mississauga – R. H. McNutt Lecture Theatre

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

THAT one of the 75-seat laptop lecture theatres in the Communication, Culture and Information Technology (CCIT) facility at the University of Toronto at Mississauga be named the R.H. McNutt Lecture Theatre.

3. External Appointment: University of Toronto Asset Management Corporation ¹

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

THAT Mr. Felix P. Chee be approved and nominated as Chair of the Board of Directors of the University of Toronto Asset Management Corporation until his successor is appointed or until the 2004 annual meeting of the members of the Corporation, whichever comes first.

4. Business Arising from the Meeting of October 18, 2002

The Chair reported on a matter of business arising from the *in camera* portion of the meeting of October 18, 2002.

¹ Mr. Chee was not present for consideration of this item.

5. Report of the President

The President reported on a personnel matter.

THE COMMITTEE MOVED INTO CLOSED SESSION.

The President invited the Vice-President and Provost to report on the budget.

(a) Budget Update

The Provost reminded members that, in 2003-04, the University would be entering the final year of a six-year budget cycle. At the end of that period, the maximum permissible accumulated deficit would be \$14.3 million. The accumulated deficit estimated in the 2002-03 Budget Report had been \$17 million. Currently, the forecasted actual deficit was \$44.8 million. Factors contributing to the current deficit included both unexpected expenditures and unrealized revenues. On the expenditures side, the new deficit figures included:

- increased utilities costs (\$1.4 million);
- unanticipated costs for asbestos removal (\$.8 million);
- additional legal costs to settle a lawsuit (\$1 million);
- overcommitments in the Academic Priorities Fund (APF) of the last planning exercise (\$2 million).

The 2002-03 budget had been formulated around a number of revenue assumptions that had not been realized, including:

- the inclusion in the budget plan of an assumed inflationary adjustment to the provincial operating grant which had not been provided (\$3.2 million);
- less than anticipated performance-based funding owing to good performances by other universities (\$1 million);
- unrealized investment income resulting from poor market performance for the 'float' of funds that are committed but not yet spent; a substantial loss would instead be likely (\$20.3 million variance).

In addition, the Provost noted that poor market performance had also reduced the return on the University's endowment funds. The 5% payout rate, along with the amount required to maintain the value of the endowment against inflation, and the associated costs of administering the fund, would require an annual return of 9%, which had not been realized. The payout was based on the market value of the endowment which had led to a very high payout following earlier years of strong investment returns. It now would be appropriate to reverse the payout formula to reduce the payout to a sustainable level. It would therefore be necessary to use funds from the operating budget to subsidize the payout rate in some cases.

The pension surplus in the two University pension plans – the regular plan and the Supplemental Retirement Arrangement (SRA) – had largely evaporated. The current pension surplus was \$12 million. The University, because of the surplus, had not been making contributions to the registered pension plans. It had continued to budget 75% of the cost of such contributions, but had been able to use the amount for one-time-only purposes. The current valuation of the pension plan assumed a 7% annual return on the pension funds to meet liabilities. That assumption would have to be re-examined. In order to deal with these matters, and to build up the special fund being set aside to match the liability in the Supplemental Retirement Arrangement, it would be necessary

5. Report of the President (cont'd)

(a) Budget Update (cont'd)

over the next four years to allocate \$70 million, much of that amount one-time-only, but also some for annual employer contributions. By 2007-08, \$103 million would be required by the University to meet its contributions. A base contribution of \$31.2 million had been budgeted; \$70 million remained to be found.

The 2003-04 operating budget included the following assumptions:

- development of a capital budget for the University. Carrying costs for the capital budget would be included in the operating budget;
- indirect costs of 20% would be provided by the federal government in research grants to the University;
- no inflationary increases would be assumed in the provincial operating grant;
- reduced return from investment income on the University's 'float';
- enrolment levels at the enrolment target agreement signed with the provincial government;
- phased-in reduction of endowment payout.

