

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL
**REPORT NUMBER 347 OF
THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

Wednesday, April 24, 2002

To the Governing Council,
University of Toronto.

Your Committee reports that it held a meeting on Wednesday, April 24, 2002 at 5:00 p.m. in the Board Room, Simcoe Hall, with the following members present:

Ms Wendy M. Cecil (In the Chair)	Dr. Thomas Simpson
Professor Robert J. Birgeneau, President	Non-Voting Member:
Dr. Robert Bennett	Mr. Louis R. Charpentier
Professor W. Raymond Cummins	Secretariat:
Professor Brian Langille	Ms Cristina Oke
Ms Karen Lewis	
Mr. Kashif Pirzada	
Dr. Joseph L. Rotman	
Ms Heather Schramm	

Regrets:

Mrs. Mary Anne V. Chambers
Professor Brian Corman
Mr. Gerald A. Lokash
Mrs. Susan M. Scace

In Attendance:

Professor Jack Carr, Chair, Academic Board
Mr. Amir Shalaby, Chair, Business Board
Ms Françoise Ko, Member, Governing Council
Ms Geeta Yadav, Member, Governing Council
Professor Adel Sedra, Member, Governing Council and Vice-President and Provost
Mr. Felix Chee, Vice-President, Business Affairs
Dr. Beata FitzPatrick, Director of the Office of the President and Assistant Vice-President
Professor Angela Hildyard, Vice-President, Human Resources
Professor Derek McCammond, Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget

Add to the Agenda

On motion duly moved and seconded, the consideration of a senior appointment and an item on interim updates to the *Policy on Approval and Execution of Contracts* were added to the agenda.

Vary the Agenda

On motion duly moved and seconded, the order of the agenda was varied to allow the consideration of the tuition fee schedules, the budget, and the notice of motion arising from the April 5 meeting of the Governing Council at the beginning of the agenda.

1. Item for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council

(a) Item 8 (a): Tuition-Fee Schedules for Publicly Funded Programs (Arising from Report Number 117 of the Business Board (April 8, 2002))

Mr. Shalaby explained that, for more than half of the students, tuition was regulated by the Province, and increases were limited to 1.96%. For a further 40% of students, fees were proposed to increase by 5%.

Mr. Shalaby informed members that, for students who were now at the University and continuing their programs, the fee increase was proposed to be either 1.96% in the fee-regulated programs or 5%. For about 10% of students entering the University in the coming year, fees would increase more substantially. For new students entering the Master of Business Administration Program, tuition fees would increase from \$20,000 per year to \$23,500. For students entering the undergraduate program in Law, tuition fees would increase by \$2,000 to \$14,000. In Dentistry, tuition fees would increase by 12% to \$16,500. For students entering the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering, the tuition fee would be \$6,250. Students entering programs in Commerce, Computer Science, and the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM) program in Culture, Communications and Information Technology complete a program similar to other Arts and Science students in their first year, and they would pay the same fee. In their second year, however, they took more specialized courses in their fields, and they would pay increased tuition fees: \$8,000 for commerce and business administration students, and \$6,250 for Computer Science students.

In some cases, in particular law and the Master of Business Administration, the increases were one step in a planned multi-year increase. It should be understood unequivocally that the approval being proposed at this time was for the fee for 2002-03 only. The Provost had assured the Business Board that the administration would propose the next phase of increases only if it were satisfied of the following:

- that there had been no impediment to accessibility;
- that the program had used the additional proceeds to make substantial quality improvements; and
- that (in the case of law) there had been no steering effect to particular areas of the law because of concerns about accumulated debt from student loans.

Mr. Shalaby noted that the fee formula would change for international students. In the past, fee increases for international students had been the same dollar amount as those for Canadian students. That translated into a smaller percent increase. International students attracted no government funding, and a new formula was being proposed. The tuition fees for international students would be the amount of the domestic student fee plus the amount of the government grant the students would have attracted had they been domestic students. In some cases, the fee increase under the new formula was higher - marginally so in Physical Education, for example, but significantly higher in other cases such as Music, where the difference was over \$3,000.

1. Item for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council (cont'd)**(a) Item 8 (a): Tuition-Fee Schedules for Publicly Funded Programs (cont'd)**

Mr. Shalaby indicated that the Board had had a long and excellent debate, and had heard representations from three student associations. Where fee increases were to exceed 5%, the Deans of the relevant faculties had been present to answer questions. For example, Dean Daniels explained the reasons for the proposal to increase fees in Law, giving the Board specific examples of the Faculty's need to compete to retain its top faculty. He concluded that the proposal was clearly ready to go forward to the Governing Council.

The President remarked that the Policy on Student Financial Support of the University of Toronto, which guaranteed that 'No student offered admission to a program at the University of Toronto should be unable to enter or complete the program due to lack of financial means', made it unique among Canadian universities. National statistics on accessibility were irrelevant to the University because of this policy. He noted that the proportion of students from low income families in high tuition programs (18%) was virtually the same as the proportion in low tuition programs (20%), and that the pool of applicants did not appear to be changing.

A member asked whether the pool of applicants was changing in response to the increased tuition. The President indicated that his previous statement had addressed that question.

A member asked whether students with high debt loads were choosing to work abroad or to make career choices that would help them pay down their debt. The Provost stated that a commitment had been made by the administration to monitor the career choices of law students and to provide an annual report on this matter. The idea of working abroad because of favourable exchange rates was not a factor that had, to his knowledge, been considered but, he noted, it would be taken under consideration.

The President noted that issues of accessibility raised in the context of tuition fee discussions were more properly dealt with by an appropriate financial aid strategy.

At the invitation of the Chair, a member described the back-end debt relief program that was available within the Faculty of Law, and noted that every student who had applied for relief through this program had had their requests granted. Both the back-end debt relief and front-end debt relief programs had been designed by students.

