

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

Thursday, December 16, 2004

MINUTES OF THE GOVERNING COUNCIL meeting held on Thursday,
December 16, 2004 at 4:30 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall.

Present:

Ms Rose M. Patten (In the Chair)
Mr. John F. (Jack) Petch (Vice-Chair)
The Honourable Frank Iacobucci, Interim
President
Ms Holly Andrews-Taylor
Professor Mary Beattie
Dr. Robert M. Bennett
Professor Philip H. Byer
Professor Pamela Catton
Dr. John R. G. Challis
Mr. P.C. Choo
Professor Brian Corman
Professor W. Raymond Cummins
Mr. Brian Davis
Dr. Claude S. Davis
Ms Susan Eng
Dr. Shari Graham Fell
Professor Vivek Goel
Dr. Gerald Halbert
Ms Shaila R. Kibria
Dr. Joel A. Kirsh
Mr. Ari David Kopolovic
Mr. Joseph Mapa
Professor Michael R. Marrus

Mr. Stefan A. Neata
Dr. John P. Nestor
Ms Jacqueline C. Orange
The Honourable David R. Peterson
Mr. Andrew Pinto
Mr. Timothy Reid
Ms Marvi H. Ricker
Professor Arthur S. Ripstein
Professor Barbara Sherwood Lollar
Mr. Stephen C. Smith
Miss Maureen J. Somerville
Professor Jake J. Thiessen
Ms Oriel Varga
Professor John Wedge

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

Secretariat:

Mr. Neil Dobbs
Ms Cristina Oke

Absent:

Mr. Shaun Chen
The Honourable William G. Davis
Dr. Alice Dong
Dr. Paul V. Godfrey
Ms Françoise Dulcinea Ko

Professor Ian R. McDonald
Mr. George E. Myhal
Mr. Richard Nunn
The Honourable Vivienne Poy
Mr. Robert S. Weiss
Mr. W. David Wilson

In Attendance:

Dr. Jon Dellandrea, Vice-President and Chief Advancement Officer
Professor Angela Hildyard, Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity
Ms Catherine Riggall, Vice-President, Business Affairs
Professor Carolyn Tuohy, Vice-President, Government and Institutional Relation

In Attendance (cont'd):

Dr. Paul Dorian, President, St., Michael's Hospital Medical Staff Association, and President, Clinical Teachers' Association of Toronto
Mr. Andrew Drummond, Assistant Secretary of the Governing Council
Ms Sheree Drummond, Assistant Provost
Professor David Farrar, Deputy Provost and Vice-Provost, Students
Ms Liz Finney, Director of Government Liaison
Dr. Beata Fitzpatrick, Assistant Vice-President and Director, Office of the President
Professor Avrum Gotlieb, Chair, Planning and Budget Committee, and Chair, Department of Laboratory Medicine and Pathobiology, Faculty of Medicine
Professor Edith Hillan, Vice-Provost, Academic
Professor George Luste, President, University of Toronto Faculty Association
Ms Bryn MacPherson-White, Director of University Events and Presidential Liaison (Advancement)
Ms Margaret McKone, Administrative Manager, Office of the Governing Council
Professor David Naylor, Vice-Provost, Relations with Health Care Facilities and Dean, Faculty of Medicine
Ms Christina Sass-Kortsak, Assistant Vice-President, Human Resources
Mr. Mahadeo Sukhai, President, Graduate Students' Union
Mr. Howard Tam, Vice-President, University Affairs, Students' Administrative Council
Ms Riki Turofsky, Vice-Chair, College of Electors
Professor Ronald Venter, Vice-Provost, Space and Facilities Planning
Ms Mary Ward, University Ombudsperson
Professor Safwat Zaky, Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget

THE MEETING BEGAN *IN CAMERA*.

1. Report of the Committee for Honorary Degrees

It was RESOLVED

THAT the recommendations contained in Report Number 47 of the Committee for Honorary Degrees be approved; and

THAT the Chancellor and the President be empowered to determine the degree to be conferred on each candidate and the date of the conferral.