In order to bring the accumulated deficit to the permissible amount, a budget cut of 5 – 6% would be required for all units within the University, in addition to the planned 1.5% cut for reallocation.

There were some possibilities for increased revenue from the federal and/or provincial governments.

A member asked whether improved utilization of space was possible and whether this could yield savings on new construction. The Provost replied that efforts were underway to schedule classes earlier and on the weekends, but that expansion of class schedules would result in additional costs to provide administrative and technical support. Mr. Chee added that the utilization of the campus was at capacity in the fall and winter. Increased use in summer might create revenue opportunities. A member noted that, since the job market for students was worsening, the flexibility provided by weekend classes would be welcomed, particularly by part-time students.

A member commented that a 7.5% budget reduction would be very hard for units to absorb. Mr. Chee noted that a 1% change in return on the University's \$4 billion investments equaled \$40 million or 8% of the operating budget. He stated that the options for addressing a deficit included budget cuts, an increase in the amount of the permissible deficit, or the depletion of capital. The University's capital depletion was now at an end, leaving the other two options.

A member complimented the Provost on the clarity of the presentation while acknowledging the difficulties involved. The member suggested serious consideration of substantial restructuring to deal with the budget problem. He suggested that budget cuts should be differential, as it would not be appropriate to have a 7.5% cut in an area in which the University wished to excel. Professor Neuman replied that some Deans had begun to consider the affordability of various programs and were seeking to concentrate resources in academic areas of growing importance. With so much of the budget dedicated to the salaries of tenured faculty, however, change could only come slowly as faculty retired or departed for other reasons.

5. Report of the President (cont'd)

(b) Provincial Government Relations

The President reported that the University had submitted a proposal to SuperBuild, requesting \$88 million, but had not yet received a response. He also reported that the provincial government was taking under consideration a proposal from the Council of Ontario Universities (COU) to establish a quality assurance fund which would be available to universities. The Province would want to link such funding to the double cohort.

(c) Federal Government Relations

The President indicated that the University was still on track for indirect costs. He was also exploring the possibility of the federal government having an interest in transforming federal student financial aid programs to focus on needs-based aid.

(d) Search for Vice-President, Research and Associate Provost

The President informed members that the work of the Advisory Committee on the Search for the Vice-President, Research and Associate Provost was progressing well. He also noted that the search for the Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget was nearing completion.

(e) Questions

A member asked whether any changes to the Ontario Student Assistance Program (OSAP) were anticipated. The President replied that the University, with the administration working together with student leaders, had made a submission to the provincial government, suggesting changes, but that no response had been received.

A member asked whether details of the Ontario Student Opportunity Trust Fund (OSOTF) program had been announced by the government. The President replied that no announcement had been made to date.

6. Report of the Previous Meeting

Report Number 355 of the Executive Committee meeting held on December 2, 2002 was approved.

7. Business Arising from the Reports of the Previous Meetings

Business Arising from the meeting of October 18, 2002

(a) Process for Consideration of Tuition Fee Schedule and Budget Report

The Chair proposed that the Executive Committee dispose of the notice of motion considered at the October meeting by recommending a process to the Governing Council on the consideration of the tuition fee schedule and the budget report.

7. Business Arising from the Reports of the Previous Meetings (cont'd)

(a) Process for Consideration of Tuition Fee Schedule and Budget Report (cont'd)

A member asked whether such a process would predetermine the outcome of a debate on the tuition fee schedule or budget, or hinder the work of the Governing Council. The Chair replied that the recommendation was that the appropriate motion for a member to make if he/she did not wish to accept the tuition fee schedule or the budget report was to refer the entire proposal back to the originating Board with a view to reconsidering a certain element(s). One of the roles of the Executive Committee was to provide procedural leadership to the Governing Council.

Several members spoke in support of having a procedural debate at the Governing Council prior to the consideration of the substantive issues of tuition and budget.

