

**UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO**  
**THE GOVERNING COUNCIL**

**Thursday, April 26, 2001**

MINUTES OF THE GOVERNING COUNCIL meeting held on Thursday, April 26, 2001 at 4:30 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall.

**Present:**

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Ms Wendy M. Cecil-Cockwell (In the Chair) | Professor Heather Munroe-Blum                                   |
| Ms Mary Anne V. Chambers, Vice-Chair      | Dr. John P. Nestor  |
| Dr. Robert J. Birgeneau, President        | Mr. Elan Ohayon   |
| Mr. Muhammad Basil Ahmad                  | Ms Jacqueline C. Orange   |
| Professor Mary Beattie                    | The Honourable David R. Peterson                                |
| Dr. Robert Bennett                        | Mr. Fayed A. Qureshy  |
| Mr. Brian C. Burchell                     | Dr. Joseph L. Rotman  |
| Professor Philip Byer                     | Professor Adel S. Sedra   |
| Professor Jack Carr                       | Mr. Amir Shalaby  |
| Ms Jennifer Carson                        | Ms Carol Stephenson   |
| Professor Brian Corman                    | Ms Wendy Talfourd-Jones   |
| Professor W. Raymond Cummins              | Professor Donna Wells   |
| Mr. Brian Davis                           |   |
| Ms Susan Eng                              | Mr. Louis R. Charpentier,<br>Secretary of the Governing Council |
| Dr. Shari Graham Fell                     |   |
| Mr. Ljupco Gjorginski                     |   |
| Professor Vivek Goel *                    |   |
| Mr. Josh Koziebrocki                      | <b><u>Secretariat:</u></b>                                      |
| Professor Brian Langille                  | Mr. Neil Dobbs  |
| Mr. Gerald A. Lokash                      | Ms Cristina Oke   |
| Professor Ian R. McDonald                 |   |

**Absent:**

|                                    |
|------------------------------------|
| The Honourable William G. Davis    |
| Mr. Paul V. Godfrey                |
| Dr. Anne Golden                    |
| The Honourable Henry N. R. Jackman |
| Ms Naana Afua Jumah                |
| Ms Karen Lewis                     |
| Ms Rose M. Patten                  |

|                               |
|-------------------------------|
| The Honourable Robert K. Rae  |
| Professor Emmet I. Robbins    |
| Mrs. Susan M. Scace           |
| Professor Kenneth Sevcik      |
| Professor Chandrakant P. Shah |
| Mr. John H. Tory              |
| Mr. Robert S. Weiss           |

**In Attendance:**

|  |
|--|
| Professor Michael G. Finlayson, Vice-President, Administration and Human Resources |
| Dr. Sheldon Levy, Vice-President, Government and Institutional Relations           |
| Professor Derek McCammond, Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget                       |
| Professor Ian Orchard, Vice-Provost, Students                                      |
| Professor Carolyn Tuohy, Deputy Provost  |
| Professor Ronald Venter, Vice-Provost, Space and Facilities Planning               |

\* was not present for the consideration of Item 1.

**In Attendance: (cont'd)**

Ms Françoise Ko, Member-elect of the Governing Council  
Mr. Andrew Morgan, Member-elect of the Governing Council  
Professor Rona Abramovich, Provost's Advisor on Pro-Active Faculty Recruitment  
Professor Carl Amrhein, Dean, Faculty of Arts and Science  
Dr. Chris Cunningham, Special Assistant to the President  
Mr. Marty England, Assistant Vice-Provost, Strategic Planning  
Ms Georgina Gray, Acting Director, Office of the President  
Mr. Robert Hanks, incoming Liaison Officer, CUPE 3902  
Ms Lesley Lewis, Assistant Vice-Provost, Professional Faculties  
Ms Mary McGee, Assistant Provost - Designate  
Ms Margaret McKone, Administrative Manager, Office of the Governing Council  
Ms Amina Mir, Executive Member, CUPE 3907  
Professor Peter Pauly, Associate Dean, Rotman School of Management  
Mr. Justin Saunders, University Affairs Commissioner, Students' Administrative Council  
Ms José Sigouin, Acting Director, Status of Women Office  
Professor Pekka Sinervo, Vice-Dean, Faculty of Arts and Science  
Ms Margaret Smith, Vice-Chair, College of Electors  
Ms Maureen Somerville, Chair, College of Electors  
Mr. Jorge Sousa, President, Graduate Students' Union

