

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

Thursday, February 10, 2005

MINUTES OF THE GOVERNING COUNCIL meeting held on Thursday,
February 10, 2005 at 4:30 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall.

Present:

Ms Rose M. Patten (In the Chair)
The Honourable Frank Iacobucci, Interim
President
Ms Holly Andrews-Taylor
Professor Mary Beattie
Dr. Robert M. Bennett
Dr. John R. G. Challis
Professor Brian Corman
Professor W. Raymond Cummins
Dr. Claude S. Davis
Dr. Alice Dong
Ms Susan Eng
Dr. Shari Graham Fell
Professor Vivek Goel
Dr. Gerald Halbert
Ms Shaila R. Kibria
Dr. Joel A. Kirsh
Ms Françoise Dulcinea Ko
Mr. Ari David Kopolovic
Professor Michael R. Marrus

Professor Ian R. McDonald
Mr. Stefan A. Neata
Ms Jacqueline C. Orange
Mr. Timothy Reid
Ms Marvi H. Ricker
Professor Arthur S. Ripstein
Professor Barbara Sherwood Lollar
Mr. Stephen C. Smith
Miss Maureen J. Somerville
Ms Oriel Varga
Mr. Robert S. Weiss

Mr. Louis R. Charpentier,
Secretary of the Governing Council

Secretariat:

Mr. Neil Dobbs
Ms Cristina Oke

Absent:

Professor Philip H. Byer
Professor Pamela Catton
Mr. Shaun Chen
Mr. P.C. Choo
Mr. Brian Davis
The Honourable William G. Davis
Dr. Paul V. Godfrey
Mr. Joseph Mapa
Mr. George E. Myhal

Dr. John P. Nestor
Mr. Richard Nunn
Mr. John F. (Jack) Petch
The Honourable David R. Peterson
Mr. Andrew Pinto
The Honourable Vivienne Poy
Professor Jake J. Thiessen
Professor John Wedge
Mr. W. David Wilson

In Attendance:

Professor Angela Hildyard, Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity
Ms Catherine Riggall, Vice-President, Business Affairs
Professor Kwong-loi Shun, Vice-President and Principal, University of Toronto at
Scarborough
Professor Carolyn Tuohy, Vice-President, Government and Institutional Relations

In Attendance (cont'd):

33160

Professor Rona Abramovich, Director, Transitional Year Program and Provost's Adviser on Outreach and Access
Mr. John Bisanti, Chief Capital Projects Officer
Ms Sheila Brown, Chief Financial Officer
Mr. Andrew Drummond, Assistant Secretary of the Governing Council
Ms Sheree Drummond, Assistant Provost
Professor David Farrar, Deputy Provost and Vice-Provost, Students
Dr. Beata Fitzpatrick, Assistant Vice-President and Director, Office of the President
Ms Rivi Frankle, Assistant Vice-President, University Advancement
Ms Connie Guberman, Status of Women Officer
Professor Edith Hillan, Vice-Provost, Academic
Ms Helen Lasthiotakis, Director, Policy and Planning, Office of the Vice-President and Provost
Ms Bryn MacPherson-White, Director of University Events and Presidential Liaison (Advancement)
Ms Margaret McKone, Administrative Manager, Office of the Governing Council
Mr. Mahadeo Sukhai, President, Graduate Students' Union
Mr. Ron Swail, Assistant Vice-President, Facilities and Services
Mr. Howard Tam, Vice-President, University Affairs, Students' Administrative Council
Professor Ronald Venter, Vice-Provost, Space and Facilities Planning
Professor Safwat Zaky, Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget

THE MEETING BEGAN IN CAMERA.

1. Senior Appointments

(a) Chief Financial Officer

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT Ms Sheila Brown be appointed to the position of Chief Financial Officer, effective February 10, 2005.

(b) Assistant Vice-President, Facilities and Services

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT Mr. Ron Swail be appointed to the position of Assistant Vice-President, Facilities and Services, effective February 10, 2005.