A member asked why, since the tuition schedule was considered separately from the budget report, the tuition schedule could not be further broken down. The Provost replied that the tuition fee schedule and the budget were developed in tandem. It would not be appropriate for certain tuition fees to be targeted for change. If the tuition fee schedule were to be referred back, the budget report could be amended accordingly. If the tuition fee schedule was accepted but the budget report was referred back, additional cuts to expenses would be necessary.

A member asked whether the proposed process would apply to the Boards and Committees of the Governing Council. The Chair replied that, the Business Board normally considered proposals (including tuition fees) from the administration on an accept/reject/refer back basis in any event. If, in some unusual circumstance, a proposal were amended, the administration had the right to withdraw the proposal. The Academic Board similarly considered proposals, including budget proposals, from its Planning and Budget Committee on an 'accept/reject/refer back' basis. The Committee itself, however, did have the authority to make amendments. It would therefore be better to rely on the usual Board and Committee procedures rather than have the proposed Governing Council procedure apply at those levels. It might, therefore, not be appropriate for a Board or Committee to adopt the proposed process.

In a detailed discussion, several revisions were made to the proposed procedure.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

to the Governing Council for consideration

- (a) THAT the Governing Council consider each of the following as integrated proposals:
- the tuition fee schedule for publicly funded programs,
 - long-term budget guidelines or frameworks, and
 - budget reports,

and that a member who opposes a part(s) of these proposals put forward, after a full debate on the entire proposal, a motion to refer back to the appropriate Board the entire proposal with a view to reconsidering the relevant part(s); and

7. Business Arising from the Reports of the Previous Meetings (cont'd)

(a) Process for Consideration of Tuition Fee schedule and Budget Report (cont'd)

- (b) THAT motions to amend the above proposals or to divide the proposals for separate consideration could be ruled out of order at the discretion of the Chair.

Business Arising from the meeting of December 2, 2002

(b) Provost's Accessibility and Career Choice Study in the Faculty of Law

The Chair reported that a special meeting of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs (AP&P) would be held on Monday February 24 at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber to receive the Provost's Study on Accessibility and Career Choice in the Faculty of Law. The Report would be made available to members of the Governing Council and of the Business Board at the same time as it was distributed to members of AP&P. Any member interested in the matter would be welcome to attend this special meeting.

A member asked whether the report could be referred to during discussion of the tuition fee schedule at the Business Board. The Chair indicated that the report was being provided as background to the consideration of the tuition fee schedule, and it would be in order to refer to it. He emphasized that the report was being received for information, and that the approval of the tuition fee schedule was the matter on which members of the Business Board and Governing Council would vote.

A member asked why the report was not being debated at the Academic Board. The Chair replied that matters of student financial support and accessibility were in the terms of reference of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs. The report of the February 24 meeting would be distributed to members of the Academic Board.

A member noted that while attention was focused on tuition-fee increases for the Faculty of Law, other professional faculties were also substantially increasing tuition.

(c) Notice of Motion given at meeting of the Governing Council, October 31, 2002

At the invitation of the Chair, the Provost provided advice on the following notice of motion which had been given at the October 31, 2002 meeting of the Governing Council.

- (i) Whereas the Governing Council of the University of Toronto recognizes the importance of a quality and universally accessible elementary and secondary education system,

Whereas the Toronto District School Board has been taken over by the province of Ontario due to an inability to meet demanding budgetary restraints due to provincial cuts and downloading

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Governing Council of the University of Toronto direct the administration of the University of Toronto to undertake a study on the impact provincial budgetary cuts have had on admissions to the University of Toronto.

7. Business Arising from the Reports of the Previous Meetings (cont'd)

(c) Notice of Motion given at meeting of the Governing Council, October 31, 2002 (cont'd)

This study would examine the impact budgetary restrictions have had on admissions of students who are from Toronto and the surrounding areas diverse, multicultural, and multilingual communities.

The Provost noted that elementary and secondary education had recently received a 3 percent increase in funding. It was her advice that it would be neither appropriate nor practically possible for the University to conduct such a study.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

THAT no further action be taken on this notice of motion.