The Chair reminded members that nominees' names and the discussion of nominations was strictly confidential. When all individuals had responded to their offers, the President would report to the Governing Council. Following that report, a public announcement would be made.

2. Chair's Remarks

(a) Welcome

The Chair welcomed members and guests to the meeting.

(b) Audio web-cast

The Chair reminded members that the meeting was being broadcast on the web. She asked any guests 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 Meetings

The minutes of the meetings held on November 1, 2004 and November 29, 2004 were approved.

4. Business Arising from the Minutes of the Previous Meetings

There was no business arising from either meeting.

5. Report of the President

(a) Update on the Postsecondary Review (Rae Review)

The President informed members that a good deal of his time since the previous meeting of the Governing Council had been spent on matters related to the Postsecondary Review (Rae Review). Based on the principles and directions that had been accepted and reaffirmed by the Council, the University had finalized and relayed to the Rae Review its submission entitled "The Choice for A Generation". Copies of the full submission as well as copies of brochures containing a synopsis of the submission had been circulated to members. The University had received very positive comments about its submission.

The President noted that, as requested by the Rae Review, members of the University community had been identified to participate in three Rae Round-Tables, one in each of the East, West and central Greater Toronto Area (GTA). Many members of the University had also participated in Town Halls organized by the Rae Review.

The Report of the Rae Review was expected to be submitted to the Premier and the Minister of Colleges, Training and Universities in early to mid February 2005.

(b) Academic Symposium: 'Taking Public Universities Seriously'

The President described the academic symposium on issues related to post-secondary education in industrialized democracies, entitled "Taking Public Universities Seriously", which had been one of the University's key activities around the Rae Review. The symposium, which had taken place December 3 and 4, 2004, at the Munk Centre, had included international scholars from Australia, England and the United States, as well as many of the University's faculty, bringing their research to bear on some of the issues that were being faced by the Rae Review. The Honourable Bob Rae had attended some parts of the conference, as had members of his Review panel. The University had received very positive reports about the excitement generated by the conference. The conference papers would be posted on the web, and would be published by the University of Toronto Press. The President observed that the symposium had been an excellent example of the University contributing its research in the aid of solving important problems.

A member expressed his thanks for the December symposium, and noted that participants had been intrigued by the University's governance system. Another member noted that, since attendance at the symposium had been by invitation only, some students who had wanted to attend had not been able to do so. It was the member's view that there had been few dissenting views expressed at the symposium, particularly with respect to income-contingent loan schemes. The President replied that he had heard a number of divergent views expressed at the symposium by the participants, who were broadly-representative and included students. He also expressed his disappointment with the behaviour of some national student leaders with respect to the symposium. A member suggested that, in future, student leaders would be willing to work with the President's office in organizing such events.

5. Report of the President (cont'd)

(c) Task Force on Rae Advocacy

The President explained that the University's main task now was to focus intensely on advocacy to ensure that the Government, in its next budget, listened to the Honourable Bob Rae's message that universities were at a critical turning point and must not be allowed to slide into decline.

The President announced that he had set up a Task Force on Rae Advocacy. The President, Vice-President, Government and Institutional Relations, and the Vice-President and Provost would serve as its executive. The Task Force included members of the senior administration in addition to a number of Deans.

The Task Force would develop and refine the specific policy proposals that would inform the University's advocacy to the Government. It would also consider developing a strategy for political advocacy, particularly to help shape opinion in support of the University's objectives.

The President indicated that the University needed to maximize its efforts to raise public awareness through a variety of media and fora in the period between now and the spring budget. He noted that he would be devoting his energies to promoting the University's agenda, and he encouraged members to continue to be ambassadors for the University in making its case for better support of post-secondary education.

(d) Dr. Jon Dellandrea, Vice-President and Chief Advancement Officer

The President announced with regret that Dr. Jon Dellandrea, Vice President and Chief Advancement Officer, would be leaving the University of Toronto on June 30, 2005, to become Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Development and External Affairs) at the University of Oxford, effective October 1, 2005.

