

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

Thursday, March 29, 2007

MINUTES OF THE GOVERNING COUNCIL meeting held on Thursday, March 29, 2007 at 4:30 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall.

Present:

Ms Rose M. Patten, (Chair)
Mr. John F. (Jack) Petch, (Vice-Chair)
Professor C. David Naylor, President
Professor Varouj Aivazian
Ms Diana A. R. Alli
Mr. P.C. Choo
Professor Brian Corman
Dr. Claude S. Davis
The Honourable William G. Davis
Ms Susan Eng
Dr. Shari Graham Fell
Professor Jonathan Freedman
Professor Vivek Goel
Mr. Robin Goodfellow
Professor Ellen Hodnett
Professor Glen A. Jones
Dr. Joel A. Kirsh
Mr. Joseph Mapa

Professor Michael R. Marrus
Mr. Geoffrey Matus
Ms Florence Minz
Ms Jacqueline C. Orange
Mr. Tim Reid
Ms Marvi H. Ricker
Professor Arthur S. Ripstein
Professor Barbara Sherwood Lollar
Mr. Stephen C. Smith
Miss Maureen J. Somerville
Ms B. Elizabeth Vosburgh
Mr. Larry Wasser

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

Secretariat:

Mr. Henry Mulhall
Ms Mae-Yu Tan

Absent:

Mr. Kristofer T. Coward
Miss Coralie D'Souza
Miss Saswati Deb
Dr. Alice Dong
Professor William Gough
Dr. Gerald Halbert
Professor Louise Lemieux-Charles
Mr. George E. Myhal

Mr. Richard Nunn
The Honourable David R. Peterson
Ms Estefania Toledo
Professor John Wedge
Mr. Robert S. Weiss
Ms Johanna L. Weststar
Mr. W. David Wilson
Mr. Patrick Wong

In Attendance:

Dr. John R. G. Challis, Vice-President, Research and Associate Provost
Professor Angela Hildyard, Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity
Professor Cheryl Misak, Acting Vice-President and Principal of the University of Toronto at Mississauga
Ms Catherine J. Riggall, Vice-President, Business Affairs
Mr. Daniel Atlin, Assistant Vice-President, Government, Institutional and Community Relations
Ms Susan Addario, Director, Student Affairs
Ms Raha Bahreini, Research Director, Education-Bringing Youth Tobacco Truths (E-BUTT)

In Attendance (cont'd)

Ms Melissa Cheung, Research Chair, E-BUTT
Ms Kim Derrick, Executive Secretary, Office of the President
Mr. Matt Drennan-Scace, Communications Director-elect, E-BUTT
Ms Sheree Drummond, Assistant Provost
Professor David Farrar, Deputy Provost and Vice-Provost, Students
Mr. Albert R. Gaudio, Vice President of External Affairs, E-BUTT
Ms Nora Gillespie, Legal Counsel, Office of the Vice-President and Provost, Office of the Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity
Mr. Corey Goldman, Associate Chair (Undergraduate), Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology and Program Director, First-Year Learning Communities Program
Dr. Anthony Gray, Judicial Affairs Officer, Office of the Governing Council
Ms Johanna Groenberg, Vice President of Internal Affairs, E-BUTT
Professor Edith Hillan, Vice-Provost, Academic
Professor Charlie Keil, Director, Cinema Studies Program
Mr. Gerard Kennedy, Communications Director, E-BUTT
Ms Rosanne Lopers-Sweetman, Director, Strategic Initiatives and Priorities, Office of the Vice-President and Provost
Ms Bryn MacPherson-White, Director, Office of the President and University Events
Mr. Steve Moate, Senior Legal Counsel
Ms Cristina Oke, Assistant Secretary of the Governing Council
Ms Jayme Shaughnessy, First-Year Learning Communities Program
Ms Elizabeth Sisam, Assistant Vice-President, Campus and Facilities Planning
Ms Meredith Strong, Interim Special Assistant, Office of the Vice-President, University Relations
Ms Linda Vranic, Director, Operations, Office of the Vice-President, Research and Associate Provost
Mr. Tyler Ward, President, E-BUTT
Professor Safwat Zaky, Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget

1. 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, and that private conversations might be picked up and broadcast. She asked all members, senior administrators, and guests who were invited to speak during the meeting to use a microphone, so that their comments could be heard by those listening to the audio web-cast.