(d) Notice of Motion regarding the Proposed Canada Post-Secondary Education Act of the Canadian Association of University Teachers (CAUT)

The Chair noted that, at the November meeting of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs, a notice of motion that a forum be created to discuss the proposed legislation for post-secondary education had been given by the same member who had given the following notice of motion at the Executive Committee:

BE IT RESOLVED that an ad hoc Governing Council committee including student governors and administrators be struck to examine CAUT's proposed Education Act, exploring the possibility of a spring forum.

The Agenda Committee of the Academic Board had considered the notice of motion from AP&P at its December meeting, and agreed that no further action be taken on this notice of motion. Although Section 31 (e) of By-Law Number 2 provided that no matter decided by a committee under the authority of a resolution of the Council may be considered again by the committee or by the Council within 12 months, the Chair indicated that he was allowing consideration of this notice of motion since it was slightly different from the notice of motion given previously. The Chair emphasized, however, that this was not intended as a precedent to consider similar motions at various Boards and Committees.

At the invitation of the Chair, Dr. Levy distributed a written response to the notice of motion. He advised members that it would be injudicious for the University to have a formal institutional approach to the CAUT proposal. Dr. Levy reminded members that responsibility for postsecondary education was a provincial matter, not a federal matter. He explained that some of the implications of the proposal were troubling, for example the possible reduction or elimination of funding based on the merit of postsecondary programs. Overall, there was nothing to be gained and potentially much to be lost in pursuing this matter.

The member thanked Dr. Levy for providing this substantial information and withdrew the notice of motion.

8. Minutes of the Governing Council Meeting held on December 12, 2002

The Committee received for information the minutes of the Governing Council meeting held on December 12, 2002.

9. Business Arising from the Governing Council Meeting

The Chair noted that there had been one item of business arising from the Governing Council meeting. Members had requested the gender and racial distribution of honorary degree recipients. Information had been distributed to members of the Governing Council in January 2003. The President reminded members of the Executive Committee that the Committee for Honorary Degrees reviewed the nominations that it had received, and he invited members to make and to encourage nominations of individuals from underrepresented groups.

10. Items for Confirmation by the Executive Committee

Professor Cummins reported that the four items for confirmation had not generated any questions at the Board. The constitutional changes at University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM) and the Faculty of Arts and Science had, in effect, separated UTM from the Faculty and had set it up on its own. The constitutional changes and the departmental name changes at UTSC were also steps in the implementation of the *Framework for a New Structure of Academic Administration for the Three Campuses*.

(a) Capital Project: Southeast Infrastructure Upgrade, Electrical Substation and Chiller -Change in Scope

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE CONFIRMED
THE APPROVAL OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD

THAT the scope pertaining to the electrical power provision of the original project be modified as indicated to provide for a direct electrical connection to Toronto Hydro in preference to the construction of the Southeast Substation as planned. No change in scope of the chiller component of the project is planned.

THAT the previously approved allocation from the Centre for Cellular and Biomolecular Research and the Leslie L. Dan Pharmacy Building capital project budgets be maintained at that previously approved.

10. Items for Confirmation by the Executive Committee (cont'd)

(b) Faculty of Arts and Science: Constitution – Amendments

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE CONFIRMED
THE APPROVAL OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD

THAT the “Council of the Faculty of Arts and Science and its Standing Committees” as amended, dated January 13, 2003, be approved.

(c) University of Toronto at Mississauga: Constitution – Amendments

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE CONFIRMED
THE APPROVAL OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD

THAT the Erindale College Council Constitution (UTM) as amended, dated October 10, 2002, be approved.

(d) University of Toronto at Scarborough: Divisional Name Changes

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE CONFIRMED
THE APPROVAL OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD

THAT the following divisional name changes at the University of Toronto at Scarborough be approved, effective February 1, 2003:

Division of Humanities to Department of Humanities
Division of Life Sciences to Department of Life Sciences
Division of Mathematical Sciences to Department of
Computer and Mathematical Sciences
Division of Physical Sciences to Department of Physical and
Environmental Sciences
Division of Social Sciences to Department of Social Sciences

The President noted that the confirmation of the approval of the three previous items was historically significant, as it was a major change in the structure of the University of Toronto at Mississauga and of the University of Toronto at Scarborough that would have a profound effect on their future development.

11. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council

**(a) Capital Project: University of Toronto at Scarborough, Parking Expansion and Renovation – Project Planning Report
UTSC Parking Ancillary: Fee Increases**

*Arising from Report Number 116 of the Academic Board (January 16, 2003),
Report Number 122 of the Business Board (January 20, 2003) and Report
Number 112 of the University Affairs Board (January 21, 2003)*

Professor Cummins explained that this capital project concerned the expansion of the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC) parking facilities and right-of-way improvements. There would be a total of 2399 parking spaces in the outer parking facility at UTSC. The total project would cost \$10.150 million. Centennial College would contribute to the cost of the right-of-way improvements. There had been a question at the Academic Board about the trees that were cut down and the appropriate method of replacing them – nature or landscape.

Mr. Shalaby reported that the administration had made a convincing case for the urgency of additional parking expansion and roadway improvements at the University of Toronto at Scarborough. With four UTSC capital projects underway and a Centennial College Building nearing completion on a UTSC site, together with the significant growth in enrolment anticipated in 2003, it was evident that the project was needed and that the business plan could support it. He indicated the Business Board's concurrence with the proposed resolution of the Academic Board for approval in principle.

Dr. Nestor reported the concurrence of the University Affairs Board with the Project Planning Report. He noted that the proposed increase in parking rates was required to fund the parking facility.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED

to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation

THAT the Project Planning Report for the Expanded and Renovated Outer Parking Facilities at the University of Toronto at Scarborough, to allow for the provision of a total of 2399 parking spaces and Right of Way Improvements, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 116 of the Academic Board as Appendix "B", be approved in principle;

THAT the project cost of \$10,150,000 be approved, with the funding sources for the Outer Parking Facilities and the Right of Way Improvements to be as follows:

11. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council (cont'd)

**(a) Capital Project: University of Toronto at Scarborough, Parking Expansion and Renovation – Project Planning Report
UTSC Parking Ancillary: Fee Increases (cont'd)**

- For the Outer Parking Facilities,
- i) UTSC Parking Ancillary allocation of \$232,000
 - ii) Contribution identified with the Academic Resource Centre project of \$184,000
 - iii) Financing of a mortgage in the amount of \$7,797,953 to be repaid from the parking fee revenues over a 25 year amortization period at 8% per annum

- For the Right of Way Improvements,
- iv) Contribution from Centennial College for \$790,000 to support right-of-way improvements consistent with an agreement with Centennial College,
 - v) Contribution from UTSC of \$1,110,000 derived from the funds received from the Centennial College SuperBuild Lease Agreement.

and

THAT, to meet the funding requirements of the Outer Parking Facility, approval be given to allow the University of Toronto at Scarborough parking ancillary to increase fees by 25% in each of 2003-04 and 2004-05 and by a minimum of 5% for each of 2005-06, 2006-07, and 2007-08, with the understanding that an increase of a higher percentage may be approved by the University Affairs Board on an annual basis, if needed to meet currently unforeseen circumstances.

(b) Policy for Compulsory Non-Academic Incidental Fees – Proposed Revisions
Arising from Report Number 112 of the University Affairs Board (January 21, 2003)

Dr. Nestor informed members that the proposed revisions would better align incidental fees with the new academic definitions of part-time and full-time students being put into place by the divisions.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED

to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation

THAT the amendments to the Policy for Compulsory Non-Academic Incidental Fees as outlined in the January 10 proposal included in Appendix “B” attached to Report Number 112 of the University Affairs Board, be approved, to be effective 1 May 2003.