2. Chair's Remarks

(a) Welcome and Congratulations

The Chair welcomed members and guests to the meeting. She congratulated Professor Cummins, Professor Marrus, and Professor Ripstein on their acclamations to another term on the Governing Council. She also congratulated Mr. Mahadeo Sukhai on his acclamation to the Governing Council for a one-year term beginning July 1, 2005.

2. Chair's Remarks (cont'd)

(b) Resolutions approved by Council during *in camera* session

The Chair announced that Ms Sheila Brown had been appointed as Chief Financial Officer, effective February 10, 2005, and that Mr. Ron Swail had been appointed as Assistant Vice-President, Facilities and Services, effective February 10, 2005.

(c) Update on Presidential Search

The Chair drew the attention of members to the update on the Presidential Search which was included on pages 3 and 4 of Report 384 of the Executive Committee (January 27, 2005).¹ The Chair reminded members that a memorandum had been distributed earlier in the week that included information about the Call for Nominations and the next steps of the Committee's work. Members were invited to raise any questions they had concerning the Presidential Search under Other Business.

(d) Speaking Request

The Chair informed members that the speaking request made by Mr. Mahadeo Sukhai, President of the Graduate Students' Union, had been granted.

(e) Audio web-cast

The Chair reminded members that the meeting was being broadcast on the web. She asked senior administrators and non-members, who were invited to speak during the meeting, to use a standing microphone so that their comments could be heard by those listening to the audio web cast.

3. Minutes of the Previous Meeting

The Chair noted that one amendment had been brought to the attention of the secretary – Dr. Alice Dong was incorrectly reported as being absent from the meeting. The minutes of the meeting held on December 16, 2004 were approved as amended.

4. Business Arising from the Minutes of the Previous Meetings

There was one item of business arising. A member had requested a private response to her question of the process for a member of the Governing Council to review contracts entered into by the University. The Secretary had sent a written response to the member.

A member repeated her concern that, in her view, debate on the research conducted in the Centre for Biological Timing and Cognition had been shut down. This was of concern to the member because she believed that the University did not have specific policies for conducting research in aboriginal communities. The Chair noted that the Capital Project for the Centre for Biological Timing and Cognition had been approved at the Governing Council meeting of December 16, 2004, and was therefore not a matter of business arising.

5. Report of the President

¹ Report Number 384 of the Executive Committee (January 27, 2005) is available at: <http://www.utoronto.ca/govcncl/bac/details/ex/2004-05/exr20050127.pdf>

(a) President-elect of Ryerson University

The President announced the recent appointment of Dr. Sheldon Levy as President of Ryerson University effective August 1, 2005, and, on behalf of the University of Toronto, wished Dr. Levy every success in his new position.

(b) Honorary Degree Recipients

The President informed members that the following individuals had accepted the University's offer of an Honorary Degree: Dr. Peter George, Mr. J. Douglas Grant, Ms Ruth Grant, Dr. Michael Jensen, Dr. Charles Kuen Kao, The Hon. Mr. Justice John (Jack) Major, Dr. Heather Munroe-Bloom, Dr. Joseph Rykwert, Dr. Adel Sedra and Dr. Richard Splane.

(c) Ontario – A Leader in Learning: Postsecondary Review Report (Rae Report) and Recommendations²

The President recalled that the Rae Report had been released on February 7, 2005. The University was pleased with the response of the Honourable Bob Rae and of the Postsecondary Review Panel. The Panel had questioned, listened and responded in a very balanced and comprehensive way. The President noted that the Rae Report was integrated and coherent. At a recent pre-budget consultation called by Finance Minister Sobara, the President and Professor Tuohy had advised that the recommendations of the Rae Report should be implemented in their entirety, or the report's coherence and integrity would be lost.

The President thanked members of the Council for their input into the University's submission. He believed that the Rae Report reflected a lot of the points made by the University in its submission. He referred to the positive influence on the Rae Report of the conference on *Taking Public Universities Seriously* that had been hosted by the University in December 2004.