(c) Chair of Governing Council, 2007-08

The Chair announced that Mr. John F. (Jack) Petch had been acclaimed as Chair of the Governing Council for the period of July 1, 2007 to June 30, 2008. The Chair congratulated Mr. Petch and expressed her gratitude to him for his outstanding service and support during his term as Vice-Chair. Mr. Petch thanked everyone for the honour that had been given to him. He stated that he had been greatly attached to the University since he was a student in the Faculty of Law and expressed his intention to make himself readily available to members.

1. Chair's Remarks (cont'd)**(d) Governing Council Election Results**

Mr. Charpentier reported that the elections for Governing Council positions had been completed. Two current governors had been re-elected for another term – Mr. P.C. Choo and Ms Saswati Deb. Nominations had reopened and closed for Governing Council and Academic Board seats for which no nominations had been initially received. A memorandum had been distributed on March 29, 2007 to Governing Council and Board members with the complete results of the Governing Council and Academic Board elections. As three seats on the Academic Board remained unfilled, nominations would be re-opened for those positions.

Mr. Charpentier also informed members that the College of Electors had met on Monday, March 26, 2007 and had elected three alumni members of Governing Council. Mr. Stephen Smith and Miss Maureen Somerville, current governors, had been re-elected and would each continue for another three-year term effective July 1, 2007. Dr. Stefan Larson, a new member, would begin his three-year term on July 1, 2007. The College had also elected Mr. Larry Wasser to begin a term immediately, filling a vacancy that had occurred as a result of the resignation of Mr. John Badowski. Mr. Wasser's term would end on June 30, 2009.

The Chair welcomed the new member, members-elect and the returning governors.

2. Minutes of the Previous Meeting of February 1, 2007

The minutes of the meeting of February 1, 2007 were approved.

3. Business Arising from the Minutes of the Previous Meeting

There was no business arising from the minutes of the previous meeting.

4. Report of the President**(a) Enhancing the Student Experience**

The President commented that a number of initiatives designed to enhance the student experience were being carried out within the University. Governors had been provided with a copy of the *Putting Students First – 2005-06 Year in Review* booklet. Contained in the pamphlet were highlights of some of the achievements in the Faculty of Arts and Science in 2005-06. It provided one example of the way in which divisions in the University were working to advance the important priority of enhancing the student experience. The President added that, whenever possible, presentations on new developments in student life and student learning opportunities in the University would be given at meetings of the Governing Council.

(b) First-Year Learning Communities

The President introduced two guests who would speak about the First-Year Learning Communities (FLCs) program. The innovative program in the Faculty of Arts and Science, designed for newly admitted students in the Life Sciences, Computer Science, and Commerce, was in its second year of operation. Mr. Corey A. Goldman is the Program Director of the FLCs program and the Associate Chair (Undergraduate) of the Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology. Ms Jayme Shaughnessy, a fourth-year Honours Bachelor of Science student who would be graduating in June 2007, was a FLCs peer mentor. The President thanked the Office of the Vice-President and Provost for facilitating the presentation.

4. Report of the President (cont'd)

(b) First-Year Learning Communities (cont'd)

During his presentation, Mr. Goldman highlighted the following points:

Introduction

- FLCs provide a great way for students to learn and succeed. The program gives them the opportunity to make connections with faculty, students and staff and resources and opportunities on campus.
- FLCs are non-credit, no-fee programs that are noted on students' transcripts as a non-academic activity.
- A FLC is a small group of students who join together to create a community of learners.
- The twenty-four students in each learning community take two or three courses in common, belong to the same college or program, and meet regularly from September to April for fifteen sessions.
- Meetings are facilitated by an upper-year student peer mentor under the guidance of a staff and faculty advisor who also attend the sessions.
- FLCs make it easier for students to find their way around the University, make friends, form study groups, develop skills, and succeed academically.