A member asked for clarification about the role of the Executive Committee with respect to the tuition fee schedule. The Chairman responded that the role of the Executive Committee was not to debate the matter if it agreed the matter was ready for the consideration of the Governing Council, but to forward the motion to the Governing Council.

A member remarked on the evolution of the student financial aid program that had originated with a Task Force Report in 1997, and stated his belief in the commitment of the senior administration to student financial aid.

A member indicated that there was widespread dissatisfaction among students concerning student financial assistance, and that a request would be made for a study of the reasons for this dissatisfaction. The member asked if the University had a strategy for outreach in low income communities. The President noted one example of outreach, that members of the University community were meeting with leaders in the Regent Park community of Toronto to encourage students in that area to consider attending the University of Toronto.

1. Item for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council (cont'd)**(a) Item 8 (a): Tuition-Fee Schedules for Publicly Funded Programs (cont'd)**

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED

to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation

THAT the proposed tuition-fee schedules for publicly funded programs for 2002-03 be approved.

(b) Item 8(b): Tuition-Fee Schedules for Self-funded Programs

(Arising from Report Number 117 of the Business Board (April 8, 2002))

Mr. Shalaby explained that, for the self-funded programs, there was no government funding. Tuition fees were set at the level required to enable each program to recover its costs. For most of the self-funded programs, the increase was 5% or less. In three cases, there were larger increases. In the Executive M.B.A. (Global Option) the increase was 10% to cover the cost of the overseas component of the program. In the Master of Management and Professional Accounting, the proposed fee increase was 6.5% for domestic students. In OISE/UT, the fee for the Institute for Child Study's laboratory school was proposed to increase by 8.9%. For the University of Toronto Schools (U.T.S.), the increase proposed was 17.9%, which included the second phase of a levy to improve U.T.S. facilities.

Mr. Shalaby reported that the Business Board had considered the tuition-fee schedule very carefully. It had reviewed the Enrolment Report, and it was clear that enrolment was very strong.

Mr. Shalaby informed members that the Business Board had also reviewed the annual report of the Vice-Provost, Students on student financial support, and concluded that needy students were not being priced out of the University. The report demonstrated that accessibility to the University had been maintained for potentially disadvantaged students in all categories including gender, parental income, parental education, ethno-cultural background, and reliance on the Ontario Student Assistance Program (OSAP).

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED

to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation

THAT the proposed tuition-fee schedule for self-funded programs for 2002-03 be approved.

2. Business Arising from the Governing Council meeting of April 5, 2002**(a) Notice of Motion**

The Chairman recalled that a notice of motion had been made at the April 5, 2002 meeting of the Governing Council:

THAT tuition fee increases for the Faculty of Law be considered separately from the tuition fee schedule for de-regulated programs.

2. Business Arising from the Governing Council meeting of April 5, 2002 (cont'd)**(a) Notice of Motion (cont'd)**

The member who proposed the notice of motion asked whether it would be procedurally permissible to amend the motion to add other tuition fee increases. At the request of the Chairman, the Secretary spoke to the general principle: that the proposal before the Board had been presented as a single non-divisible motion, therefore, the appropriate motion would be to refer the tuition fee schedule back to the Business Board, if the member so wished. The member made a brief power point presentation to the Committee in support of his notice of motion.

A member asked whether the motion was in order. At the request of the Chairman, the Secretary explained that the Committee was being asked to determine whether or not the notice of motion should be placed on the agenda of the Governing Council. He noted that there had been no request for a division of the motion at the meeting of the Business Board at which the tuition schedule had been recommended for approval. He also noted that the Agenda Planning group of the Business Board had discussed the issue and determined that dividing the tuition fee schedule into separate components was not appropriate.

Professor Sedra advised the Committee not to place the motion on the agenda of the Governing Council meeting as it would set a precedent of separating elements of the tuition schedule after it had been duly considered by the appropriate Board. A member supported the advice of the Vice-President and Provost, and noted that members of the Governing Council had a fiduciary responsibility to consider the tuition schedule and budget as a whole. The Secretary also noted that it had been the consistent practice of the Governing Council, following the principle approved in the Balfour Report, to accept, reject or refer back motions from its Boards and Committees, rather than to change them.

A member explained that there had been a full public debate on the planned tuition increases within the Faculty of Law, and that the Dean had addressed all the concerns that had been raised.

It was duly moved and seconded,

THAT the following motion be placed on the agenda of the Governing Council meeting:

THAT tuition fee increases for the Faculty of Law be considered separately from the tuition fee schedule for de-regulated programs.

The motion was defeated.

The President commented that the senior administration took the issue of tuition increases very seriously, and were joining in a student-led review of the Ontario Student Assistance Program (OSAP). Professor Sedra added that the senior administration was proud of the University's student financial support policy, and welcomed an opportunity to discuss and address the concerns which had been mentioned earlier in the meeting.

The Chairman drew the attention of members to the letters regarding the increase in tuition for the Faculty of Law which had been placed on the table. She noted that the letters would be circulated to members of the Governing Council, along with material provided by the Dean.

2. Business Arising from the Governing Council meeting of April 5, 2002 (cont'd)**(a) Notice of Motion (cont'd)**

The Chairman informed members of several speaking requests on the item of the tuition fee schedule which had been received for the May 2 meeting of the Governing Council from the following groups: the Graduate Students' Union on behalf of five student groups (APUS, SAC, GSU, ASSU, OISE/UT GSA); Councillor Olivia Chow; the Law Alumni Coalition; the Law Alumni Association, and the University of Toronto Schools' Parents' Association. After discussion, members of the Committee advised the Chairman that all the requests that had been received prior to the meeting of the Executive Committee should be granted.