The President described the challenges facing the University following the public release of the Rae Report. The University had to ensure that every effort was made to persuade the government to accept the Report in its entirety. The work of the Rae Advocacy Task Force would respond to that challenge. In the days ahead, the President and the senior team would be analyzing the report in detail.

The President highlighted the key recommendations of the Rae Report.

- increased provincial operating funding for the system of \$1.3 billion by 2007-08;
- increased attention to student assistance with an investment of \$300 million;
- increased enrolment at the graduate level, in institutions that could demonstrate the necessary quality and capacity for student support;
- funding for new capital and for facilities renewal;
- continuation of the Ontario Student Opportunity Trust Fund (OSOTF);
- creation of a Council on Higher Education that co-ordinated best practices and provided research support on post-secondary education;

5. Report of the President (cont'd)

² *Ontario – A Leader in Learning* is available at <http://www.raereview.on.ca/en/report/default.asp?loc1=report>

(c) **Ontario – A Leader in Learning: Postsecondary Review Report (Rae Report) and Recommendations** (cont'd)

- greater involvement of the federal government; and
- more co-operation between institutions.

The President commented that he believed that the Report's approach to tuition was balanced and constructive. The Report called for a major overhaul of student assistance and for increased funding as pre-conditions for institutional autonomy in setting tuition fees. The Report recommended that low-income and other special groups be targeted to receive 'tuition-free' university, and that legislation enshrine the principle that no academically-qualified student be denied access to university because of financial need, as stated in the University's *Policy on Student Financial Aid*.³ These recommendations gave the University the opportunity to build on its existing policies to further enhance accessibility and affordability.

The President concluded his report by calling on members to help the academic leadership of the University convince the government to implement the Rae Report in its entirety for the good of the Province, and to ensure that post-secondary education was a priority in the 2005 budget.

Professor Cummins thanked the President for the leadership demonstrated by the University in response to the Rae Review. A member commented that, in her view, the Review Panel had not listened to students, and had proposed a cumbersome bureaucratic system for student financial aid. Another member emphasized the importance of becoming advocates and persuading members of the general public to support increased investment in post-secondary education.

6. Policy for Assessment and Review of Academic Programs and Units

Professor Cummins explained that the proposed Policy incorporated and replaced the *Accountability Framework* that had been approved by the Executive Committee in June 1999, and Section III of the *Guidelines for Divisional Submissions* that had been approved by the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs on October 23, 2002.

Members of the Academic Board had been informed that this Policy had been approved unanimously by the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs. A Board member suggested that an evaluation of student life be included as an element of a unit's self-study.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT the Policy for Assessment and Review of Academic Programs and Units, a copy of which is attached to Report 132 of the Academic Board as Appendix "A", be approved effective for proposals submitted as of September, 2005 and for reviews that will be conducted after September, 2005, be approved.

7. Policy on Crisis Preparedness and Response

³ <http://www.utoronto.ca/govcncl/pap/policies/stufinan.html>

Dr. Bennett informed members that the proposed Policy on Crisis Preparedness and Response would empower the Crisis Manager, appointed by the President, with full authority to make and implement decisions in crisis situations. The Policy established priorities in responding to crises: the safety of people, the limiting or containing of damage, the assurance of clear communication, and the restoration of academic and research operations. The Crisis Manager, who was Professor Hildyard, would establish response teams with the expertise and authority needed to deal with each situation. All University divisions would be required to prepare emergency and business-continuity plans.

Ms Jacqueline Orange reminded members that the Business Board was responsible for safety matters as well as personnel policy for administrative staff. The Board had received a very helpful presentation from Professor Hildyard, and it had had a full discussion. The Board had been assured that in a crisis situation, the Crisis Manager would be required, in her decision-making, to consider the *Statement of Institutional Purpose*, the *Statement on Freedom of Speech*, the *Statement on Human Rights*, and other policies protecting human rights.

