

**UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO**

**THE GOVERNING COUNCIL**

**FEBRUARY 25, 2010**

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE GOVERNING COUNCIL held on February 25, 2010 at 4:30 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, University of Toronto.

**Present:**

Mr. John F. (Jack) Petch ( In the Chair)  
Dr. Alice Dong (Vice-Chair)  
The Honourable David R. Peterson,  
Chancellor  
Professor C. David Naylor, President  
Mr. Andrew Agnew-Iler  
Professor Varouj Aivazian  
Ms Diana A.R. Alli  
Mr. Ryan Matthew Campbell  
Mr. P. C. Choo  
Dr. Claude S. Davis  
Mr. Ken Davy  
Ms Judith Goldring  
Professor William Gough  
Ms Joeita Gupta  
Dr. Gerald Halbert  
Mr. Adam Heller  
Professor Ellen Hodnett  
Ms Shirley Hoy  
Ms Min Hee (Margaret) Kim  
Dr. Joel A. Kirsh  
Professor Ronald H. Kluger  
Professor Christina E. Kramer  
Dr. Stefan Mathias Larson  
Professor Louise Lemieux-Charles  
Mr. Geoffrey Matus  
Professor Cheryl Misak  
Professor Ian Orchard

Professor Doug W. Reeve  
Professor Arthur S. Ripstein  
Ms Melinda Rogers  
Mr. Olivier Sorin  
Miss Maureen J. Somerville  
Mr. John David Stewart  
Mr. W. John Switzer  
Ms Rita Tsang  
Ms B. Elizabeth Vosburgh  
Mr. Greg West

**Secretariat:**

Mr. Louis R. Charpentier  
Mr. Anwar Kazimi  
Mr. Henry Mulhall

**Absent:**

Mr. William Crothers  
Mr. Joseph Mapa  
Ms Florence Minz  
Mr. Gary P. Mooney  
Mr. George E. Myhal  
Mr. Richard Nunn  
Mr. Tim Reid  
Mr. Stephen C. Smith  
Professor Elizabeth M. Smyth  
Mr. W. David Wilson

**In Attendance:**

Mr. Jeff Peters, former Member of the Governing Council and President, Association of Part-Time Undergraduate Students (APUS)

Professor Angela Hildyard, Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity

Mr. David Palmer, Vice-President, Advancement and Chief Development Officer

Dr. Lorna Jean Edmonds, Assistant Vice-President, International Relations

Ms Lucy Fromowitz, Assistant Vice-President, Student Life

Professor Peter N. Lewis, Associate Vice-President, Research

Ms Elizabeth Sisam, Assistant Vice-President, Campus and Facilities Planning

Mr. Jim Delaney, Director, Office of the Vice-Provost, Students

Dr. Anthony Gray, Special Advisor to the President

Ms. Marijana Josifovska, Investors Without Borders

Professor Bruce Kidd, Dean, Faculty of Physical Education and Health

Mr. Christopher Lang, Director, Appeals, Discipline and Faculty Grievances

Professor Jill Matus, Vice-Provost, Students

Mr. Mark Vallena, Investors Without Borders

IN ACCORDANCE WITH A DETERMINATION BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE PURSUANT TO SECTIONS 38 AND 44 OF BY-LAW NUMBER 2 OF THE GOVERNING COUNCIL, ITEM 10 ON THE AGENDA WAS CONSIDERED BY THE GOVERNING COUNCIL *IN CAMERA*.

**1. Chair's Remarks**

The Chair welcomed the members and guests to the meeting. He began his address by updating the members on a matter related to conduct and decorum. The Chair expressed his concern that there seemed to be uncertainty or misunderstanding about the conduct of Governing Council meetings. He said that the quality of debate and tone of the meetings had not been to what they should, or could, have been. The Chair stated that his concerns had been reflected by the comments that he had received from a number of members and others who had attended the Governing Council meetings. With this in mind, the Chair outlined his intentions to focus on this issue at each of his planned meetings with the constituency groups over the course of the following weeks. He invited members to come forward with their advice and observations on what they believed could be done differently to ensure that the deliberations remained positive and constructive at Committees, Boards and the Governing Council. The Chair stated that he had received some good ideas from student governors at a meeting earlier in the week. He looked forward to similar meetings with administrative staff, alumni, faculty and Lieutenant-General-in-Council members that were scheduled in the following weeks. The Chair ended by expressing his confidence that the collective input, advice and support from all members would lead to a consensus on some practical and appropriate approaches for the remainder of the year and beyond.