3. Item for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council**(a) Budget Report 2002-03**

(Arising from Report Number 111 of the Academic Board (April 11, 2002) and Report Number 117 of the Business Board (April 8, 2002))

Professor Carr stated that Professor Sedra had given a comprehensive overview of the budget in his presentation to the Board. Although there had been a good discussion of the Budget at the Planning and Budget Committee, the Academic Board members had had no questions. A member had noted that the ease with which the Budget and other items on the Board agenda were dealt with was in large part due to the trust the members had in the expertise of the budget and planning secretariat - particularly in Professors Adel Sedra and Derek McCammond and Mr. Martin England.

On behalf of the Chair of the Business Board, Dr. Simpson reported that the Business Board was responsible for reviewing the Budget Report and advising the Governing Council whether it was financially responsible.

He noted that the proposed budget would leave the University with a cumulative deficit of some \$20.3-million, which is \$7-million above the usual policy limit of 1.5% of operating revenue. This was permissible, however, if the long-range budget plan would bring the deficit under the limit by the end of the planning period, in 2003-04. The plan projected a surplus in 2003-04, which would bring the cumulative deficit in under the limit.

He reported that, at the Business Board meeting, both the President and Professor Sedra had reviewed the key budget assumptions and areas of risk, and had assured the Board that the assumptions were reasonable and the risks acceptable. The Business Board had accepted those assurances and concurred with the recommendation of the Academic Board that the Budget Report be approved.

A member noted that construction projects were being approved based on enrolment expansion, and asked for clarification on the risk involved in the timing vis-à-vis the University's dependence on funding for capital projects. Professor Sedra replied that the University was confident that the funds promised by the provincial government would be provided. Mr. Chee added that the University was aware of the amount of the gap between the funding that was in place and the costs of approved capital projects, and that sufficient funds were available for the projects to proceed.

3. Item for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council (cont'd)**(a) Budget Report 2002-03 (cont'd)**

A member expressed concern that capital mortgages were in place, and that if the necessary funds did not materialize for the capital projects, funds would be diverted from faculty and program needs. Professor Sedra assured the member that such a situation would be a University problem, not a divisional problem, and that the enrolment expansion plan would have to be reconsidered if the appropriate funding was not provided.

Mr. Chee pointed out the distinction between internal debt, which amounted to less than 2% of the operating budget of the University and which could be restructured, and external debt. A member commented that the University should not sacrifice areas of excellence in order to help the government deal with its problems. The President indicated his agreement that areas of excellence should not be sacrificed, but noted that, as a public institution, the University had an obligation to students in the greater Toronto area who wished to study at the University of Toronto.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED

to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation

THAT the Budget Report 2002-03 be approved.

THE COMMITTEE MOVED INTO *IN CAMERA* SESSION.

4. Senior Appointments

The Executive Committee considered a recommendation from the President for a senior appointment.

Following discussion,

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED

to the Governing Council for consideration

The recommendation for a senior appointment contained in the memorandum from the President dated April 24, 2002.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

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

4. Senior Appointments (cont'd)

The Executive Committee then considered a second recommendation for a senior appointment.

Following discussion,

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED

to the Governing Council for consideration

The recommendations contained in the Memorandum from the Secretary of the Governing Council dated April 23, 2002.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

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

THE COMMITTEE MOVED INTO CLOSED SESSION.

5. Reports of the Previous Meetings

Report Number 345 of the Executive Committee meeting held on March 25, 2002 and Report Number 346 of the Executive Committee meeting held on April 11, 2002 were approved.

6. Business Arising from the Reports of the Previous Meetings

There was no business arising from the previous meetings.

7. Minutes of the Governing Council Meetings held on April 5, 2002 and April 11, 2002

The Committee received for information copies of the minutes of the Governing Council meetings held on April 5, 2002 and April 11, 2002.

8. Business Arising from the Governing Council Meetings**(a) Ticketing for Governing Council Meetings**

The Chairman recalled the discussion at the April 5 meeting of Council in response to this Committee's decision about ticketing. She noted that several members of the Governing Council asked the Executive Committee to reconsider the decision to implement ticketed seating for meetings of the Governing Council.

The Chairman reminded members of the Committee's discussion of March 25. She indicated that there was a requirement to hold Governing Council meetings in open session and therefore to permit access by the general public to the Council's deliberations. She also commented that there was a responsibility to ensure that representatives from across the University's constituencies had the opportunity to attend if they wanted or needed to do so. The approach to ticketing reflected current practice with respect to meeting notices. It was fair to all constituencies and included access by the media to ensure broad public access. It ensured, for example, that student governments,

8. Business Arising from the Governing Council Meetings (cont'd)**(a) Ticketing for Governing Council Meetings (cont'd)**

the University of Toronto Faculty Association (UTFA) and the United Steelworkers of America (USWA) had first priority to reserve seats. The ticketing system had worked well at the last meeting of the Council. Given the agenda, it might not have been a representative meeting, but guests were admitted quickly and some seats were not filled. The Chairman indicated that, in anticipation of attendance at the May 2 meeting, the Board Room would be set up as an overflow space with an audio feed.

It was the sense of members of the Committee that there was no need to reconsider the use of ticketed seating.

A member asked whether it would be possible to make an audio recording of meetings of the Governing Council which could then be made available upon request to those who wished to listen to the tapes. At the request of the Chairman, the Secretary replied that the official record of the meeting was the Minutes, and that audio recording of the meetings would not be appropriate.

(b) Meeting Disruptions

The Chairman noted that, at the Governing Council meeting of April 5, questions had been raised with respect to alternatives for dealing with disruptions. A suggestion had been made that the Governing Council develop a policy with respect to public access to Council meetings. At the invitation of the Chairman, the Secretary commented that there was no reason for a policy on public access as the *University of Toronto Act* prescribed that Governing Council meetings were open to the public.