Program Development

- A pilot project conducted in 2005-06 had involved 260 life sciences students taking large classes who did not live in residence.
- Funding had been obtained from the Student Experience Fund; the funding facilitated the hiring of a program coordinator, Ms Heidi Pepper.
- The program was made available to life sciences, commerce and computer science students in 2006-07, and there were plans to expand the program in 2007-08 to 650 students, adding those in economics and philosophy programs.
- Peer mentors were given an honorarium and were provided with training on their role at the end of the summer and throughout the year.

Activities

- The sessions were a combination of academic, social and developmental activities.
- Some of the topics covered included:
 - Time management
 - Study groups
 - Choosing a program
 - Research opportunities
 - Career explorations
 - Exam preparation
- Social activities had included pumpkin carving, bowling, night skiing, skating at Nathan Phillips Square, paintball, a Raptors basketball game, and dodgeball.
- A year-end banquet had been held at the 89 Chestnut residence, and participants had received a certificate of completion during a ceremony at a picnic, the final event of the program.

Outcome

- Detailed assessments had been conducted to ensure that the program goals had been achieved.
- It had been found that students wanted to get involved in activities on campus and were keen to continue their involvement in second year.

4. Report of the President (cont'd)**(b) First-Year Learning Communities (cont'd)**

- Participants indicated that:
 - They had made new friends...97%
 - They were learning to be a successful student...82%
 - Their peer mentor had been effective...95%
 - They would recommend FLC to friends...98%

Ms Shaughnessy highlighted the following points during her presentation:

- Attending the University of Toronto was sometimes an overwhelming experience for students; it was difficult to find a community to join or to find a study group and a social group.
- Serving as a peer mentor in FLCs had enhanced her own experience at the University and had helped her to feel more connected to the University community than in any of her past years. She was glad that she had participated and felt that she would graduate with a greater feeling of accomplishment because of the FLCs program.
- As a mentor, she had an opportunity to observe students develop relationships with each other and with faculty and staff, share work together, sit together in class, and develop friendships outside of the classroom.

The President thanked Mr. Goldman and Ms Shaughnessy for their presentation and their contributions to the FLCs program.

(c) Divestment in Tobacco Company Securities

The President drew governors' attention to his letter to the Chair dated March 26, 2007 that had been distributed. In his letter, which addressed the matter of divestment of tobacco holdings, the President had indicated his acceptance of the recommendations of the President's Advisory Board. He had directed the President of the University of Toronto Asset Management Corporation (UTAM) to begin the process of divesting from tobacco-related holdings.

The President emphasized the leadership role that students had undertaken in the matter and thanked the student-led group named Education-Bringing Youth Tobacco Truths (E-BUTT) that had initiated the proposal through a petition. Under the Policy on *Social and Political Issues With Respect to University Investment*, the Advisory Board had considered the University's position with regard to current and future investments in tobacco-related companies and had submitted a report to the President. The President thanked the five governors – Mr. Brian Davis, Mr. Ran Goel, Mr. Richard Nunn, Ms. Marvi Ricker and Professor Arthur Ripstein - who had served on the Board, and he acknowledged their excellent work and insightful analysis which had required a great investment of their time. He also expressed thanks to Ms Catherine Riggall, Vice-President, Business Affairs, who had guided the Advisory Board in their work and had liaised with UTAM.

The President noted that professors and graduates of the University had been national leaders in the battle against tobacco addiction and its terrible consequences for human health. Countless countries had passed legislation aimed at reducing the prevalence of tobacco addiction and all its adverse effects. There was an overwhelming scientific consensus about the harmful nature of tobacco, and the issue had led to divestment by many leading institutions such as Harvard University and the University of Michigan. Partner institutions such as the Princess Margaret Hospital Foundation and the Toronto General and Western Hospital Foundation had divested.

4. Report of the President (cont'd)**(c) Divestment in Tobacco Company Securities (cont'd)**

Even the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, which had been such a huge force for global good, had made an exception to its practice of not engaging in socially-motivated decisions about its massive stock holdings and had divested from its tobacco holdings.

The President stated that when making such decisions, the University had to do so in a way that did not compromise its fiduciary responsibility to pensioners and others whose money it managed. The University's assets sustained its faculty and staff upon their retirement, provided support to students in need of financial assistance, underwrote salaries of faculty who held endowed chairs and professorships, and supported various research and educational programs. The President noted that Canadian law compelled the University to prioritize its fiduciary responsibilities. By law, and by principle, divestment could not be allowed to undermine the University's financial performance on behalf of pensioners and others.