The President noted that Dr. Dellandrea had served the University of Toronto with passion, intensity and enormous success in his eleven years as Vice-President and Chief Advancement Officer. His history with the University of Toronto, as a student, staff member and most recently, as Vice President, was filled with accomplishment.

The President acknowledged that Dr. Dellandrea's skill and dedication, evident in the extraordinary success of the University's campaign that had raised more than \$1 billion for students, faculty and programs, would be missed, as would his sage advice and boundless enthusiasm. He was leaving the University of Toronto to join one of the world's leading universities; this was well-deserved recognition, but he would be greatly missed by all.

The President observed that one of Dr. Dellandrea's most important legacies to the University was the talented group of individuals, located on all three campuses, whom he had recruited, educated and inspired. Thanks to his leadership, the University of Toronto had one of the best and most professional advancement staffs to be found anywhere. Dr. Dellandrea had underscored the importance of advancement to the University's mission, and advancement would remain a high university priority for the University's leadership.

The President informed members that he would be playing a greater role with the University's major donors and with staff over the next six months. He would also be consulting with his senior colleagues with respect to seeking Dr. Dellandrea's replacement. While the appointment would be made by the new President, the process of seeking a successor should begin so that the new President could move quickly to make

5. Report of the President (cont'd)

(d) Dr. Jon Dellandrea, Vice-President and Chief Advancement Officer (cont'd)

an appointment to this very important position. President Iacobucci undertook to keep members informed.

The President indicated that the University would be planning appropriate recognition to thank and celebrate Dr. Dellandrea before he stepped down at the end of June.

The Chair, on behalf of the Governing Council, recognized the contributions that Dr. Dellandrea had made to the University, and wished him well in his new endeavours. On behalf of the Academic Board, Professor Cummins acknowledged the debt of gratitude owed to Dr. Dellandrea for advancing the academic mission of the University. On behalf of the Business Board, Ms Orange congratulated Dr. Dellandrea for his success in establishing donor contributions as an important revenue stream. She also commended the President's commitment to advancement.

A member commented that Dr. Dellandrea and his accomplishments would be remembered in the history of the University. Another member commented on the importance of Dr. Dellandrea's support of volunteers. A member recalled the support that Dr. Dellandrea had given to sports and athletics at the University.

Members and guests joined the President in recognizing Dr. Dellandrea's service to the University by means of applause.

(e) Holiday Greetings

The President expressed his appreciation for the kind welcome and generous support that members of Council had given him since his return to the University. He acknowledged the importance to the University of members' service as Governors, and he thanked members for volunteering their time to serve the University in this way. He wished members, and their family and friends, the very best for the holidays and for the New Year.

6. Ombudsperson: Annual Report and Administrative Response

The Chair welcomed Ms Mary Ward, University Ombudsperson, to the meeting. The Chair reminded members that the University Ombudsperson was responsible to the Governing Council. As part of this responsibility, she reported annually on her activities. Members had received both her Report and the response of the administration to the Report. The Chair invited Ms Ward to comment on her report.

Format and Structure of the Report

Ms Ward explained that the format of her report over the past several years had been a continuation of her predecessors' approaches, with tables and graphs to facilitate year-to-year statistical comparisons, and a response to two previous end-of-term Governing Council review committees' Reports. In 1998, the review committee had emphasized in its recommendations and amendments to the Terms of Reference for the Office that the Ombudsperson was to act as the final avenue of recourse for complaints on campus. It was the concern of the Review Committee that the Office's resources had been overly focused on more general information and referral queries that other resources within the University were better placed to address. In 2001, the review committee had concluded that, in addition to being the final avenue of recourse, it would be an effective use of the Office's resources to assist in early

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

resolution of individuals' concerns whenever possible, and the Terms of Reference were amended. In light of these amendments to the mandate and operations of the Office, Ms Ward anticipated that subsequent Annual Reports might be modified to have less focus on statistical reporting.