The Chairman asked the advice of members on the matter of meeting disruptions. At the meeting of March 25, the Committee had had a broad-ranging discussion of the matter. It was agreed to provide a summary of the discussion to be recorded in this Report. Members of the Executive Committee had discussed the possibility of physically removing individuals who disrupted the meeting. It was the consensus of members that they did not want to be party to having anyone physically removed from the meeting. The current practice of having the Chairman call for order, and, if order was not restored, calling a brief recess, and reconvening in another location would be continued.

It was also the consensus of members that firm follow-up action be taken with respect to those who participated in a meeting disruption, including making appropriate charges under University policies or under municipal, provincial or federal laws. In this context, a letter would be sent by the Secretary to individuals who had participated in the disruption. It would include the following points: that the individuals had behaved in a way that interfered with the regular business of the University, thereby contravening University policy; that free speech extended to members of the Governing Council as well as to those who voiced opinions different from those of members of the Council; that the use of video cameras to record how members of the Governing Council had voted on an issue contravened By-Law Number 2 which described procedures for requesting a recorded vote. Members agreed that the purpose of the proposed letter was to provide a written record of the disruption and indicate that, in future, there would be consequences for inappropriate behaviour which disrupted the Governing Council's ability to conduct the University's business.

8. Business Arising from the Governing Council Meetings (cont'd)**(c) Costs of Meeting Disruption**

At the request of the Chairman, the Secretary reported on the additional costs created by meeting disruptions. He noted that full payment (\$800) had to be made for the audio equipment and technician even if the meeting were moved and the audio equipment could not be moved. Appropriate space for the meeting, at a cost of up to \$90, had to be reserved, whether or not it was used. Six security staff were required at a cost of \$1,100. Additional staff time within the Office of the Governing Council was required to review procedures and to ensure preparations were complete, at a cost of approximately \$400. Three additional senior staff from the Office were also required to attend the meeting, at an additional cost of \$360. The cost of ticket printing and distribution was approximately \$120, reflecting the staff time involved in the distribution of tickets.

A member asked whether the described costs could be differentiated from the regular costs of a meeting of the Governing Council. The Secretary replied that all the costs he had provided were additional costs that reflected the arrangements that had to be made and work that had to be done to provide for options in the event of meeting disruptions. It was the responsibility of his office to ensure that appropriate facilities were available and that procedures were in place to allow the Governing Council to conduct its business.

9. Report of the President

The President reported briefly on the following matters.

(a) Appointment of Professor Heather Munroe-Blum

The President reminded members of the recent appointment of Professor Heather Munroe-Blum as Principal and Vice-Chancellor of McGill University, effective January 1, 2003.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

THAT the Executive Committee recognize and express its appreciation for the significant contributions to higher education made by Professor Heather Munroe-Blum during her service to the University of Toronto over the past eight years as Vice-President, Research and International Relations.

(b) Meeting of the Association of American Universities (AAU)

The President reported that he had attended the recent meeting of the Association of American Universities.

(c) Appointment of the Vice-President and Provost

The President informed members that he had received many congratulatory remarks on the appointment of Professor Shirley Neuman as Vice-President and Provost, effective July 1, 2002. Professor Neuman will be coming to Toronto several times in the next two months to meet with Provost Sedra and others.

9. President's Report (cont'd)**(d) Retired Female Faculty**

The President congratulated Professor Hildyard, Vice-President, Human Resources, and Professor Vivek Goel, Vice-Provost, Faculty, for their work in successfully negotiating an agreement with retired female faculty members of the University.

(e) University of Toronto Faculty Association

The President noted that Professor George Luste had been elected as President of the University of Toronto Faculty Association, effective July 1, 2002.

(f) Varsity Project Referendum

The President expressed his disappointment at the result of the Referendum on the Varsity Project, in which the proposed student levy for the Varsity Project was defeated.

(g) Provincial Budget

The President indicated that he was optimistic about the next provincial budget.

(h) Federal Government Relations

The President reported on recent meetings he had attended in Ottawa.

10. Interim Updates to Policy on Approval and Execution of Contracts and Documents

At the invitation of the Chairman, the Secretary stated that the proposed interim provisions were designed to achieve two goals: to update the position titles of signing officers to reflect current titles and responsibilities, and to remove a provision with respect to bills of sale.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED

to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation

THAT the proposed revisions to the *Policy on Approval and Execution of Contracts and Documents*, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "A", be recommended to the Governing Council for approval.

11. Item for Confirmation by the Executive Committee

(Arising from Report Number 111 of the Academic Board (April 11, 2002))

Professor Carr explained that the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC) proposed to offer joint programs, with Centennial College, in Journalism and in New Media. The Journalism program would be unique in the University. Discussion with the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM) about its new program in Communication, Culture and Technology revealed that the New Media program at UTSC would be distinctive.

11. Item for Confirmation by the Executive Committee (cont'd)

Enrolment in both programs would be 25 each year. Costs associated with the programs would be met from the UTSC Enrolment Growth Fund allocation.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE CONFIRMED

THAT the proposals for new Joint Programs with Centennial College, as described in the University of Toronto at Scarborough submission for 2002-2003 to the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs dated December 6, 2001, be approved, effective for the academic year 2002-03.

12. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council

The following motions were presented as omnibus motions in appropriate groupings by Professor Carr.

(a) Item 6: Academic Priorities Fund: Allocation - Faculty of Dentistry, *Raising Our Sights Plan*

(Arising from Report Number 111 of the Academic Board (April 11, 2002))

Professor Carr noted that this allocation completed the Faculty's requests under the current round of academic planning.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED

to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation:

THAT allocations from the Academic Priorities Fund of \$167,300 in base and \$125,000 OTO for the Faculty of Dentistry, as described in the memorandum from the Vice-President and Provost dated February 6, 2002 which is attached to Report Number 111 of the Academic Board as Appendix "D", be approved.