Next, the Chair noted that one speaking request had been granted for Mr. Jeff Peters, President, Association of Part-Time Undergraduate Students (APUS). A second request had been received from CUPE 3902. It was related to the Presidential Review. With the advice of the Executive Committee members, the speaking request had not been granted. The Chair stated that he had invited CUPE 3902 representatives to meet him in person to discuss this matter. Members had received copies of the communication between CUPE 3902 and the Chair. The Chair stated that a similar request had been received from APUS and had also not been granted. The Chair informed the members that he had also invited representatives from APUS to meet with him to discuss the same matter.

**2. Minutes of the Previous Meetings of December 10, 2009 and January 21, 2010**

The members had received copies of revised minutes of the December 10, 2009 meeting, and the minutes of the January 21, 2010 meeting

The Chair reminded the members that the approval of the minutes of December 10, 2009 had been deferred to this meeting. A member had provided a note to the Secretary with a request to consider changes, some of which had incorporated in the revised minutes.

**Item 5(d) Capital Project: Utilities Infrastructure Upgrade for St. George Campus**

One of the requested revisions made by the member had referred to a specific project as a documented rationale for the upgrade. However, the Chair stated, none of the item's documentation referred to this project. As a result, the requested change had not been made.

**Item 5(f) Election Guidelines 2010**

The Chair advised members that the revised minutes reflected the member's input on two specific groups of students: those in Co-Op programs and the University of Toronto at Scarborough, and Professional Experience Year (PEY) students. Finally, under the same item a revision had been made with respect to an exchange regarding the Chair's ruling on a matter.

A member made a motion to have the proposed corrections that she had submitted, and a letter that had been distributed to the members, appended to the minutes of the December 10, 2009 meeting. The motion was seconded and defeated.

Two motions to approve the minutes of the meetings of December 10, 2009 and January 21, 2010 were seconded and approved.

**3. Business Arising from the Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

**Item 6(e) Performance Indicators for Governance: Measuring UP (2009)**

The Chair said that a member had requested further details on some items of the report that had been presented at the meeting of January 21, 2010. The member had been contacted and provided with the information by the Office of the Vice-President and Provost.

#### **4. Report of the President**

##### **(a) Student Presentation – Investors Beyond Borders**

The President began his address by introducing the members to Investors Beyond Borders, a student group based at the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM). The President introduced Ms. Marijana Josifovska, a third-year Finance Specialist and the group's President; and Mr. Mark Vallena, a fourth-year Economics student and the group's Promotions Director. The initiative that had started at UTM had spread to four continents and five countries.

Ms Josifovska began by stating that Investors Beyond Borders was a university-based international group, with its headquarters at UTM. The group encouraged students to study investments in the renewable energy sectors of emerging markets. The executive of the group was made up of students engaged in academic pursuits in a broad range of disciplines. The group had developed a network of similar groups across four continents, including universities in North and South America, Europe and Asia. A highlight of the group was its development of the International Renewable Energy Case Competition (IRECC). The IRECC was the world's first case competition to look at investments in renewable energy in emerging markets. The emerging market chosen by the group for the year was the Republic of Macedonia. The competition was divided into two rounds. The first round was to occur simultaneously at five different universities around the world. Undergraduate and graduate students would engage in developing renewable energy investment proposals for the Republic of Macedonia. The winners of the first round would then travel to Macedonia to test the viability of their proposals. There, they expected to meet prominent individuals including the Prime Minister of Macedonia and other leading industry professionals. On their return, it was expected that the students would share their ideas in an open forum.