Caseload

Ms Ward noted that her caseload had increased in both size and complexity in the past year. In her view, this was a result of successful ongoing communication through materials such as academic calendars, posters, bookmarks, and the Office's web-site. The major focus of the Ombudsperson was on situations in which the Office was not the initial avenue of recourse. Many individuals approached the Office after having been referred by previous visitors to the Office, or by members of the University administration who were familiar with the mandate of the Ombudsperson. It remained an important ongoing challenge to maintain awareness among community members across all three campuses of the Office's existence, role and function.

New Issues

Ms Ward indicated that no major new trends had emerged from her caseload during the past year that warranted her bringing them to the attention of the Governing Council. She had reviewed her annual reports and the administrative responses over the past several years. In her view, the administrative response provided reasonable protocols and timelines for addressing the six recommendations included in the report.

Discussion

The President noted the importance of the service of the Office of the Ombudsperson to the University, and thanked Ms Ward for her report. A member congratulated the Ombudsperson and suggested that a copy of her report be forwarded to the Minister of Colleges, Training and Universities.

A member referred to the increase from 9 to 29 in cases related to fees and financial aid. Ms Ward replied that a number of students in a program with a Professional Experience Year option had been in touch with her office to seek assistance with a particular problem (described on page 7 of her report).

A member asked how much time the Ombudsperson spent on the Mississauga and Scarborough campuses. Ms Ward replied that she went to those campuses by appointment only. Some students from those campuses, for reasons of privacy, preferred to come to the Office of the Ombudsperson on the St. George campus.

7. Policy on Clinical Faculty

Professor Cummins explained that the Policy on Clinical Faculty had been discussed at length at the Academic Board and the Board's discussion was reflected in its Report Number 130 (<http://www.utoronto.ca/govcncl/bac/details/ab/2004-05/abr20041111.pdf>). Many members had voiced their strong support of the Policy and the accompanying Procedures Manual. One member had spoken against the motion. The motion had been passed by an overwhelming majority.

A member observed that there had been a great deal of discussion of this policy at the Academic Board. He recognized the importance of the policy. He had some concerns,

7. Policy on Clinical Faculty (cont'd)

but had been assured that the Guidelines provided flexibility with respect to the implementation of the policy.

A member noted that Report 130 of the Academic Board had reflected her comments in opposition to the policy. She was concerned that those who had needed protection with respect to academic freedom did not support the proposed policy.

At the invitation of the Chair, Professor George Luste, President of the University of Toronto Faculty Association (UTFA) commented on the proposed policy. He noted the difference in culture between the University and the teaching hospitals with respect to accountability, governance and funding. He explained that UTFA did not pretend to fully represent clinical faculty, but it had acted as a safety net for academic freedom. UTFA's concern was the protection of academic freedom for clinical faculty. In his view, the challenge was to demonstrate that the proposed procedures provided clinical faculty with protection of their academic freedom that was equivalent to that given to University faculty. Professor Luste stated that UTFA would not challenge the proposed policy with an association grievance, at this time, and wished the Dean of Medicine well in implementing the policy.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT the Policy on Clinical Faculty dated October 28, 2004, a copy of which is attached to Report 130 of the Academic Board as Appendix "A", be approved effective July 1, 2005.

Invited to speak, Professor Naylor acknowledged the work of Professor Dorian, Professor Goel and all their colleagues in developing the policy and guidelines. He expressed his appreciation to Professor Luste for the statesmanlike remarks that he had made. On behalf of the clinical faculty, Professor Naylor thanked members of the Council for approving the policy.

8. Capital Project: Centre for Biological Timing and Cognition - Project Planning Report

Professor Cummins commented that this project had been recommended by the Planning and Budget Committee and by Academic Board in November, subject to a review of the final Project Planning Report in December. The recommendation had been confirmed by the Planning and Budget Committee on December 7 and reported to the December 9 meeting of the Academic Board. He noted that the Interim Project Planning Report was attached to Report 130 of the Academic Board, while the final Project Planning Report was attached to Report 131 of the Academic Board.

Professor Cummins informed members that questions had been raised by a member of the Board concerning the research that would be conducted in the Centre. The member had been advised that individual research projects were not a matter for governance discussion or approval. Responses to the questions raised had been provided directly to the member by the administration.