The Chairman noted that, pursuant to Section 38 of *By-law Number 2*, the Executive Committee had determined that consideration of items 1 and 2 would take place *in camera*.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was APPROVED

THAT the agenda be varied to allow the President to present part of his report *in camera*.

**1. Senior Appointment**

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT Professor Vivek Goel be appointed Vice-Provost, Faculty for a five-year term from July 1, 2001 to June 30, 2006

**2. Senior Appointment**

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT Dr. Angela Hildyard be appointed Vice-President, Human Resources, effective July 1, 2001 for a period of seven years until July 30, 2008, renewable by the Governing Council for a further three years.

**3. President's Report**

The President reported on two personnel matters.

THE COUNCIL MOVED INTO OPEN SESSION.

**4. Chairman's Remarks**

**(a) Senior Appointment: Vice-Provost, Faculty**

The Chairman announced that Professor Vivek Goel had been appointed Vice-Provost, Faculty effective July 1, 2001.

**(b) Senior Appointment: Vice-President, Human Resources**

The Chairman announced that Dr. Angela Hildyard had been appointed Vice-President, Human Resources effective July 1, 2001.

**(c) Other Announcements**

The Chairman congratulated Dr. Jon Dellandrea on his designation by the Institute for Charitable Giving as Laureate for the year 2001. The Chairman also congratulated Mr. Paul Godfrey on being nominated for an honorary degree from Ryerson Polytechnical University.

The Chairman drew to the attention of members the flyer that had been placed on the table announcing the speech to be given by the President to the Canadian Club on May 14.

**(d) Welcome**

The Chairman welcomed Ms Maureen Somerville, the Chair of the College of Electors, and other members of the College who were in attendance. The Chairman also welcomed the members-elect of the Governing Council who were in attendance.

**5. Minutes of the Previous Meetings held on March 8, 2001 and March 27, 2001**

The minutes of the previous meeting held on March 8, 2001 and the special meeting held on March 27, 2001 were approved.

**6. Business Arising from the Previous Meeting**

**(a) Summary of Key Government Funding Issues**

In response to a request made at the meeting of March 8, 2001, Dr. Sheldon Levy, Vice-President, Government and Institutional Relations, gave a presentation on key government funding issues. A copy of his presentation and summary sheet is attached as Appendix "A".

Dr. Levy stated that an announcement on funding for universities was expected from the provincial government on May 9 as part of the 2001-02 budget. He noted that the projected growth in the population aged 18 to 24 in the Greater Toronto area (GTA) was greater than that in the rest of Ontario, and it would be sustained by demography. The total expected growth between 1999-2000 and 2005-06 at the University of Toronto was 8,392 students, including 2,873 at the Mississauga campus, 1,984 at the Scarborough campus, and 3,535 at the St. George campus.

**6. Business Arising from the Previous Meeting (cont'd)****(a) Summary of Key Government Funding Issues (cont'd)**

Dr. Levy explained that the key issue facing universities was the amount of funding that would be provided by the provincial government for enrolment increases above the existing corridor. The universities were requesting full average funding for all additional students, which would require additional operating grants from the provincial government in the amount of \$500 million per year. The University of Toronto would receive \$100 million of the \$500 million. In addition, \$110 million in new capital funding would be required to increase capacity at the Mississauga and Scarborough campuses by approximately 400,000 square feet to accommodate the increased number of students. In recent years, the SuperBuild Program had provided funding for capital expansion and increased capacity at the St. George campus, with marginal increases funded for the Mississauga and Scarborough campuses.