The group had received encouragement and letters of support from President Naylor and Professor Orchard, Vice-President and Principal, UTM among others at the University. The group had also received international attention from the World Energy Council, the United Nations, the World Bank, and the European Union. Investors Beyond Borders had developed an international board of advisors consisting of experts from the renewable energy industry worldwide. It was expected that a number of short and long term benefits would emerge from this project. The group was involved in having a documentary filmed to cover the event to share their experiences. The leaders of the project hoped that their efforts would inform curriculum development as they believe that the knowledge and skills their group helps to foster would be valuable commodities in the employment market of the future. Finally, the project would provide UTM and the University an opportunity to showcase these initiatives on a global scale.

A member thanked the presenter on behalf of the Council.

**(b) Awards and Honours**

The President drew the members' attention to the Awards and Honours list that was included in the agenda package. The President began by congratulating alumna Heather Moyse, the brakeman on the Canada 1 sled, who had won a gold medal in the bobsleigh event at the 2010 Winter Olympics in Vancouver. Ms Moyse had earned a Masters degree in Occupational Therapy at the University of Toronto in 2007. With reference to the Awards and Honours list, the President highlighted the successes of the University's Division of University Advancement, Rotman School of Management, Hart House Theatre, and the U of T Magazine. This particular group had collectively won five medals earlier that month from the International Council for the Advancement and Support of Education (District Two). District Two, the President added, comprised the province of Ontario, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania among others and included over 700 schools at every level.

The Varsity Blues swim team continued to excel. The men's team had placed first in Ontario and second in Canada. Varsity Blues men's and women's swim team had together won 40 medals – more than half gold – at major national and international swim meets over the course of the previous two months. Colin Russell had been named CIS male swimmer of the year and Byron MacDonald had been named as the male coach of the year.

The President then went on to give an update on TVO's *2010 Big Idea Best Lecturers Competition*. The station had announced ten finalists and two faculty members from the University – Professor Monika Havelka, Department of Biology, University of Toronto at Mississauga and Professor Steve Joordens, Department of Psychology, University of Toronto at Mississauga – had been named among the finalists. The President informed the members that the competition had highlighted the high quality of undergraduate teaching at the University's Mississauga and Scarborough campuses in previous years and the current year had been no exception. He encouraged the governors and all members of the University community to watch the televised lectures for Professors Joorden and Havelka, and to vote online for their favourites.

**(b) Honorary Degree**

The President expressed his pleasure in announcing that Mr. Nandan Nilekani had accepted the Governing Council's offer of an honorary degree. Mr. Nilekani was the co-founder of Infosys Technologies, a global corporation that had placed India at the forefront of information technology services and was an exemplar of good governance and corporate social responsibility. Mr Nilekani, the President added, would be awarded an honorary degree from the University in celebration of his outstanding contributions to international business, and to the social and economic development of India. While graciously accepting the Governing Council's offer of an honorary degree, Mr. Nilekani had asked to defer the conferral of the degree until 2011 as he was busy leading the Unique Identification Authority program in India.

**4. Report of the President (Cont'd.)**

**(c) Government Relations**

Moving on to the topic of government relations, the President said that the federal budget was expected on March 4<sup>th</sup>. Details on the budget remained unclear. There were indications to suggest that there would be a move from a period of stimulus to one of cost cutting. It was possible that there could be a return to off-loading debt through reductions of provincial transfers, as had been the case in the mid-to-late 1990s. The University continued its advocacy efforts particularly in areas related to the institutional costs of research; graduate fellowships and scholarships; student aid particularly in the post-Millennium Foundation era; and support for core research and for the granting councils.

On the provincial side, things were no clearer. A budget was expected to arrive in late March or early April. It was expected that Minister Dwight Duncan's address to the Economic Club in early March would be of interest in signaling many of the themes that were expected to follow in the budget. These, the President said, would provide the University with numerous avenues to pursue its advocacy efforts. The University was actively engaged with the government on a range of files, and there were a large number of critical questions that remained unanswered. Among these were questions related to the multi-year funding agreement for quality; how funding for the enrolment growth would be designed and allocated; what would replace the framework related to tuition and student aid; what was to become of the province's dormant plans related to long-term capital and renewal projects; how the province's plans for graduate and international student support would change; and, what the resolution of the pension solvency issue would be, even as the Council of Ontario Universities had submitted the final report of its pension working group.