The President commented that there would likely be very few issues in the future where social consensus and past legislation would combine to create such a clear premise for divestment. The University would divest from tobacco stocks without incurring unreasonable costs or risks.

The President commented on a practical concern, noting that other issues or a number of petitions might arise in the future that would require multiple advisory boards and involve greater debate, disagreement and time commitments of governors. As well, the *Policy* put governors in the unusual position of generating a recommendation to the President that could be accepted or declined. There was a need to determine whether the existing process was the most efficient one, and the President intended to consult with governors and the administration about the process. With respect to the current matter, the President was pleased with the University's decision on this unique issue and thanked the students and governors who had made contributions.

(d) Federal Budget

The President reported that the University was pleased that the Federal Budget announced on March 19, 2007 had added important new support for post-secondary students. The creation of 1000 new graduate scholarships would be beneficial as planned graduate enrolment expansion took place. The increase in budget for the three granting councils - the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR), the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC), and the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council (NSERC) - was most welcome. The continued support (over \$500 million) for the Canadian Foundation for Innovation was also encouraging and would enable more competitions to occur. As well, a number of investments in centres of excellence had been announced, and a targeted fund (approximately \$195 million) had been set aside to support research commercialization.

The President stated that while it was of concern that enhanced recovery of indirect costs of research had not been addressed in the budget, the University was encouraged by discussions with the Government that had occurred so far, and it intended to continue advocacy on the matter. Many senior government officials understood the magnitude of the issue for every research-intensive institution. A number of university presidents had already contacted each other and intended to continue to engage in dialogue with the Federal Government with respect to indirect research costs.

The President noted that the Federal Government had initiated a new Post-Secondary Education transfer, with not less than \$800 million of new base support to be transferred to provinces

4. Report of the President (cont'd)**(d) Federal Budget (cont'd)**

beginning in eighteen months. The impact on the University's core education mission could be very positive if the funds flowed through to institutions, but the President cautioned that the details of the allocations of the transfer would need to be worked out through federal-provincial negotiations.

(e) Provincial Budget

The President reported that the Ontario Budget provided new funding for a number of initiatives including \$50 million to develop the University's capacity for interdisciplinary research at the Joseph L. Rotman School of Management on the creation of jurisdictional economic advantage, \$15 million for research on structural genomics, and new clinical and graduate funding. The investment of \$210 million in incremental funds to alleviate Ontario universities' immediate cost pressures was especially welcome. The University of Toronto's share was approximately \$40 million. There would still be a need to have discussions with the Provincial Government about the provision of quality funding. An increase in the per-student funding as a base commitment to stabilize the University's educational mission and enhance the student experience was essential. Other highlights of the budget were available on the University's website¹ and the Council of Ontario Universities website².

(f) Awards and Honours

The President updated members on some of the prestigious awards that had been won by faculty at the University of Toronto in the past two weeks. Five emerging superstars in the Faculty of Arts and Science had won three Steacie Fellowships and two Sloan Fellowships. Professors Eckhard Meinrenken of Mathematics, Gregory Scholes of Chemistry and Aephraim Steinberg of Physics were three of the University's outstanding young researchers who had won the Natural Sciences and Engineering Council of Canada's E.W.R. Steacie Memorial Fellowships, one of Canada's premier science and engineering research awards.

Two of the University's talented young researchers were among the winners of the prestigious Sloan Research Fellowships - Professors Ravin Balakrishnan of Computer Science and Deborah Zamble of Chemistry. They joined an impressive list of one hundred and sixteen rising stars, most of whom were based at American universities including Harvard University, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, University of California at Berkeley and Princeton University. The fellowships were awarded to the very best young faculty members in seven specified fields of science.