8. Capital Project: Centre for Biological Timing and Cognition - Project Planning Report (cont'd)

Ms Orange reported that, subject to Governing Council approval of the motion, the Business Board had approved spending of \$1.5-million to allow for the appointment of the architects and consultants for the proposed Centre. The objective was to get the project underway expeditiously and to avoid any risk to the Government funding for the project. This facility was being built for a particular research area. The Business Board had been advised that the capital project would be funded by the Canada Foundation for Innovation and the Government of Ontario for between three and five years. The Chair of the Department of Psychology had assured the Business Board that ongoing operating support from such other sources as the Canada Institutes for Health Research would be sought for this long-term, important research.

A member stated that, at the Academic Board, she had raised questions about the connections between the proposed center and the northern aboriginal communities that would be a major focus of the Centre's research, and the communication between the researchers and those communities. In her view, the University should adopt a specific protocol for research conducted within aboriginal communities. She did not feel that the administration had answered the specific questions that she had raised.

Professor Cummins informed members that the Agenda Committee had reviewed the questions that had been raised by the member at the Academic Board meeting. Members of the Agenda Committee had reviewed the responses that had been provided to the member by the Secretary of the Governing Council and by the Acting Director of the Ethics Review Office and had agreed with the principles outlined in those responses. The Provost had noted that the Tri-Council Policy Statement: *Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans* included information about good practices in conducting research in aboriginal communities. The University's Ethics Office was responsible for ensuring that each research project complied with the principles of the Tri-Council Policy Statement.

The Agenda Committee had agreed that:

1. Discussion of the specifics of any research project was not appropriate at the Academic Board.
2. Questions regarding the policies and procedures under which research was conducted at the University of Toronto were an appropriate topic to be raised at the Board or Committee level.
3. Concerns about the policies and procedures which govern research at the University should be referred to the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs for consideration.

A member stressed that the item being considered was the approval of the capital project, not the research that would be conducted within the building.

A member asked for a report on the process for conducting ethical reviews to which members could refer. She was aware that the University had high standards. Professor Challis, Vice-President, Research, and Associate Provost, said that the Centre would house a University research team that had received a grant to conduct research on the impacts of biological timing, environmental cycles and work schedules on cognitive ability and mental health. The collaborative research project included the Nunavut Cognitive Assessment Facility in Iqaluit. The research to be carried out at the proposed University of Toronto facility would include cognitive studies on human subjects, cognitive studies on animal subjects, and the study of brain cells in vitro.

8. Capital Project: Centre for Biological Timing and Cognition - Project Planning Report (cont'd)

in animal subjects. It did not include any requirement for research involving aboriginal people. The research involving human subjects would deal with the general population.

Professor Goel commented that the general questions that had been raised were important. He referred to Section 6 of the Tri-Council Policy Statement: *Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans* that described good practices for conducting research with aboriginal peoples (<http://www.pre.ethics.gc.ca/english/menuAWM/.../policystatement/section6.cfm>). All faculty and graduate students who engaged in research involving aboriginal peoples were well aware of the issues raised by the member and would be guided by the Tri-Council policy and the forthcoming amendments to it. For any research having an impact on aboriginal people there would be appropriate consultation. Professor Goel stressed that it was not appropriate for the Governing Council to consider individual research projects. Its doing so could infringe upon academic freedom.

Two members observed that the University had a rigorous ethics review process for research, with appropriate policies and procedures in place. Ethical aspects of research should receive an informed principled review by experts. It was not the role of governance to review research that was being undertaken. The requirement for expert review was an essential protection both for research subjects and for academic freedom. The President commented that the University of Toronto had been a leader in developing ethical review procedures for research.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

1. THAT the Project Planning Report for the Centre for Biological Timing and Cognition at the University of Toronto, a copy of which is attached to Report 131 of the Academic Board as Appendix "A", be approved in principle.
2. THAT the project scope as identified in the Project Planning Report which requires the construction of additional floors on the south section of the Ramsay Wright Building be approved at a cost of \$13,161,000 from the following funding sources, with the following amounts¹:
 - i) A cash contribution in the amount of \$2,466,725 from the Faculty of Arts & Science,
 - ii) A contribution in the amount of \$5,347,137.50 awarded by the Canada Foundation for Innovation, and
 - iii) A contribution in the amount of \$5,347,137.50 awarded by the Ontario Innovation Trust and the Ministry of Economic Development and Trade.