**(d) University Affairs**

Turning his attention to the University, the President began by stating that the process of preparing the University's budget was underway. It was expected that the Budget would be presented to the Business Board on March 22<sup>nd</sup> before coming to the next Governing Council meeting. In the President's opinion, the forthcoming budget was one of the most challenging that the University had had to plan and devise. Alluding to his earlier comments, he said that the uncertainty with the federal and provincial support made planning harder. Nevertheless, it was hoped that a draft budget could be presented through the channels of governance. Such a budget could then be modified once the details of the federal and provincial budgets were known.

With reference to the University's advancement efforts, the President reminded members that after a record year in 2007-2008, the University's fund raisers, like others, had had a difficult year in 2008-2009. Despite the setback, the commendable support of the University's friends and benefactors had continued. It was anticipated that

**Report of the President (Contd.)**

**(d) University Affairs**

2009-2010 would similarly yield modest returns. Research had indicated that benefactions typically fell off for two years after large market corrections. Nevertheless, whenever the expected recovery would materialize it was important for the University to be prepared with its campaign activities. Bearing that in mind, campaign activities had been planned for the Fall. It was expected that senior administrators, Principals, and Deans would be closely involved in the campaign efforts – fund-raising and advancement seminars for them had already started. A campaign, the President stated, was about more than fund-raising numbers. A successful campaign galvanized the University community as it engaged alumni, faculty and students, while helping the institution sharpen its priorities.

Next, turning his attention to the University of Toronto Asset Management Corporation (UTAM) the President said that the review process had been productive. He extended his gratitude to The Honorable Mr. Henry Jackman, the Committee's Chair, and to Mr. Larry Wasser, its Vice-Chair for their continued commitment and passion towards the betterment of the University. The President expressed his indebtedness to the other members of the Committee – Ms Judy Goldring, Dean Mayo Moran, Mr. William Hewitt, Mr. Hugh Mackenzie and Mr. Jason Wei. He went on to express his gratitude to the Committee's administrative assessors Vice-Presidents David Palmer and Catherine Riggall. The President had written to the university community, and the Committee's report and his response were available online. UTAM's Response to the Report had also been published and was available from the UTAM website. The President expressed his intention to act upon the Committee's recommendations expeditiously.

In concluding his report to the Council, the President commented briefly on free speech and diversity on campus. He stated that over the previous few months, a number of universities had faced challenges over racism and intolerance. The University had had two such challenges in the year. One incident involved four students in black face at a Halloween costume party and a second, more recently, involved anti-Semitic comments by students in the Faculty of Social Work over placements in the community. The University had responded to both the incidents rapidly and appropriately. The President went on to tell the members that the events had occasioned difficult conversations and debate but had also served as educational opportunities for the university. He noted that "Israeli Apartheid Week" was scheduled to start the following week. The President said that it was one of the most challenging periods of the year on campus. As in previous years, the University was following a strategy that balanced its uncompromising commitment to free speech with its mandate to promote a safe, inclusive, and open academic environment. The President had issued a statement the previous day reiterating this commitment and he had called upon members of the extended University community to rededicate themselves to maintain an environment that was free of discrimination and racism of any form. The President concluded by saying that the University campus was society's principal locus for rigorous debate and the free exchange of ideas.

**4. Report of the President (Cont'd.)**  
**(d) University Affairs**

In response to the President's report, a member stated it was important to note the University's commitment to free speech and the preservation of academic freedom. However, she enquired whether an apology would be forthcoming from the University to the group dubbed the "Fight Fees 14" who, she said, had been exonerated of all charges by the courts for participating in a peaceful sit-in at Simcoe Hall in March 2008. In the member's opinion this was an example of the criminalization of dissent by the use of draconian measures. The member questioned the University's handling of this affair.