The President reported that seven colleagues from the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering had formed a fabulous team to win the 2007 Alan Blizzard Award for collaboration in teaching. It was the first time that a team from the University of Toronto had won the award, which was sponsored by the Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education (STLHE) and McGraw-Hill Ryerson. Members of the team included:

¹ <http://www.news.utoronto.ca/bin6/070322-3021.asp>

²

<http://www.cou.on.ca/content/objects/COU%20Press%20Release%20on%20Provincial%20Budget%20007Mar23.pdf>

38705

4. Report of the President (cont'd)**(f) Awards and Honours (cont'd)**

- Professor Susan McCahan of Mechanical and Industrial Engineering and Chair of First-Year for the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering;
- Mr. Philip Anderson, senior lecturer in Electrical and Computer Engineering;
- Professor Robert Andrews of Civil Engineering;
- Professor Mark Kortschot of Chemical Engineering and Applied Chemistry;
- Ms Sandy Romas, administrative assistant for the Faculty;
- Mr. Peter Weiss, senior lecturer in the Engineering Communication Program; and
- Professor Kimberly Woodhouse of of Chemical Engineering and Applied Chemistry.

The President added that the team leader, Professor Susan McCahan, had also captured a prestigious individual 3M National Teaching Fellowship. The Fellowship was widely regarded as the top teaching award in the country; it recognized teaching excellence and educational leadership. Professor McCahan's award was the first 3M Fellowship won by an Engineering faculty member and was the sole 3M Fellowship awarded to a University of Toronto professor for 2007.

Lastly, the President announced that University Professor Richard (Dick) Bond of Astronomy and Astrophysics, one of the world's leading cosmologists, had been honoured with a double crown for career achievement - the 2006 Gerhard Herzberg Canada Gold Medal for Science and Engineering, and a Killam Prize in the natural sciences category. The Herzberg was widely recognized as Canada's most prestigious science prize, and the Killam Prizes were awarded to distinguished Canadian scholars doing research in any of the following fields: health sciences, natural sciences, engineering, social sciences and humanities.

The President stated that the University possessed a great professoriate, and ultimately, that was what drew great students to the University and secured its worldwide reputation.

5. Items for Governing Council Approval**(a) Capital Plan, 2006-2011**

Professor Marrus reported that the Capital Plan, 2006-2011, had been considered by the Planning and Budget Committee and the Academic Board and had been endorsed by both governance bodies. A dynamic, integrated presentation on the Real Estate Strategy, the Borrowing Strategy and the Capital Plan had been given by Professor Goel and Ms Riggall. It had been explained that the Capital Plan was a dynamic list of Capital Projects with assigned priorities rather than a fixed list of projects as it had been in the past.

Points raised in the discussion at the Board had included questions about the desirability of enrolment growth and deferred maintenance. Professor Goel had explained that many of the projects on the Capital Projects List were not directly linked to enrolment, and that many of the projects dealt with the renewal of older buildings. Not all of the University's space was tied directly to student classroom needs, so a decrease in student enrolment would not necessarily significantly change the space needs. Because accommodations for faculty, staff and research facilities would still be required, campus development would still be needed. With respect to deferred maintenance, Professor Goel had noted that significant investments had been made over the past few years and the strategy was to ensure that the level of deferred maintenance remained steady and was not increasing.

5. Items for Governing Council Approval (cont'd)**(a) Capital Plan, 2006-2011 (cont'd)**

Ms Orange stated that with its fiduciary responsibility to ensure that the Capital Plan was financially viable, the Business Board had received and discussed at some length the integrated presentation on the Capital Plan, the Borrowing Strategy and the Real Estate Strategy at its January 15, 2007 meeting. With appropriate public funding and with reasonable success in fundraising, the proposed Capital Plan should be achievable within the current borrowing strategy. That strategy limited external borrowing to no more than 40% of net assets averaged over five years.

A member referred to one of the *Criteria for the Selection of Capital Projects* (page 6 of Appendix "A" to Report Number 148 of the Academic Board) and suggested that a second question could be added to the Mission Objectives (a):

How will the relative allocation of the planned capital projects affect the University's academic balance among its Faculties?

The member had analyzed the Capital Projects List by faculty, and had determined that on the St. George campus, the numbers appeared to show that while the full-time equivalents (FTE) for undergraduate and graduate enrolment in the Faculty of Arts and Science for the current year accounted for over 50 percent of the total FTEs, the percent in the Capital Plan allocation for that Faculty was approximately 21 percent. The member expressed concern that such a wide disparity between FTEs and the allocation of planned Faculty capital expenditures might lead the downtown campus into quite a different academic balance than currently existed.