12. Assistant Vice-President, Human Resources: Establishment of Position

At the invitation of the Chair, Professor Hildyard explained that the creation of the position of Assistant Vice-President, Human Resources, was necessary to attract candidates with the appropriate level of expertise and credibility to the position. The change could take place within the existing resource base of the Vice-President, Human Resources.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED

to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation

THAT the creation of the position of Assistant Vice-President, Human Resources be approved effective April 1, 2003.

13. Proposed Property Transaction

The Chair outlined to members the possible procedural options for consideration of the proposed property transaction prior to the meeting of the Governing Council on February 14, 2003:

- Follow standard procedure and call special meetings of all appropriate Boards and Committees;
- Have joint meeting of Planning and Budget Committee and Business Board;
- Expedite consideration with recommendation from Executive Committee directly to the Governing Council.

After a full discussion, it was agreed that the matter would be considered by the Business Board at a special meeting. Since no resource allocations would be made at this time, a meeting of the Planning and Budget Committee was not necessary. It was agreed that a substantial block of time would be set aside at the Governing Council for a complete discussion of this proposed transaction.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

to the Governing Council for consideration

THAT, notwithstanding the terms of reference of the Governing Council Boards and Committees, the Governing Council consider the proposed property transaction on the basis of the recommendations of the Business Board arising from the special meeting held on February 11, 2003.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

THAT pursuant to Section 70 (k) of By-Law Number 2, consideration of this item by the Governing Council begin in the Committee of the Whole *in camera*.

14. Performance Measures for Governance

Information concerning the participation of members at the December 12, 2002 meeting of the Governing Council was distributed, and comments were invited.

It was suggested that meetings would be more efficient if procedural concerns and motions were raised in advance and circulated prior to the meeting. A member asked if the quality of interventions, as well as the quantity, could be measured, in order to differentiate between interventions that did not move the business of Council forward and those that had been well thought out and contributed positively to discussion.

The Chair encouraged members to think of their own performance as an initial step to peer review of governors by governors.

15. Participation in Meetings via Audio or Video Conferencing

Discussion of this item was deferred to the next meeting.

16. Reports for Information

Members received for information the following reports:

- Report Number 116 of the Academic Board (January 16, 2003)
- Report Number 122 of the Business Board (January 20, 2003)
- Report Number 112 of the University Affairs Board (January 21, 2003)

17. Date of the Next Meeting

The Chair reminded members that the next regular meeting of the Executive Committee was scheduled for Monday, March 24, 2003 at 5:00 p.m. He advised members that a special meeting of the Executive Committee might be necessary immediately prior to the meeting of the Governing Council to consider an additional senior appointment.

18. Other Business

(a) Date of April Meeting of Executive

The Chair noted that members had been canvassed as to their availability on an alternative date to April 21, 2003. As more members were available on April 21 than on the alternative date, the Chair confirmed April 21, 2003 as the Executive Meeting date.

(b) Request for Non-member to Address the Governing Council

The Chair informed members that two speaking requests had been received. One concerned a matter that was not on the February 14 agenda of the Governing Council, but would be coming forward later in the spring. The group making the request would be advised of the dates of the Board/Committee meetings at which the matter was being discussed. The other request concerned a property matter. It was the advice of the Executive Committee that this speaking request not be granted.

18. Other Business (cont'd)

(b) Request for Non-member to Address the Governing Council (cont'd)

A member requested that Mr. Jason Price, Vice-President of the Graduate Students' Association at OISE/UT, address the February 14, 2003 meeting of the Governing Council on the topics of First Nations, equity, diversity and tuition. The Chair suggested that this speaker could be invited to speak for three minutes under Other Business.

A member suggested that the approved *Procedures for Non-Members to Address Governing Council, its Boards and Committees* be revisited. A member spoke in support of the approved procedures. A member suggested that this matter be discussed at the next meeting of the Executive Committee. To prepare for this discussion, she requested that information on the current policy, practice and criteria for approving speaking requests be circulated to members of the Executive Committee prior to the next meeting, and that members write to the Chair in advance of the meeting outlining their concerns and suggestions.

The meeting adjourned at 8:10 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

February 13, 2003