In response, the President expressed his disagreement with the member's characterization of events. He noted that members of the university staff who had been affected by the demonstration, some of whom were present at the meeting, might also disagree with the member's characterization of the protest as peaceful. The President noted that freedom of expression came with a responsibility to be respectful and civil. Members of the university staff had been accosted in the corridors of Simcoe Hall and they feared for their safety when confronted by the demonstrators. They were also denied their right to leave the premises because of the actions of the demonstrators. The police had investigated the matter and had laid charges. The University would not be issuing an apology and no further public statement would be forthcoming.

**5. Items for Governing Council Approval**

**(a) Revision to the *Memorandum of Agreement* with the University of Toronto Faculty Association (UTFA)**

Professor Louise Lemieux-Charles, the Chair of the Academic Board, advised that the Academic Board had reviewed this item under its jurisdiction to review policies pertaining to academic appointments. The highlights of the item referred to the discussions between the University and the UTFA over salary and benefits for the period July 1, 2009 to June 30, 2010 pursuant to Article 6 of the *Memorandum of Agreement* (MOA). Members had received information of the highlights of the MOA. Professor Angela Hildyard had reviewed the amendment with the Academic Board.

A member, who identified himself as being a faculty governor, expressed his opinion the proposed revision represented a fundamental change in the relationship of UTFA with the University. He continued by saying that he hoped that there would be a broad engagement within the faculty as support was sought for this revision. While the Governing Council's endorsement of the proposal was important, it was not the only important proposal as it needed universal faculty support.

Invited to comment, Professor Hildyard, stated that it was up to UTFA to apprise its members on the aspects of the proposal. For its part, the University had engaged with extensive discussions with the Deans and others whose responsibility it would be to

**5. Items for Governing Council Approval (Cont'd.)**

**(a) Revision to the *Memorandum of Agreement* with the University of Toronto Faculty Association (UTFA)**

implement the revisions with respect to workload. The University had been in discussion with UTFA for over a year. Agreement had been reached on a number of principles that would affect the allocation of workload, an important issue as noted through employment surveys for faculty. In most collective agreements in Canada, the principle of workload determination remained a critical embedded issue. Although there was no collective agreement as such with UTFA, it was agreed that it would be in the University's best interests to propose moving to provide for discussion of workload at a time when salary and benefits are negotiated.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

That those negotiating on behalf of the University in the current Salary and Benefit negotiations with the University of Toronto Faculty Association be authorized to enter into an agreement, should they deem it advisable, whereby the existing Article 8 of the *Memorandum of Agreement* will be amended to provide for amendments to Article 8 being made in accordance with and as part of the process under Article 6 of the *Memorandum of Agreement*.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 165 of the Academic Board as [Appendix "A"](#).

**(b) Faculty of Physical Education and Health: Proposed Bachelor of Kinesiology (B.Kin.) Program and Proposed Revision to the Bachelor of Physical Health and Education (B.P.H.E.)**

*(Arising from Report Number 165 of the Academic Board [January 28, 2010] - Item 6)*

Professor Louise Lemieux-Charles reported that the Faculty of Physical Education and Health had proposed a new Bachelor's degree program in Kinesiology (B.Kin.) as well as a proposed revised Bachelor's degree program in Physical and Health Education (B.P.H.E.). Members had received information on the details on the revisions with agenda package.

A member requested that the Faculty address the concerns of first year students at the Faculty of Physical Education and Health. Specifically, the member said students in the Concurrent Teacher Education Program (CTEP) had expressed their concern about being forced into the B.P.H.E program instead of the B.Kin. program as they would lack the biology prerequisites.