Professor Goel thanked the member for sending the question in advance of the meeting. He acknowledged that the appropriate balance among graduate, undergraduate and professional programs was a significant matter. That type of question was always considered when the University community engaged in its long-term planning exercises. Professor Goel cautioned that comparisons of capital project ratios by divisions should be carried out with care. The Faculty of Arts and Science projects were mainly infill projects into existing sites, while the major projects in the Faculties of Dentistry, Law, Music, and Management were new building projects with estimated costs of approximately \$80-90 million each. In order to make more accurate comparisons, the cost of the Faculty of Arts and Science buildings would also need to be considered in addition to the project costs. However, that type of comparison might not be the best method for interpreting the data since space needs differed by type of program activity.

Professor Goel emphasized that individual capital projects should be assessed relative to the academic plans of the divisions and overall academic priorities rather than considering formulas across divisions as part of the planning process. He added that in order to consider all capital projects of the Faculty of Arts and Science, some projects being undertaken by the federated universities would also need to be included. As well, the current Capital Projects List was only a picture of projects planned within one five-year period that would not necessarily reveal broad trends that might be apparent over a longer period of time.

5. Items for Governing Council Approval (cont'd)**(a) Capital Plan, 2006-2011 (cont'd)**

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT the updated Capital Projects List as described in Appendix 5 of the *Capital Plan, 2006-2011*, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 148 of the Academic Board as Appendix "A", be approved.

(b) Capital Project: Interim Project Planning Report: Faculty of Law

Professor Marrus informed the Council that the expansion on the Faculty of Law's present site – 78 and 84 Queen's Park Crescent - was required to accommodate planned programs relating to the Faculty's academic mission. Augmented student space would be one significant benefit of the proposed expansion. The Faculty of Music had also identified space that it needed to meet the requirements of its academic plans. The Deans of the two faculties had engaged in dialogue, and a parallel planning process would occur. The Interim Project Planning Report had received the support of both the Planning and Budget Committee and the Academic Board.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT the Interim Project Planning Report for the Faculty of Law, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 148 of the Academic Board as Appendix "B", be approved in principle to accommodate the activities and functions described for the expansion of the School's programs at its present location at 78 and 84 Queen's Park Crescent West.

(c) Capital Project: Project Planning Report: Department of Anthropology, Hughes Building Phased Master Plan

Professor Marrus stated that the Norman Hughes Building had been assigned to the Faculty of Arts and Science in July 2006 to accommodate the Department of Anthropology. The current proposed phased approach involved less extensive work than the original proposal and could be carried out within budget. Planned renovations and deferred maintenance projects would allow use of the building for at least the next twenty years.

In-depth discussion at the Academic Board meeting had focused on the decision to carry out limited renovations rather than full renovations that might permit longer-term use of the building. Professor Goel had explained to members that although difficult, the decision had been made that the proposed staged approach to the project would make the most efficient use of available resources. The proposed project cost was \$9.76 million, whereas the cost of upgrading all of the mechanical systems could cost \$20 million or more. In addition, there was also a desire to maintain flexibility through a more limited investment as it was possible that the University might decide to erect a new building in the future. Such an endeavour could cost at least \$100 million. After much discussion, the Academic Board had approved the Project Planning Report.

5. Items for Governing Council Approval (cont'd)**(c) Capital Project: Project Planning Report: Department of Anthropology, Hughes Building Phased Master Plan (cont'd)**

Invited to comment, Ms Orange stated that the Business Board had also reviewed the project at its meeting of February 26, 2007 and had approved its execution, subject to the Council's approval.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

1. THAT the Project Planning Report for the Relocation of the Department of Anthropology to the Norman Hughes Pharmacy Building, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 148 of the Academic Board as Appendix "C", be approved in principle.
2. THAT the project scope having a total space allocation of 3660 nasm/6100 gsm space program at a cost of \$9.76 million in 2006 dollars, be approved with funding to be provided as follows:

Faculty of Arts & Science	\$7.59 million
Facilities and Services (FRP)	\$2.0 million
Office of Space Management	\$0.17 million

3. THAT all space currently occupied by the Department of Anthropology be released and made available for reallocation to other units.