(b) Item 7: Academic Priorities Fund: Allocation - Faculty of Information Studies, *Raising Our Sights Plan*

(Arising from Report Number 111 of the Academic Board (April 11, 2002))

Professor Carr indicated that this allocation was in support of the Faculty's *Raising Our Sights* plan.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED

to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation:

THAT an allocation of \$60,000 in base and \$107,000 OTO for the Faculty of Information Studies from the Academic Priorities Fund, as described in the memorandum from the Vice-President and Provost

12. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council (cont'd)**(b) Item 7: Academic Priorities Fund: Allocation - Faculty of Information Studies, *Raising Our Sights Plan* (cont'd)**

dated March 7, 2002 which is attached to Report Number 111 of the Academic Board as Appendix "E", be approved.

(c) Item 8: Academic Priorities Fund: Allocation - Office of Teaching Advancement (Arising from Report Number 111 of the Academic Board (April 11, 2002))

Professor Carr reported that this allocation supported the establishment of the new Office of Teaching Advancement.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED

to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation:

THAT an allocation of \$182,948 in base funding from the Academic Priorities Fund for the Office of Teaching Advancement, as described in the memorandum from the Vice-President and Provost dated March 7, 2002 which is attached to Report Number 111 of the Academic Board as Appendix "F", be approved.

(d) Academic Priorities Fund: Allocation - University of Toronto at Mississauga (Arising from Report Number 111 of the Academic Board (April 11, 2002))

Professor Carr indicated that this motion supported enrolment expansion at the University of Toronto at Mississauga.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED

to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation:

THAT an allocation of \$1,952,000 in base funding from the Academic Priorities Fund for the University of Toronto at Mississauga, as described in the memorandum from the Vice-President and Provost dated March 7, 2002 which is attached to Report Number 111 of the Academic Board as Appendix "G", be approved.

(e) Item 10: Academic Priorities Fund: Allocation - University of Toronto at Scarborough, University of Toronto at Mississauga and Faculty of Arts and Science: Computer Science Program, and Commerce, Management and Business Programs

(Arising from Report Number 111 of the Academic Board (April 11, 2002))

Professor Carr noted that these allocations supported programs in commerce, management, business administration and computing science.

12. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council (cont'd)**(e) Item 10: Academic Priorities Fund: Allocation - University of Toronto at Scarborough, University of Toronto at Mississauga and Faculty of Arts and Science: Computer Science Program, and Commerce, Management and Business Programs (cont'd)**

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED

to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation:

THAT the base allocations from the Academic Priorities Fund for quality improvements in the following undergraduate programs, as described in the memorandum from the Vice-President and Provost dated March 7, 2002 which is attached to Report Number 111 of the Academic Board as Appendix "H", be approved:

- (a) \$682,684 to the Faculty of Arts and Science for expenditure on the Commerce Program,
- (b) \$567,394 to the University of Toronto at Mississauga for expenditure on the Commerce and Management Programs,
- (c) \$911,434 to the University of Toronto at Scarborough for expenditure on the Bachelor of Business Administration Program,
- (d) \$298,095 to the University of Toronto at Scarborough for expenditure on the Computing Science programs.

(f) Item 11: Academic Priorities Fund: Allocation - Miscellaneous *Raising Our Sights* Plans (Arising from Report Number 111 of the Academic Board (April 11, 2002))

Professor Carr commented that these allocations continued the support to *Raising Our Sights* plans.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED

to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation:

(a) THAT the following allocations from the Academic Priorities Fund, as described in the memorandum from the Vice-President and Provost dated March 7, 2002 which is attached to Report Number 111 of the Academic Board as Appendix "I", be approved:

- i) A base allocation of \$70,800 to the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto (OISE/UT) to match increased SSHRC fellowships;
- ii) A one-time-only allocation of \$99,000 to the Asian Institute subject to approval of its establishment;
- iii) A base allocation of \$480,191 for salary and benefits in unfunded academic/librarian positions described in the memo of March 7, 2002.

(b) THAT base allocations from the Academic Priorities Fund in 2002-03 and 2003-04 to protect the Transitional Year Program from budget cuts be approved.

12. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council (cont'd)**(g) Item 12: Enrolment Growth Fund: Allocations - 2001-02**

(Arising from Report Number 111 of the Academic Board (April 11, 2002))

Professor Carr explained that this item concerned one-time only (OTO) allocations from the Enrolment Growth Fund to a number of academic divisions and the Library to help them meet the demands of enrolment expansion in 2001-02.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED

to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation:

THAT the following allocations, as described in the memorandum from the Vice-President and Provost dated February 15, 2002 which is attached to Report Number 111 of the Academic Board as Appendix "J", be approved from the Enrolment Growth Fund to the divisions to accommodate the 2001-02 enrolment expansion.

(a) one-time-only funding in 2001-02 of:

Library	\$500,000
Faculty of Arts and Science	\$3,446,881
University of Toronto at Scarborough	\$1,081,164
Faculty of Pharmacy	\$329,251
Faculty of Nursing	\$164,929
Faculty of Applied Science & Engineering	\$705,311

(b) base funding in 2002-03 of:

Library	\$500,000
Faculty of Arts and Science	\$3,381,534
University of Toronto at Mississauga	\$669,728
University of Toronto at Scarborough	\$1,364,175
Faculty of Pharmacy	\$493,876
Faculty of Nursing	\$247,393
Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering	\$881,576

(h) Item 13: Capital Project: University of Toronto at Scarborough - Management Building - Revised Project Planning Report

(Arising from Report Number 111 of the Academic Board (April 11, 2002))

Professor Carr indicated that this project had undergone a change in design.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED

to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation:

(a) THAT the revised Project Planning Report for the UTSC Management Building, as described in the memorandum from the Vice-Provost, Space and Facilities Planning dated March 7, 2002 which is attached to Report Number 111 of the Academic Board as Appendix "K", be approved in principle.

12. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council (cont'd)**(h) Item 13: Capital Project: University of Toronto at Scarborough - Management Building - Revised Project Planning Report (cont'd)**

(b) THAT the revised project scope of 2436 nasm in total on a site adjacent to the existing Humanities Wing be approved at an estimated cost of \$15.53 million (2003 dollars) excluding campus improvements.

(c) THAT the funding sources to construct the Management Building and advance the project will be allocated as follows:

(i) Allocation of \$14.37 million from the Phase I enrolment growth income that will be available to UTSC, and

(ii) External contributions by donors and others support through UTSC in the amount of \$1.16 million.

(i) Item 14: Capital Project: Sidney Smith Infill - Revised Project Planning Report University Infrastructure Investment Fund: Allocation
(Arising from Report Number 111 of the Academic Board (April 11, 2002))

Professor Carr stated that the scope of this project had been revised.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED

to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation:

(a) THAT the revised Sidney Smith Infill project, as described in the memorandum from the Vice- Provost, Space and Facilities Planning dated March 7, 2002 which is attached to Report Number 111 of the Academic Board as Appendix "L", be approved in principle,

(b) THAT the revised Sidney Smith Infill project be undertaken at a cost of \$3,075,000, and

(c) THAT the funding sources for this project be approved as follows:

(i) An allocation of \$875,000 from the Faculty of Arts and Science

(ii) The allocation of \$1,289,000 from the University Investment Infrastructure Fund previously approved be increased by \$711,000 to a total allocation of \$2,000,000 and

(iii) An allocation of \$200,000 from the funds available to the Accommodation and Facilities Directorate.

(j) Item 15: Capital Project: University of Toronto at Scarborough - Academic Resource Centre - Change of Scope - Project Planning Report
(Arising from Report Number 111 of the Academic Board (April 11, 2002))

Professor Carr indicated that the scope of this project had been revised.

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

(j) Item 15: Capital Project: University of Toronto at Scarborough - Academic Resource Centre - Change of Scope - Project Planning Report (cont'd)

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED

to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation:

(a) THAT the March 2001 revisions to the Academic Resource Centre at the University of Toronto at Scarborough, as described in the memorandum from the Vice- Provost, Space and Facilities Planning dated March 7, 2002 which is attached to Report Number 111 of the Academic Board as Appendix "M", be approved in principle.

(b) THAT project scope of 4571 net assignable square meters (nasm) of new space and 1286 nasm of renovated space at a cost of \$22,560,000 be approved, with the funding sources as follows:

SuperBuild Funds/Centennial Lease*	\$10.30 million
Allocation from the Phase I enrolment expansion at UTSC	11.99
Institutional Contribution, UTSC	1.20
Total	\$23.49 million
Encumbrance: *Due Diligence costs	(0.080)
Encumbrance: ATOP	(0.100)
Encumbrance: *Soil Remediation	(0.500)
Encumbrance: *Traffic Improvements	(0.250)
Funds available to support the Project	\$22.56 million

(k) Item 16: Capital Project: University of Toronto at Mississauga, Phase I - Allocation for Capital Projects Enrolment Growth Fund: Allocation

(Arising from Report Number 111 of the Academic Board (April 11, 2002))

Professor Carr explained that individual projects over \$2 million must be approved by the Governing Council, and that funding for all projects identified in Phase I would be provided from the Enrolment Growth Fund allocations derived from enrolment expansion.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED

to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation:

Subject to Governing Council approval of any individual project costing over \$2-million and approval by the Accommodation and Facilities Directorate of individual projects costing less than \$2-million, and subject to quarterly reports by the Vice-Provost, Space and Facilities Planning, on the progress of the Phase I plan to expand the University of Toronto at Mississauga,

12. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council (cont'd)**(k) Item 16: Capital Project: University of Toronto at Mississauga, Phase I - Allocation for Capital Projects (cont'd)
Enrolment Growth Fund: Allocation (cont'd)**

(a) THAT funding of \$26.1 million plus interest from the Enrolment Growth Fund allocation(s) to the University of Toronto at Mississauga, as described in the memorandum from the Vice- Provost, Space and Facilities Planning dated March 7, 2002 which is attached to Report Number 111 of the Academic Board as Appendix "N", be approved for the following capital projects for the Phase I expansion of the University of Toronto at Mississauga, [the projects to be financed, with principal and interest repaid over time by the University of Toronto at Mississauga from its Enrolment Growth Fund allocations, deriving from enrolment expansion]:

Phase I: Communication, Culture and Information Technology
Phase I: Vertical Expansion of the Centre for Applied Bioscience & Biotechnology [CABB]
Phase I: Kaneff Building Expansion
Phase I: Collegeway Stage 1
Phase I: Basement for the CABB
Phase I: North Building/ Classroom Renovation
Phase I: Collegeway Stage 2
Phase I: South Building Renovation
Phase I: Library Improvements

(b) THAT authority be delegated to the Vice-President and Provost and the Principal of the University of Toronto at Mississauga to allocate this funding to individual projects costing less than \$2-million.