9. Capital Project: Department of Mathematics, Phase 1 - Project Planning Report

Professor Cummins explained that this proposal had also been recommended by the Planning and Budget Committee and Academic Board in November, subject to a review of the final Project Planning Report in December. The approval had been confirmed by the Planning and Budget Committee on December 7 and reported to the December 9 meeting of the Academic Board. Again, the Interim Project Planning

9. Capital Project: Department of Mathematics, Phase 1 - Project Planning Report (cont'd)

Report was attached to Report 130 of the Academic Board, while the final Project Planning Report was attached to Report 131 of the Academic Board.

Ms Orange commented that it was also very important to get this project moving quickly. The Department of Economics would move into the proposed new Department of Mathematics space, while the Economics Building was being renovated in 2005-06. Subject to Governing Council approval of the motion, the Business Board had approved spending \$800,000 for the appointment of the architects and consultants.

A member noted that it would be helpful for Governing Council members to have information on the budgetary capacity of faculties and departments, and asked whether there was a limit on the amount of funds from a unit's operating budget that could be spent on capital projects. Professor Goel replied that, in this case, the funds were not being borrowed, but had been accumulated by the Faculty of Arts and Science. Professor Goel agreed that how much of an operating budget could be used for capital projects was an important consideration in decision making. He said that a revised Capital Plan would be coming to the Governing Council in February 2005.

A member commended the careful phasing of the project and its resulting relief of the pressure on Sidney Smith Hall.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

1. THAT the Project Planning Report for the Department of Mathematics, Phase I at the University of Toronto, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 131 of the Academic Board as Appendix "B", be approved in principle.
2. THAT the project scope as identified in the Project Planning Report which requires the outfitting of the entire sixth floor of the Bahen Centre for Information Technology be approved at a revised cost of \$5,680,000, with full funding for this project provided from the operating budget within the Faculty of Arts and Science.

10. University of Toronto at Mississauga: Departmental Restructuring and Name Changes

Professor Cummins explained that the restructuring and resulting name changes were the result of academic planning at the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM).

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT the program in religion be moved from the Department of Anthropology and Religion to become part of the Department of History and Classics.

THAT resulting from the above change, the name of the Department of Anthropology and Religion be changed to the Department of Anthropology, effective January 1, 2005

10. University of Toronto at Mississauga: Departmental Restructuring and Name Changes (cont'd)

and

THAT the name of the Department of History and Classics be changed to the Department of Historical Studies, effective January 1, 2005.

11. Capital Project: University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC) Food Services Revitalization - Project Planning Report

Professor Cummins observed that members of the Academic Board had been informed of the need for increased student space at the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC). Questions had been raised concerning the use of operating funds to support an ancillary operation, and the implications of the contribution from Aramark. Professor Goel had explained that UTSC had one budget which included ancillaries. Aramark was a food-services provider, with a non-exclusive 10-year contract that included a provision for contributions towards food-service equipment over the course of the contract.

Dr. Bennett explained that the University Affairs Board looked at capital projects for the service operations to consider their quality-of-campus-life implications. The Board had been pleased that the project increased the food service capacity at UTSC, which was particularly important on that campus, as there were not many alternatives within walking distance. The University Affairs Board concurred with the recommendation of the Academic Board.

Ms Orange commented that, subject to Governing Council approval, the Business Board had authorized the Vice-President, Business Affairs to complete the project. The Board had been assured that the project would not only provide added seating but would also improve the throughput of the entire food-service operation at Scarborough so that more students, faculty and staff could be served.

A member requested further details about the contribution from Aramark. Ms Riggall replied that the company had a ten-year contract with the University, of which seven years remained. The contract included provision for a contribution of \$500,000 towards food-service equipment over the course of the contract.