(d) Capital Project: Project Planning Report: Lash Miller Chemical Laboratories Undergraduate Laboratories, Final Phase

Professor Marrus reported that the Project Planning Report for the Lash Miller Chemical Undergraduate Laboratories had been considered by the Planning and Budget Committee and the Academic Board. The proposed Phase II project was the final renovation needed for the Lash Miller building. The plan addressed space and design inefficiencies and deferred maintenance. With the proposed renovations, the Department of Chemistry would be able to significantly increase the number of students in the laboratories and enhance the student experience. Professor Marrus noted that a student member of the Board had reported having toured the facilities and had conveyed his strong support of the proposal, stating that it would be of real benefit for students.

Invited to comment, Ms Orange stated that the Business Board had also reviewed the project and had approved its execution, subject to Council approval.

A member questioned whether students had been involved in the Student Experience Fund (SEF) allocation process and the decision to provide \$1.5 million from the SEF for the Chemical Laboratories. He stated that it was the view of the student governors that the matter should be considered more thoroughly prior to a final decision to approve the Project Planning Report.

Professor Goel provided further information about the \$3.5 million in funding requests for the renovations that had been outstanding when the proposal had entered governance. He indicated that the recommendation that \$1.5 million be provided from the Academic Initiative Fund (AIF)

5. Items for Governing Council Approval (cont'd)**(d) Capital Project: Project Planning Report: Lash Miller Chemical Laboratories Undergraduate Laboratories, Final Phase (cont'd)**

for the Chemical Laboratories had been approved by the Planning and Budget Committee at its March 6, 2007 meeting, and it would be considered on April 5, 2007 by the Academic Board. The Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Science had contributed an additional \$0.5 million, and \$1.5 million from the SEF had been approved to fund the renovations.

Professor Goel elaborated on the SEF, stating that it had been established in the budget process in 2004-05 to be used for strategic allocation by divisions, rather than for central distribution. The fund was meant to support projects that enhanced undergraduate student experience with a key objective being that successful projects have an immediate and positive impact for as many students as possible³. Each division developed its own mechanism to allocate the SEF. Within the Faculty of Arts and Science, submissions were prepared by departments and colleges, and students were fully engaged in various ways in the process of identifying priorities for funding. Last year, the Faculty had identified a need for upgraded science laboratories as many were forty to fifty years old and contained inadequate equipment. The proposal for the Chemical Laboratories had clearly met the criteria for the SEF. A member added that the President of the Arts and Science Students' Union had been part of the student representation on the SEF selection committee.

A member proposed that a tour of the Lash Miller Laboratories be arranged for the student governors to allow them to view the Phase I renovations. She felt sure that upon viewing the facility, they would recognize that the funds had been put to good use. The member stated that the facility was dedicated to teaching and had been designed to enhance the student experience while also maintaining the highest safety standards.

In response to the member's suggestion that funding for the proposal be withheld until the student governors had an opportunity to tour the facility, Professor Goel pointed out that approval of the motion at this time would allow for Phase II to be ready for student use in September 2007. Otherwise, there would be a delay of a full academic year.

The Chair asked the member if he was making a formal motion to delay the vote on the motion before the Council. The member stated that he was not, but that he would be unable to support the motion at this time.

A member suggested that the governance process should allow time for further consideration of an issue in the case of a successful motion to defer. Professor Goel explained that most proposals submitted to governance had been initiated within the University at least one year earlier and had been approved at the departmental and divisional levels after extensive planning and consultation. In the case of the Chemical Laboratories, the Project Planning Report had been submitted to the Planning and Budget Committee on January 12, 2007 after having gone through a thorough process at the departmental, divisional and administrative level.

A member suggested that the SEF criteria be attached to future Project Planning Reports in cases where the SEF was one of the sources of revenue.

³ Information on the Student Experience Fund is available on the website below:
<http://www.provost.utoronto.ca/plans/initiatives/SEF.htm>.