The Board had also been assured that there would be ample training in crisis response including, if appropriate, simulations of potential crisis situations. The Business Board therefore concurred with this recommendation.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT the proposed Policy on Crisis Preparedness and Response, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 125 of the University Affairs Board as Appendix "A", be approved.

8. School of Graduate Studies: Proposed In-Program Master of Philosophy (M.Phil) Degree

Professor Cummins reported that members of the Academic Board had been informed of the lengthy discussion at the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs, and of the fact that Committee members had been divided on this proposal. The President of the Graduate Students' Union had spoken in support of the proposal at both the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs and Academic Board meetings. There had been a full discussion at the Board, with members expressing a variety of views. The motion had passed by a substantial majority.

At the invitation of the Chair, Mr. Mahadeo Sukhai, President of the Graduate Students' Union (GSU), stated that the GSU supported the proposal for the in-program Master of Philosophy degree. He noted that the GSU Council's discussion and subsequent endorsement of the proposal, had been included in the agenda package, along with the documentation that had been presented by the GSU to the Academic Board. Mr. Sukhai highlighted two additional points in favour of the proposal.

In the opinion of the GSU, the M.Phil. degree would greatly enhance the quality of the graduate academic experience in those departments and programs that offered it, by providing an additional milestone within the program and serving to increase the late-stage "structure" of the doctoral program.

8. School of Graduate Studies: Proposed In-Program Master of Philosophy (M.Phil) Degree (cont'd)

The M.Phil. would not lessen the meaning of the current doctoral-stream research Master's degrees. The M.Phil. was a different degree, with different degree requirements, awarded in recognition of a different set of work than a research Master's. The M.Phil. would be awarded to all doctoral students in a program, regardless of whether they had a research Master's or not. There were currently large numbers of Ph.D. students who already had a Master's, who would welcome the M.Phil. and would not consider it lessening their previous education. Given the complexity of the graduate programs at the University, there could never be a "one-size-fits-all" approach to the M.Phil. – and the GSU's view was that there should not be. The implementation of the M.Phil. would vary among departments and programs as was now true of Ph.D. degree requirements at the University. The M.Phil. could therefore be tailored to match its corresponding Ph.D. program.

Mr. Sukhai noted that the discussion at Academic Board had touched on the concerns about how the M.Phil. could be mishandled to the detriment of students. The GSU acknowledged that possibility, but also accepted the challenge, as students, to ensure that it was implemented well, and in a beneficial manner.

A member stated that, in his view, approval of this degree would rank among the major accomplishments of governance this year. Another member thanked the University for listening to graduate students.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT the proposal from the School of Graduate Studies for an In-Program Master of Philosophy Degree, a copy of which is attached to Report 132 of the Academic Board as Appendix "B", be approved.

9. Capital Plan: November 2004 to December 2010

Professor Cummins informed members that the Provost had summarized the Capital Plan in a Powerpoint presentation to the Academic Board. He had explained that there were four categories of projects:

- i) those that had been approved and/or completed as part of the current Capital Plan;
- ii) those that were ready to proceed, and were included in the Short-term Capital Plan
- iii) projects that were in the planning stages, and were included in the Long-term Capital Plan beyond 2010;
- iv) all other projects.

A capital project would have to meet six criteria to be included in either the long-term or short-term capital plan:

- 1) Mission Objectives
- 2) Policy Objectives & Legislative Requirements
- 3) Space Standards
- 4) Strengthening Scholarship
- 5) Providing Academic Leadership
- 6) Student Experience

9. Capital Plan: November 2004 to December 2010 (cont'd)

To move from long-term to short-term status, projects would be evaluated on three additional criteria:

- 7) Economic Consistency
- 8) Resources
- 9) Deferred Maintenance

The Chair of the Planning and Budget Committee had reported that, after a lengthy discussion, the motion had been passed unanimously by the Committee. At the Academic Board, some questions had been raised concerning student space.⁴ The motion had passed by an overwhelming majority.