**(l) Item 17: Capital Project: University of Toronto at Scarborough, Phase I - Allocation for Capital Projects
Enrolment Growth Fund: Allocation**

(Arising from Report Number 111 of the Academic Board (April 11, 2002))

Professor Carr explained that, as in the motion above, individual projects over \$2 million must be approved by the Governing Council, and that funding for all projects identified in Phase I would be provided from the Enrolment Growth Fund allocations derived from enrolment expansion.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED

to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation:

Subject to Governing Council approval of any individual project costing over \$2 million and approval by the Accommodation and Facilities Directorate of individual projects costing less than \$2 million, and subject to quarterly reports by the Vice-Provost, Space and Facilities Planning, on the progress of the Phase I plan to expand the University of Toronto at Scarborough,

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

**(l) Item 17: Capital Project: University of Toronto at Scarborough, Phase I - Allocation for Capital Projects (cont'd)
Enrolment Growth Fund: Allocation (cont'd)**

(a) THAT funding of \$28.98 million plus interest from the Enrolment Growth Fund allocation(s) to UTSC, as described in the memorandum from the Vice- Provost, Space and Facilities Planning dated March 7, 2002 which is attached to Report Number 111 of the Academic Board as Appendix "O", be approved for the following capital projects for the Phase I expansion of the University of Toronto at Scarborough, [the projects to be financed, with principal and interest to be repaid over time by the University of Toronto at Scarborough from its Enrolment Growth Fund allocations, deriving from its enrolment expansion]:

Phase I: Academic Resource Centre [ARC]
Phase I: Management Building
Phase I: Renovation to Arts and Science Facilities
Phase I: Infills for Offices and other Facilities
Phase I: Renovations: Delivery Services
Phase I: Roads, Landscaping and Bridge

(b) THAT authority be delegated to the Vice-President and Provost and the Principal of the University of Toronto at Scarborough to allocate this funding to individual projects costing less than \$2-million.

(m) Item 18: University Infrastructure Investment Fund: Allocation: Office of Teaching Advancement and Resource Centre for Academic Technology
(Arising from Report Number 111 of the Academic Board (April 11, 2002))

Professor Carr informed members that this allocation concerned space for the newly created Office of Teaching Advancement.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED

to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation:

THAT an allocation of \$460,000 from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund towards the complete cost of the establishing the Office of Teaching Advancement and the upgrading of the Resource Centre for Academic Technology facilities, as described in the memorandum from the Vice- Provost, Space and Facilities Planning dated March 7, 2002 which is attached to Report Number 111 of the Academic Board as Appendix "P", be approved.

(n) Item 19: University Infrastructure Investment Fund: Allocation - Governing Council Chamber and Board Room Restoration, Refurbishment and Renovation

(Arising from Report Number 111 of the Academic Board (April 11, 2002))

Professor Carr indicated that this allocation concerned the restoration, refurbishment and renovation of the Council Chamber and Board Room.

12. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council (cont'd)**(n) Item 19: University Infrastructure Investment Fund: Allocation - Governing Council Chamber and Board Room Restoration, Refurbishment and Renovation (cont'd)**

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED

to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation:

THAT an allocation of \$1,593,000 from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund for the complete cost of the restoration, refurbishment and renovation of the Council Chamber and the Board Room in Simcoe Hall, as described in the memorandum from the Vice- Provost, Space and Facilities Planning dated March 7, 2002 which is attached to Report Number 111 of the Academic Board as Appendix "Q", be approved.

(o) Item 20: University Infrastructure Investment Fund: Allocation - Alumni Hall, University of St. Michael's College

(Arising from Report Number 111 of the Academic Board (April 11, 2002))

Professor Carr noted that this allocation would convert a concert theatre at St. Michael's into a dedicated classroom.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED

to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation:

THAT an allocation of \$300,000 from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund toward the renovation of Alumni Hall in the University of St. Michael's College so as to provide a significant teaching facility for programs within the Faculty of Arts and Science, as described in the memorandum from the Vice- Provost, Space and Facilities Planning dated March 7, 2002 which is attached to Report Number 111 of the Academic Board as Appendix "R", be approved.

(p) Item 21: School of Graduate Studies: Establishment of Risk Management Institute
(Arising from Report Number 111 of the Academic Board (April 11, 2002))

Professor Carr explained that, under the terms of the Marsden report, an institute that would enrol students and appoint teaching staff must be approved by Governing Council. It was proposed that the Master of Mathematical Finance program would eventually move to the Institute and that the Institute would offer at least one additional professional master's program.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED

to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation:

THAT the establishment of the Risk Management Institute, within Division III of the School of Graduate Studies, be approved effective immediately.

12. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council (cont'd)**(q) Item 5: Designation of Programs for the Purposes of Governing Council Elections**
(Arising from Report Number 106 of the University Affairs Board (March 26, 2002))

On behalf of the Chair of the University Affairs Board, Ms Lewis stated that the University Affairs Board was responsible for policy or procedures relating to Governing Council elections. Minor amendments to the Election Guidelines could be approved by the UAB. However, when the amendment is major – such as the inclusion of a new group within the University community – it was considered by the UAB and a recommendation was made to the Governing Council.

The recommendation coming forward from the University Affairs Board concluded a lengthy consultative process with respect to the status of special students in Governing Council elections. This recommendation of the Elections Committee had been well-received and overwhelmingly supported by members of the University Affairs Board.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED

to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation:

THAT the Transitional Year Program and the Millie Rotman Shime Academic Bridging Program be designated by the Governing Council as programs of post-secondary study at the University of Toronto for the purposes of clause 1 (1) (l) of the *University of Toronto Act, 1971*, for the purposes of Governing Council elections.

13. Reports for Information

Members received in their agenda packages the following report:

Report Number 111 of the Academic Board (April 11, 2002)

The following reports were placed on the table:

Report Number 117 of the Business Board (April 8, 2002)

Report Number 106 of the University Affairs Board (March 26, 2002)

14. Date of Next Meeting

The Chairman reminded members that the Committee's next regular meeting was scheduled for **Tuesday May 21st** at 5 pm.

15. Other Business**(a) Order of Agenda for the Meeting of the Governing Council on Thursday May 2, 2002 at 4:30 p.m.**

The Chairman consulted with members on the order of the agenda for the May 2, 2002 meeting of the Governing Council. It was agreed that the meeting would begin with the *in camera* session, following which the meeting would go into open session.