**5. Items for Governing Council Approval (Contd.)**

**(a) Faculty of Physical Education and Health: Proposed Bachelor of Kinesiology (B.Kin.) Program and Proposed Revision to the Bachelor of Physical Health and Education (B.P.H.E.)**

Professor Bruce Kidd, Dean, Faculty of Physical Education and Health, responded by stating that the CTEP students would have the option of either of the two programs since they would have access to the required biology courses. In addition, these students would also have the option of upper level courses in Kinesiology.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

- (a) THAT the proposed Bachelor of Kinesiology (B.Kin.) Program, as described in the proposal dated November 27, 2009, be approved commencing for students admitted for September 2009; and
- (b) THAT the proposed revisions to the Bachelor of Physical Health and Education (B.P.H.E.) program, as described in the proposal dated November 27, 2009, be approved commencing for students admitted for September, 2009.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 165 of the Academic Board as [Appendix "B"](#).

- (c) **Capital Project: Project Planning Report for the Renovation of Chemistry Undergraduate Teaching Laboratories at the University of Toronto at Mississauga**  
(*Arising from Report Number 165 of the Academic Board [January 28, 2010] - Item 7*)

Professor Lemieux-Charles reported that both the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs and the Planning and Budget Committee had recommended approval of the proposal. Mr. Matus reported that the Business Board considered approval for the execution of capital projects principally from the point of view of two factors: value for money, and the security of their funding and financing. The Business Board was satisfied that the costs for the project were in line with other laboratory renovations. The project was to be funded from the UTM operating budget.

**5. Items for Governing Council Approval (Contd.)**

**(c) Capital Project: Project Planning Report for the Renovation of Chemistry Undergraduate Teaching Laboratories at the University of Toronto at Mississauga**

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

1. That the Project Planning Report for the University of Toronto at Mississauga Renovation of Chemistry Undergraduate Teaching Laboratories be approved in principle.
2. That the project scope, comprising renovation of 958 nasm in the South Building at a total project cost of \$4.24 million be approved with the full funding from the University of Toronto at Mississauga operating budget.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 165 of the Academic Board as [Appendix "C"](#).

- (d) University of Toronto at Mississauga Campus Construction of a Parking Deck**  
*(Arising from Report Number 165 of the Academic Board [January 28, 2010] - Item 8, Report Number 179 of the Business Board [February 8, 2010] - Item 13, and Report Number 155 of the University Affairs Board [January 26, 2010] - Item 3)*

Professor Lemieux-Charles reported that this proposed UTM project had been discussed in detail at the Academic Board. She directed the members to the report of the Academic Board where the discussion on the alternatives to the proposal had been recorded as had the answers to the questions raised at the Board's meeting.

Ms Vosburgh reported that the University Affairs Board considered capital projects such as parking facilities and student residences as part of its mandate for matters that directly concerned the quality of student and campus life. The Board had been advised that parking was one of the key requirements to facilitate a positive student experience on the UTM campus, that the proposed project would maintain the trend to locate parking outside the ring road while making the inner campus more pedestrian-friendly, and that it would significantly augment the availability of accessible parking spots. A member had asked whether the project would provide sufficient parking capacity to meet UTM's needs beyond the short term. The member had been informed that it had been planned to meet projected parking needs while avoiding excess capacity that could both endanger the funding model as well as destabilize initiatives to reduce the number of vehicles on campus. The Board had concurred with the recommendation of the Academic Board for approval of the project.

**5. Items for Governing Council Approval (cont'd)**

**(d) University of Toronto at Mississauga Campus Construction of a Parking Deck**

Mr. Matus reported that the Business Board had two roles with respect to this project. It had deliberated its execution, and had also studied the business plan of the UTM parking ancillary to be able to advise the Governing Council whether the projected income of that ancillary would be sufficient to meet the project's cost. The Board had been satisfied with assurances received from UTM's Chief Administrative Officer that the revenues of the parking ancillary would be adequate to repay the borrowing in ten years. As well, the Board had been satisfied with the plan to replace only 250 of the 450 parking places that had been lost to construction on the sites of former parking lots. Even though UTM recognized that there would likely be need in the future to add to the parking stock, it would still be prudent to proceed incrementally. Recognizing the need to borrow to cover the cost, moving ahead with the project in phases would decrease financing costs and it would free up UTM's borrowing capacity for other urgent priorities.