Ms Jacqueline Orange informed members that the Business Board had a strong interest in the financial context for capital projects and in the use of the University's borrowing capacity. Professor Goel had given the Board a complete presentation of the proposed Capital Plan. The Board had had a full, wide-ranging discussion of the plan, including questions about priority-setting for capital projects: research versus teaching, the sciences versus other areas of importance, and the question of priority for a student centre.

Ms Orange emphasized that it was important for the Business Board to be confident that proposals for individual projects were made in light not only of the benefits of each project, but also in the light of the opportunity cost for other projects that would not be possible in the context of financial and borrowing constraints. Ms Orange noted that, at every Board meeting for the past couple of years where there had been proposals for new projects, Professor Venter had provided an updated list of capital priorities. The Board was pleased that the new capital planning process was to be approved in an updated Capital Plan. The criteria for selection of projects was being made more explicit so that the analysis of trade-offs could be done more efficiently and the plans focus on the long term.

Professor Goel reminded members that each capital project would still come forward for approval.

A member expressed her concern about student space, and stated that she would like to revisit the recommendations of the Task Force on Student Activity Space. Another member commented that, on many occasions, students had identified the need for additional housing, activity space, athletic facilities and club space. She asked why no funding had been allocated in the Capital Plan for student space. Professor Goel replied that the Task Force on Student Activity Space had endorsed the concept of a multi-node approach to student space in its 1999 report. Professor Farrar had been asked to convene a group to review the Task Force's recommendations and the current inventory of space. Professor Goel also noted the study and activity space that had been added in recent capital projects such as the Sidney Smith in-fill and the Morrison Pavilion. He reminded members that the Varsity capital project was scheduled to be considered by the Planning and Budget Committee in April. The leadership of the University was willing to support a variety of funding models for capital projects; for example, students at the University of

9. Capital Plan: November 2004 to December 2010 (cont'd)

Toronto at Mississauga (UTM) and the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC) had agreed to levies to support the construction of student centers on those campuses.

⁴ Secretary's Note: At the Academic Board meeting, Professor Goel had replied that many completed and planned capital projects included significant new student space.

A member suggested that, although student levies were in effect at UTM and UTSC, a student levy was not necessarily appropriate for the St. George campus.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

1. THAT the University of Toronto Criteria for the Selection of Capital Projects as defined in Section 2 of the Capital Plan, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 132 of the Academic Board as Appendix "C", be approved, superceding the Report entitled December 2001 – Capital Plan for Buildings and Projects in Excess of \$2 million approved by the Governing Council on February 14, 2002.
2. THAT an updated Capital Projects List as described in Section 4 of the Capital Plan be tabled at the appropriate Governing Council Board or Committee meeting at which approval is sought, pursuant to the Policy on Capital Planning and Capital Projects, for a capital project.

10. Capital Project: University of Toronto at Scarborough - Electrical and Mechanical Upgrades Phase 3: Cooling Towers: Project Planning Report

Professor Cummins reported that members of the Academic Board had been informed that the upgrading of the cooling towers had provided an opportunity to bring together all the aspects of the infrastructure upgrades at the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC). No questions had been raised at the Board.

A member asked whether it was appropriate for UTSC operating funds to pay for a capital project. Professor Goel replied that the funds being used for this project were from the division's funds carried forward from previous years. A member noted that this particular project was part of a \$17 million infrastructure upgrade, and asked what controls were in place to make sure that projects were not disaggregated to circumvent governance approval. Ms Riggall replied that the projects could not all be undertaken at the same time. Professor Goel added that projects approved by the Accommodations and Facilities Directorate (AFD) were reported annually to the Planning and Budget Committee.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

1. THAT the Project Planning Report for the Electrical and Mechanical Infrastructure Upgrades at the University of Toronto at Scarborough, Phase 3 Mechanical: Cooling Towers, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 132 of the Academic Board as Appendix "D", be approved in principle.