15. Other Business

**(b) Leadership role of Executive Committee members at meetings of the
Governing Council**

The Chairman reminded members of the Committee of their responsibility in ensuring that a balanced and informed debate on issues was conducted at meetings of the Governing Council. She encouraged members to speak out if they realized that important points, relevant to the debate, had not been raised in discussion.

The meeting adjourned at 7:20 p.m.

Secretary

Chairman

April 29, 2002

Appendix "A"

Direct Line: (416) 978-2118
Facsimile: (416) 978-8182
E-mail: l.charpentier@utoronto.ca

Memorandum to: Members of the Governing Council

From: Louis R. Charpentier
Secretary of the Governing Council

Date: April 26, 2002

Re: **Policy on Approval and Execution of Contracts and Documents:
Interim Updates**

Following the recent appointment of the Chief Capital Projects Officer, there is need to revise the Governing Council Policy on Approval and Execution of Contracts and Documents to give Mr. John Bisanti appropriate signing authority. Because he is the first incumbent in this new position, there is currently no provision in the policy for his position.

I have been asked to undertake a careful review of this policy. This will require broad consultation, which I plan to complete over the summer and early fall. In the meanwhile, it would be appropriate to update the current resolution to reflect Mr. Bisanti's new position and a number of other title changes.

Attached as Appendix A is a proposed housekeeping revision to the Governing Council *Policy on Approval and Execution of Contracts and Documents*. The changes are underscored and highlighted by a vertical line in the right margin. The proposed interim revision seeks to achieve the two goals.

(1) To update the position titles of signing officers. It is proposed to add the Chief Capital Projects Officer to the group "A" signers in section 1 - giving Mr. Bisanti the same signing authority as the previous Assistant Vice-President, Operations and Services. A number of other titles in the original resolution have also fallen out of date. The position "Director of Physical Plant" no longer exists in the University. It is proposed that the obsolete title be replaced with the titles of the comparable current officers who require signing authority to carry out their duties: the Director, Project Management, Design and Construction, and the Director, Utilities. The incumbent of the new position, Deputy Secretary of the Governing Council, would be permitted to countersign contracts under seal, as are the Assistant Secretaries. The titles of the Controller (previously Comptroller) and the Director of the Procurement Services (formerly Purchasing) Department would be updated.

(2) To remove a provision with respect to bills of sale.

The provision with respect to bills of sale is no longer required by law. It was inserted into the policy some years ago on legal advice, and it is now proposed to remove it on legal advice.

I request that the Governing Council consider the following motion:

THAT the proposed revisions to the *Policy on Approval and Execution of Contracts and Documents*, as outlined in Appendix A attached hereto, be approved.

Attachment.

17532

Appendix "A"

POLICY ON APPROVAL AND EXECUTION OF CONTRACTS AND DOCUMENTS

APPROVAL

Major contracts not in the normal course of business will be referred to the appropriate committee for approval on behalf of the Governing Council. Other contracts may be approved by the senior officer(s) responsible for the consultations and negotiations leading to their completion. From time to time, Governing Council may set financial or other limits (e.g. in banking resolutions, committee terms of reference, or specific policy documents) which affect administrative authority to give final approval to contracts and documents. A record of such conditions shall be maintained in the Governing Council Secretariat.

EXECUTION

- (1) Contracts and documents under seal may be signed by:
 - A. any two of the President, the Chairman of the Governing Council, the Vice-Chairman or Acting Chairman of the Governing Council, a Vice-President, an Assistant Vice-President, a Vice-Provost, the Chief Capital Projects Officer, or a member of the Governing Council specifically designated
 - B. any one of the following when countersigned by one in "A" above:

the Secretary, the Deputy Secretary or an Assistant Secretary of the Governing Council, ~~the Director of Physical Plant~~ the Director, Project Management, Design and Construction, the Director, Utilities or the ~~Comptroller~~ Controller

Normally the Secretary, Deputy Secretary or an Assistant Secretary of the Governing Council shall sign all documents together with one signing from "A" above.

- (2) Contracts and documents not requiring signature under seal may be signed by any one of the President, a Vice-President, an Assistant Vice-President, a Vice-Provost, the Chief Capital Projects Officer, the Director, Project Management, Design and Construction, the Director, Utilities, the Comptroller Controller, or the Director of ~~the Purchasing Department~~ Procurement Services.
- (3) From time to time approval may be given pursuant to By-law number 2, Section 3(b), for individuals other than those named above to sign contracts, documents or instruments in writing generally or to sign specific classes or specific instances of such. A record of such approvals shall be maintained in the Governing Council Secretariat.

.../2

-2-

~~(4) Any one of the President, Vice-President or Acting Vice-President, the Chief Financial Officer, a Vice Provost, or Assistant Vice-President be and is authorized for the Governing Council and on its behalf to take or renew all Bills of Sale necessary or expedient to be taken or renewed from time to time and to make such affidavits as may be required for the registration or filing thereof, and for the purposes aforesaid, each of them is given full power and authority to perform and executive all acts, deeds, matters and things necessary or expedient in connection therewith.~~

CORPORATE SEAL

Pursuant to By-law number 2, Section 3(a), the corporate seal is in the custody of the Secretary of the Governing Council or such other person as Governing Council may designate. A record of its use is kept in the Governing Council Secretariat.

RECORDS

Executed copies of documents are retained in the office that has been responsible for their approval or for the recommendation to Governing Council for their approval. In addition, copies of executed documents concerning property matters or with insurance or liability implications shall be sent to the Office of the ~~Chief Financial Officer~~ Vice-President, Business Affairs for the attention of the Director of Risk Management and ~~Insurance and Risk Manager~~. All capital leases (i.e. those with purchase commitments) are reviewed by the Purchasing Procurement Services Department, which retains executed copies of the documents.

Governing Council Secretariat

~~December 14, 1994~~

April 26, 2002