A member advised the Council that a full discussion on this item had taken place at the Planning and Budget Committee level. He wanted to raise the issue of whether future capital projects were taken into account as part of the secondary impact of the projects. Two previous projects had caused the need for this parking deck. In his opinion, the cost of this project should have been accounted for in the two previous projects. Another member concurred with these comments.

In response, Professor Misak said that project reports tried to take in to account the cost of secondary impact of projects. However, in many instances where funding was to be received from government agencies for a new project, the cost of secondary impact of funding could not always be taken into account.

Invited to speak to this item by the Chair, Mr. Jeff Peters, began by stating that mature and part-time students needed available affordable parking options. Costs needed to be kept low. The proposal called for an increase in parking costs and, in addition, sessional ancillary fee costs were to also increase. In the speaker's opinion, having available and affordable parking was a part of an accessible campus – ultimately the parking should be free. This issue had been raised previously by student groups. All additional fees for parking fees presented another barrier for students. The speaker's view was that the provision of parking should be a part of the University's budget. Students had been taking on the cost of services such as housing and child care – these costs should have been covered through tuition fees.

**5. Items for Governing Council Approval (cont'd)**

**(d) University of Toronto at Mississauga Campus Construction of a Parking Deck**

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

THAT the proposed construction of a single-level parking deck, on the site of an existing surface parking lot and with a capacity of approximately 250 spaces, be approved at a total cost not to exceed \$6.5 million with funding to be provided by a loan to be repaid by the UTM Parking ancillary over a period of ten (10) years, beginning in fiscal 2010/11.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 165 of the Academic Board as [Appendix "D"](#).

**(e) Capital Project: Project Planning Report for the Centre for Collaborative Digital Media**

*(Arising from Report Number 165 of the Academic Board [January 28, 2010] - Item 9)*

Professor Lemieux-Charles put forward the motion for this project for which members had received information with their agenda package. The estimated total project cost for the renovation and construction portion of the project was \$3,187,000, with the Canadian Foundation for Innovation (CFI) and the Ontario Research Fund (ORF) providing \$1,493,500 each, and the balance of \$200,000 being provided by the Faculty of Arts and Science. Speaking on behalf of the Business Board, Mr. Matus reported that the Board had approved the execution of the project, subject to the Council's approval. The average cost of the renovated and new space would be \$187 per square foot. The project would not require borrowing.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

1. That the Project Planning Report for the Centre for Collaborative Interactive Digital Media be approved in principle.
2. That the project scope as identified in the Project Planning Report be approved in principle at a Total Project Cost of \$3,187,000 with funding as follows:

Canada Foundation for Innovation	\$ 1,493,500
Ontario Research Fund	\$ 1,493,500
Faculty of Arts & Science	\$ 200,000
Total	\$ 3,187,000

Documentation is attached to Report Number 165 of the Academic Board as [Appendix "E"](#).

**(f) Capital Project: Project Planning Report for the Centre for Microsatellite Science and Technology**  
*(Arising from Report Number 165 of the Academic Board [January 28, 2010] - Item 10)*

Professor Lemieux-Charles reported that the Academic Board had approved this project in principle, with details as outlined in the information provided to the members. The estimated total project cost for the construction portion of the project was \$5,400,000, with funding provided entirely from the CFI and the ORF grant awards. Mr. Matus reported that the Business Board had approved execution of the project on the condition of Governing Council approval, and also the availability of monetary assistance from the two external agencies as outlined in the project report.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

1. That the Project Planning Report for the Microsatellite Science and Technology Centre be approved in principle.
2. That the project scope as identified in the Project Planning Report be approved in principle at a Total Project Cost of \$5,400,000 with funding as follows:

Canada Foundation for Innovation	\$ 2,700,000
Ontario Research Fund	\$ 2,700,000
Total	\$ 5,400,000

Documentation is attached to Report Number 165 of the Academic Board as [Appendix "F"](#).