5. Items for Governing Council Approval (cont'd)**(d) Capital Project: Project Planning Report: Lash Miller Chemical Laboratories Undergraduate Laboratories, Final Phase (cont'd)**

The President urged members to allow the proposal to proceed, as the renovations were an important investment needed to enhance the student experience.

Mr. Charpentier also reminded members that the Office of the Governing Council worked together with the Chairs of the Boards and Committees and the administration to prepare a Calendar of Business, identifying items for governance consideration well in advance of the beginning of the academic year. As such, there was ample opportunity at several points throughout the governance process for concerns on matters to be raised before they reached the Council level.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

1. THAT the Project Planning Report for the Phase II Chemistry Undergraduate Practical Laboratory renovations, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 148 of the Academic Board as Appendix "D", be approved in principle.
2. THAT the total project scope consisting of approximately 2,175 NASM with a Total Project Cost of \$5,000,000 be approved with the funding sources identified as:

FAS & Department of Chemistry (50%-50%)	\$1,080,000
Faculty of Engineering	\$350,000
Faculty of Pharmacy	\$70,000
Outstanding funding requests	\$3,500,000
Total	\$5,000,000

(e) School of Graduate Studies: Master of Arts Program in Cinema Studies

Professor Marrus stated that the proposal for a one-year, course-based Master of Arts program followed on the approved establishment of the Cinema Studies Institute. There was a strong core of faculty in the field, and the structure of required and optional courses would allow for an excellent program. The program would begin small and grow slowly. No questions had been raised by members of the Board.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT the proposed Master of Arts (M.A.) Program in Cinema Studies, as described in Appendix "E" to Report Number 148 of the Academic Board, be established within the Faculty of Arts and Science, commencing September 2007.

6. Reports for Information

Members received the following reports for information.

- (a) Report Number 148 of the Academic Board (February 15, 2007)
- (b) Report Number 403 of the Executive Committee (March 8, 2007)
- (c) Report Number 154 of the Business Board (January 15, 2007)
- (d) Report Number 155 of the Business Board (February 26, 2007)
- (e) Report Number 139 of the University Affairs Board (January 16, 2007)

7. Date of the Next Meeting

The Chair reminded members that the next regular meeting of the Governing Council was scheduled for Thursday, April 26, 2007 at 4:30 p.m.

8. Question Period

Members had no questions for members of the senior administration.

9. Other Business

There were no items of Other Business.

IN ACCORDANCE WITH A DETERMINATION BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE PURSUANT TO SECTION 38 OF BY-LAW NUMBER 2, ITEMS 10, 11 AND 12 WERE CONSIDERED BY THE GOVERNING COUNCIL *IN CAMERA*.

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

(a) First Recommendation for Expulsion

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT the President's first recommendation for expulsion, as outlined in the memorandum and supporting documentation from the Secretary of the Governing Council, dated March 29, 2007, be confirmed.

(b) Second Recommendation for Expulsion

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT the President's second recommendation for expulsion, as outlined in the memorandum and supporting documentation from the Secretary of the Governing Council, dated March 29, 2007, be confirmed.

10. Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters: Recommendations for Expulsion (cont'd)

(c) Third Recommendation for Expulsion

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT the President's third recommendation for expulsion, as outlined in the memorandum and supporting documentation from the Secretary of the Governing Council, dated March 29, 2007, be confirmed.

11. Appointment to the Governing Council

(a) Teaching Staff Appointment

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT Professor Douglas Reeve serve on Governing Council beginning March 30, 2007 and until his term ends on June 30, 2010.

(b) Part-Time Undergraduate Student Appointment

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT Mr. Ken Davy serve on Governing Council beginning March 30, 2007 and until his term ends on June 30, 2008.

12. Senior Appointments

(a) Associate Vice-Provost, Relations with Health Care Institutions

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was Resolved

THAT the term of Professor John Wedge as Associate Vice-Provost, Relations with Health Care Institutions be extended for six months ending June 30, 2007.

(b) Vice-President, Advancement

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was Resolved

THAT Mr. David Palmer be appointed to the position of Vice-President, Advancement for a five-year term, effective September 1, 2007 and continuing until June 30, 2012.

The meeting adjourned at 6:05 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

April 10, 2007