10. Capital Project: University of Toronto at Scarborough - Electrical and Mechanical Upgrades Phase 3: Cooling Towers: Project Planning Report (cont'd)

2. THAT the project scope, consisting of the replacement of the existing cooling towers by new units and appropriately designed screens, be approved at an estimated total project cost of \$2,515,000 to be funded from the following sources:
 - i) A cash contribution in the amount of \$1,218,166 from the 2004-05 operating budget of the UTSC.
 - ii) A cash contribution in the amount of \$500,000 from the 2005-06 operating budget of the UTSC.
 - iii) Deferred Maintenance Funds allocation to UTSC in 2005-06 in the amount of \$596,834.
 - iv) Facilities Renewal Program allocation 2005-06 in the amount of \$200,000.

11. Academic Initiatives Fund (AIF): Allocations

Professor Cummins commented that members of the Academic Board had been informed that the allocation decisions had been based on advice from a Review Committee, which had included Principals, Deans, Vice-Presidents and Vice-Provosts. Concerns had been raised at both the Planning and Budget Committee and at the Board about the use of AIF allocations for debt relief.⁵ The motion had been passed by an overwhelming majority of Academic Board members.

A member echoed concerns about AIF funds being used for debt relief, and suggested the funds should be used for innovative and creative projects. A member replied that newly-constructed buildings were housing innovative academic programs. Professor Goel added that proposals related to capital were being considered in the first few years. In later years, divisions could have additional funds to support programs. A member noted that, at the Planning and Budget Committee, the point had been made that using AIF funds for internal mortgages freed other funds to be used for academic programs.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT the First Round of Academic Initiative Funds, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 132 of the Academic Board as Appendix "E", be allocated as per the table (Appendices 3 and 4) attached to the Memorandum from the Vice-President and Provost dated November 30 for December 7, 2004.

12. Canada Research Chairs Fund: Allocations

Professor Cummins explained that members of the Academic Board had been informed that this allocation was a routine annual item. No questions had been raised at the Board.

⁵ Secretary's Note: At both the Planning and Budget Committee and the Academic Board meetings, Professor Goel had explained that it had been the decision of the division to ask for capital support rather than for program support.

12. Canada Research Chairs Fund: Allocations (cont'd)

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT \$3.8m be allocated from the Canada Research Chair Fund to cover salaries, benefits, research allowances and cluster support for the nineteen Chairholders approved during the 2003 competitions.

THAT \$1.24m (\$1.4m less \$.16m indirect cost of 16% of salaries and benefits) be allocated to the Faculty of Medicine in support of nine campus-based Chairholders that were awarded in 2004.

THAT \$1.627m (\$1.7m less \$72,857 indirect cost of 6% of salaries and benefits) be allocated to the Faculty of Medicine in support of the twelve Chairholders based in Hospital and Research Institutes that were awarded in 2004.

13. College of Electors – Constitution – Revisions

Dr. Bennett reported that this proposal had arisen from the work of a Special Committee of the Executive Committee. As most members were aware, the College of Electors was an assembly of alumni, elected by the alumni associations of the various divisions. The College, acting on behalf of the alumni, elected the Chancellor and the alumni members of Governing Council.

The proposed changes to the Constitution dealt primarily with the process for electing the Chancellor. The College's expanded Executive Committee would be called a Search Committee for Chancellor, and it would act in the same manner as other senior search committees in the University. The Search Committee would secure the consent of the nominee before bringing the name forward to the full College. Dr. Bennett noted that a Chancellor was permitted, under the *University of Toronto Act*, to serve a maximum of two three-year terms. The Constitution now included a section outlining the process for the re-election of a Chancellor which included a review process. The revised Constitution also included some routine updating of divisional names and titles..

Dr. Bennett reminded members that the Special Committee of the Executive Committee had made other recommendations concerning the College of Electors. The University Affairs Board had been told that the recommendation to revise the composition of the College of Electors had been deferred. Other recommendations did not require constitutional amendments and would be implemented by the Chair of the College. Dr. Bennett expressed his personal pleasure with the wisdom of the decisions.