**6. Reports for Information**

Members received the following reports for information:

- a. [Report 165 of the Academic Board \(January 28, 2010\)](#)
- b. [Report 179 of the Business Board \(February 8, 2010\)](#)
- c. [Report 155 of the University Affairs Board \(January 26, 2010\)](#)
- d. [Report 428 of the Executive Committee \(February 11, 2010\)](#)

**7. Date of the Next Meeting**

The Chair reminded the members that the next meeting of the Governing Council was scheduled for Thursday, April 8, 2010 at 4:30 p.m.

## **8. Question Period**

The Chair questioned the validity of an unsigned letter distributed to the members at the meeting. He reminded the members that normal practice was to address only those referred matters identified in signed letters. In this context, the Chair went on to say that he was scheduling with groups of Governors. One goal was to discuss the procedure for the distribution of documents received from various groups and individuals.

A member asked the Provost to advise the Council regarding recent the decision to issue guidelines to regulate student societies. The member suggested that students would be given the ability to opt out of student societies. Further, according to the member, an ad hoc committee had been set up, in the form of an undergraduate advisory committee, with the objective of reaching the decision to offer an opt out option. The member suggested that this amounted to union bashing. The student unions were united to stop such actions on the part of the University. In the member's opinion, the University was using the Policy on Ancillary Fees as a way to infringe upon the by-laws of student societies. Describing the University's actions as being anti-democratic, the member suggested that the process was also problematic. The Graduate Students Union had not been invited to the discussion. The member called for an immediate moratorium on the guidelines. The member suggested that issues of secession needed to be dealt with through the by-laws of individual student groups and that there was no room for interference by the University administration in such matters. In the member's view, such action would be deemed as an encroachment on the autonomy of a student union

In response, the Provost began by providing the members with a background to this matter. She said that the student advisory committee was made up of members of various recognized student governments and societies. Based on advice received from Council members, the purpose of the committee was to engage in more deliberative and less formal discussions to address issues. The idea was also to hear from student leaders about what they thought the University ought to be doing. Through these discussions, an independent matter of secession had been raised among certain student societies. The Provost admitted that this was a difficult issue. In response to a formal query, the matter of secession had been discussed at the student advisory committee. The student advisory committee had been tasked to think about guidelines to provide frameworks for secession.

The member then went on to enquire about the Review of the Code of Student Conduct. She expressed her concern about the procedure that was being taken. The member suggested that historically there had been a student majority on the body that reviewed the Code of Student Conduct. In the member's view, the current review was being carried out through an administrative body without adequate student representation. She called for a cancellation of the current apparatus of the process, and for a committee with a student majority, if such a Code was even needed.

**8. Question Period (Contd.)**

Invited to comment, Professor Matus, Vice-Provost, Students, advised members that as had been announced at the University Affairs Board, her office had initiated in updating the Student Code of Conduct. In an effort to ensure broad consultations, invitations had been issued to student, staff and faculty groups across all three campuses. The consultation process was open and transparent. The intention was to take into account the views of student groups and student governors. Professor Matus concluded by saying that their input would inform the decisions her office would decide whether an update or a full review of the Code of Student Conduct would be necessary. A report would be provided to the University Affairs Board once consultations were completed.

**9. Other Business**

A member wished to apprise other Council members that the student governors, like the University administration, were working hard on various matters. The student governors had met with Professor Matus and her staff with regards to the Student Code of Conduct. The graduate student governors were also scheduled to meet with members of the University administration regarding funding of years six and seven of graduate studies. In addition, meetings had been planned with the Provost and various student groups. He concluded by stating that student governors were actively involved in the governance process.

IN ACCORDANCE WITH A DETERMINATION BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE PURSUANT TO SECTION 38 OF BY-LAW NUMBER 2, ITEM 10 WAS CONSIDERED BY THE GOVERNING COUNCIL *IN CAMERA*.

**10. Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters: Recommendations for Expulsion**

On individual motions duly moved, seconded, and carried

It was Resolved

THAT the President's recommendations for expulsions, as outlined in the memoranda and supporting documentation from the Secretary of the Governing Council, dated February 19, 2010 for February 25, 2010, be confirmed.

The meeting adjourned at 6:20 p.m.

---

Secretary

---

Chair

March 15, 2010