A member asked what the University was planning to do to secure increased funding per student. Dr. Levy replied that the Council of Ontario Universities (COU) was asking for full average funding per student for all universities.

A member asked when an announcement on capital funding was expected. Dr. Levy replied that the universities did not wish to speculate on the timing of such an announcement from the provincial government.

A member asked whether student financial assistance might be revamped. Dr. Levy replied that any activity in the area of student financial assistance would be incremental and designed to make the provincial and federal systems more compatible with one another.

A member asked what level of solidarity among Ontario's universities could be expected from COU if the desired funding was not forthcoming from the provincial government. Dr. Levy replied that there might be some fragmentation, with the five research-intensive universities working together.

**(b) Report on Status of Women Office**

The Chairman indicated that the President would address this matter in his Report.

**(c) Notices of Motion**

The Chairman recalled that two notices of motion had been given at the March 8 meeting. The Executive Committee had considered these requests at the special meeting held on March 22, 2001. She drew attention to pages 4 and 5 of Report Number 333 of the Executive Committee meeting which contained an account of the Committee's discussion.

**(d) Legal Costs**

The Chairman replied to a member's request for an estimate of the legal costs for the request for leave to appeal the judicial review decision. University counsel had estimated the cost to be \$32,000 for the motion of leave to appeal, and between \$15,000 and \$25,000 for the costs of carrying the appeal forward to its conclusion.

**6. Business Arising from the Previous Meeting (cont'd)****(e) Other Business**

A member requested information on elections and on the situation at the Faculty of Law. The Chairman replied that the matter of elections would be considered under Other Business, and that the situation at the Faculty of Law would be addressed by the President in his Report.

**7. Tuition Fee Schedules for Publicly Funded Programs****(a) Introduction**

Mr. Shalaby described the proposed tuition fee increases, explaining that, for the majority of students, tuition fees were regulated by the province and increases were limited to 1.96%. This percentage increase applied to most Arts and Science programs, Architecture, Music, Physical Education, Physical Therapy, Occupational Therapy, and other programs. For other students, fees were proposed to increase by 5%, with two exceptions. For students entering the Master of Business Administration (MBA) program, fees would be \$20,000 per year, and for students entering the undergraduate program in Law, fees would increase by \$2,000 to \$12,000.

Mr. Shalaby noted that tuition fees were considered in the context of the Tuition Fee Policy. The Business Board had examined the Enrolment Report and the annual report of the Vice-Provost, Students on Student Financial Support, and had concluded that enrolment was strong and that accessibility had been maintained.

**(b) Addresses by Non-Members**

The Chairman informed the Council that speaking requests had been received from the Students' Administrative Council (SAC) and from four groups representing graduate students: the Canadian Union of Public Employees (CUPE) Local 3902, CUPE Local 3907, the Graduate Students' Association of OISE/UT and the Graduate Students' Union. She explained that, given the length of the agenda, she had granted speaking rights to SAC and allowed the groups representing graduate students a total of 10 minutes of speaking time. She had requested that Mr. Jorge Sousa, President of the Graduate Students' Union, co-ordinate with his colleagues on the distribution of this time among the four groups. She then invited Mr. Sousa to address the Council. Mr. Sousa introduced his colleagues: Mr. Robert Hanks, Incoming Liaison Officer of CUPE Local 3902, and Ms Amina Mir, Executive Member of CUPE Local 3907.

Mr. Hanks noted that the Teaching Assistants represented by CUPE 3902 were in close contact with undergraduate students. It was their view that accessibility was not improving and that the quality of undergraduate education was being undermined for students who had to deal with a large debt load, a heavy courseload, the demands of part-time employment, and the strains of commuting, given the cost and availability of housing on and near the campus. Mr. Hanks outlined the difficulties of graduate students who had faced annual increases in tuition fees, and indicated that Teaching Assistants had had their wages frozen and their workload increased. He suggested that the four-year time period of guaranteed funding for graduate students would not provide enough time for students to complete their course work, comprehensive exams, and dissertations and continue to work as Teaching Assistants. He requested that the University freeze tuition.