A member asked what the process would be for a member of the Governing Council to review contracts entered into by the University, and requested a private response to this question.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

1. THAT the Project Planning Report for the Food Services Revitalization at the University of Toronto at Scarborough, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 130 of the Academic Board as Appendix "D", be approved in principle.
2. THAT the project scope identified in the Project Planning Report, to expand the food services at the University of Toronto at Scarborough, be approved at a cost of \$3,065,000 from the following funding sources:

11. Capital Project: University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC) Food Services Revitalization - Project Planning Report (cont'd)

- i) A mortgage in the amount of \$1,460,000 to be amortized over a period of 20 years and to be repaid from the Enrolment Growth Fund at the University of Toronto at Scarborough.
- ii) A cash contribution in the amount of \$200,000 to be provided by Aramark.
- iii) A cash contribution in the amount of \$50,000 from the UTSC food services ancillary.
- iv) A cash contribution in the amount of \$1,355,000 from the operating budget of the University of Toronto at Scarborough.

12. Election Guidelines 2005

Dr. Bennett explained that the University Affairs Board, on the recommendation of the Elections Committee, recommended the approval of Election Guidelines. There were three substantive changes to the proposed Election Guidelines for 2005:

- The campaign period for web-based voting for student constituencies had been reduced to two weeks, including the voting period. It had been three weeks in 2004. In 2003, it had been the two weeks before the voting period.
- Candidates would be permitted to claim appropriate expenses incurred between the announcement of the candidates and the voting period.
- To address privacy concerns, voters' lists and mailing labels would no longer be made available to candidates.

A member spoke in favour of the revisions. He noted that recommendations for changes to the Guidelines, made in response to an invitation from the Elections Committee in the fall, had been considered and incorporated in these Guidelines. He noted the importance of the shorter campaign period to student candidates. A member requested that the minutes reflect her concerns about web elections and their legitimacy.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

That the Election Guidelines, 2005, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 124 of the University Affairs Board as Appendix "A" be approved.

13. Reviews of Academic Units and Programs: Annual Review

The Chair noted that this item was for information only. Members had received a copy of the *Reviews of Academic Programs and Units* dated June 2004. The record of the Executive Committee's discussion of the Review Summary was on page 11 of Report 383 (<http://www.utoronto.ca/govcncl/bac/details/ex/2004-05/exr20041202.pdf>). Discussion of the Review Summary was also included in Report Number 109 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs and Report 115 of the Agenda Committee, both of which had been included in the agenda packages.

There were no questions.

14. Reports for Information

Members received the following reports for information:

- Report Number 130 of the Academic Board (November 11, 2004)
- Report Number 131 of the Academic Board (December 9, 2004)
- Report Number 136 of the Business Board (October 6, 2004)
- Report Number 137 of the Business Board (November 8, 2004)
- Report Number 124 of the University Affairs Board (November 9, 2004)
- Report Number 382 of the Executive Committee (November 29, 2004)
- Report Number 383 of the Executive Committee (December 2, 2004)

15. Date of the Next Meeting

The Chair reminded members that the next regular meeting of the Governing Council was scheduled for Thursday, February 10, 2005 at 4:30 pm.

16. Question Period

A member commented that, while some questions raised by student members of the Governing Council might be considered controversial and/or annoying by some members, such questions created important discussion.

A member asked for information concerning the drive for unionization currently being undertaken by University of Toronto Sodexho cafeteria employees. Professor Hildyard replied that, once 40% of eligible members had indicated their support for a union, a vote would be conducted by the Labour Relations Board.

A member encouraged the University to support Sodexho employees. Another member urged the University to encourage Sodexho to accept the unionization of its employees. Professor Hildyard noted that at least 50% of Sodexho workplaces were unionized. She repeated the University's position that the process of unionization should proceed through the Labour Relations Board.

17. Other Business

The Chair extended her best wishes to members of the Council and their families for the holiday season.

The meeting adjourned at 6:10 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

February 2, 2005