A member asked whether the process for the re-election of a Chancellor would include a call for nominations. Mr. Charpentier replied that it would.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT the proposed amendments to the Constitution of the College of Electors, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 125 of the University Affairs Board as Appendix "B", be approved.

14. University Program Review Audit Committee (UPRAC): Report of the Auditors

The Chair reminded members that this item was for information only. Members had received a copy of the University Program Review Audit Committee (UPRAC): Report of the Auditors. The record of the Executive Committee's discussion of the Review Summary was on page 11 of Report 384. Discussion of the Review Summary was also included in Report Number 111 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs⁶ and Report 116 of the Agenda Committee⁷, both of which had been distributed to members. There were no questions.

15. Reports for Information

Members received the following reports for information:

- (a) Report Number 132 of the Academic Board
- (b) Report Number 125 of the University Affairs Board
- (c) Draft Excerpt of Report Number 138 of the Business Board
- (d) Report Number 384 of the Executive Committee

16. Date of the Next Meeting

The Chair reminded members that the next regular meeting of the Governing Council was scheduled for Wednesday, March 30, 2005 at 4:30 p.m.

17. Question Period

A member referred to a situation at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto (OISE/UT) concerning a research partnership with a company that was involved with military research. Professor Goel replied that the research project being undertaken by the Institute for Knowledge Innovation and Technology (IKIT) would involve research using OISE/UT-developed multimedia software called Knowledge Forum. The project was being funded by an Initiative on the New Economy (INE) collaborative research grant from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC). Atlantis – a Canadian engineering firm specializing in simulation-based training – was one of several proposed collaborative partners on the project. A number of false statements had been made concerning this research project. A statement had been issued by the Provost and by the Vice-President, Research and Associate Provost concerning the IKIT Research.⁸

A member asked for an update on an allegation of racism that had been made by a former member of the Governing Council. The Chair replied that the question was not appropriate for governance, and any questions should be directed to the administration outside of the meeting.

⁶ This Report is available at: <http://www.utoronto.ca/govcncl/bac/details/ap/2004-05/apr20041208.pdf>

⁷ This Report is available at: <http://www.utoronto.ca/govcncl/bac/details/ac/2004-05/acr20041216.pdf>

⁸ see http://edu.oise.utoronto.ca/documents/IKIT_Research_Statement.pdf

18. Other Business**(a) Capital Project: Centre for Health Improvement and System Performance (CHISP),
155 College Street**

The Chair informed members that she and the President had consulted on the need for a special meeting of the Governing Council in the week of February 21, 2005. The purpose of this meeting was to deal with a Capital Project – 155 College Street – which was currently making its way through governance.

The President explained that there was an urgent need to secure formal Governing Council approval for the Capital Project – 155 College Street Renovation. Business Board had approved the full expenditure on January 17, 2005, subject to the approval by Planning & Budget, Academic Board and Governing Council. Planning & Budget had approved the project on January 25, 2005. The schedule of the regular approval cycle would require Academic Board approval on February 21, 2005 followed by Governing Council on March 30, 2005. However, to complete the building for the required September 1, 2005 occupancy required that the mechanical and electrical infrastructure contracts, which were significant components of the 155 College Street Renovation, be signed by February 25, 2005. Failure to put these agreements in place would most certainly mean that the project could not be completed by September 2005. The building was needed to house the Faculty of Nursing and two departments of the Faculty of Medicine.

The revised cost of the project was \$28 million; Business Board had already approved a total of \$7.3 million of the required \$28 million that had enabled the revised price to be established. The revised pricing, which followed an in-depth investigation of the state of the infrastructure at 155 College Street had only recently become available.

The President thanked members of the Council for their understanding of the need to schedule a special meeting to deal with this approval. The Chair indicated that the date of the special meeting would be communicated to them as soon as possible.

The meeting adjourned at 5:55 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

March 3, 2005