**7. Tuition Fee Schedules for Publicly Funded Programs (cont'd)****(b) Addresses by Non-Members (cont'd)**

Ms Mir voiced her concern that the increased cost of tuition fees was making higher education inaccessible, and that, in the future, financial resources would determine who could pursue a graduate degree. She noted that two motions passed by the Faculty Council of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto (OISE/UT) had been distributed to members of the Governing Council – one calling for the rejection of tuition increases for 2001-02, and one calling for immediate action to remedy the inequity in funding faced by OISE/UT graduate students.

Mr. Sousa asked, on behalf of graduate students, that the Governing Council vote to forego tuition increases. He referred to other universities in Canada that had either frozen or reduced tuition fees. He suggested that the Council's approval of millions of dollars in capital projects at the same time that requests for a tuition freeze were being denied was sending the wrong message to students regarding the priorities of the University.

The Chairman invited Mr. Justin Saunders, University Affairs Commissioner of SAC, to address the Council. Mr. Saunders highlighted accessibility issues. Students were required to take out loans under the Ontario Students' Assistance Plan (OSAP) before they could receive funds from the University of Toronto Advanced Planning for Students (UTAPS). This left many students deeply in debt. Mr. Saunders expressed his concern that, while the quality of University of Toronto programs would be high, students would not be financially able to attend the University.

**(c) Discussion of the Proposal**

A number of members spoke against the proposal, raising the following concerns:

- By increasing tuition to compensate for reduced financial support from the provincial government, the University was supporting the government's position on funding for higher education.
- The existence of UTAPS should not be used to justify tuition increases.
- Tuition increases created additional stress for students and reduced the quality of student work.
- Teaching Assistants were required to teach more hours and also to do more work as a result of increased class sizes.
- There was no standardization of graduate student financial assistance across departments.
- The percentage increase in tuition was greater than the percentage increase in salary for Teaching Assistants.
- Fewer visible minority students were pursuing graduate work.
- Students were making program choices based on financial reasons rather than on academic reasons.

Some members spoke in favour of the proposal and made the following points:

- The 1.96% increase in regulated fees was less than the 3% rate of inflation.
- The development of a *Tuition Fee Policy* and a *Policy on Student Financial Support* had provided a level of predictability to students of the cost of their program of study.

**7. Tuition Fee Schedules for Publicly Funded Programs (cont'd)****(d) Questions for Clarification**

A member raised the following questions regarding the MBA program at the Rotman School of Management:

- Had there been significant improvements in program quality over the past couple of years? Were these improvements tangible to students who now had to pay significantly higher fees?
- Was the program competitive, on a cost basis, with other similar programs, especially those at Queen's, York and Western?
- Were the income prospects of graduates still high? Did students completing an MBA receive an income boost?

At the suggestion of the Provost, the Chairman called on Professor Peter Pauly, Associate Dean, Research and Academic Resources of the Rotman School of Management to respond to the questions. Professor Pauly stated that the School was in the middle of a five-year program renewal, which included a significant tuition increase. He reported that the School was ranked as one of the top 7 Business Schools outside of the United States in the *Business Week* 2000 rankings. Professor Pauly indicated that there was no evidence that increased tuition had resulted in decreased accessibility to the School. He noted that graduates could recoup their financial investment in the MBA program within nine months after graduation, based on starting salaries for graduates. With respect to competitiveness with other Schools, Professor Pauly replied that MBA tuition fees at both Queen's and Western were higher than the University of Toronto tuition, while tuition at York University was lower.

A member asked for examples of universities at which tuition had been either frozen or reduced. The Provost replied that Memorial University of Newfoundland had been able to reduce tuition fees by 10% because of increased provincial funding. In British Columbia, tuition fees had been reduced by 5% because of increased provincial funding.

It was duly moved and seconded,

THAT the proposed tuition fee schedule for publicly funded programs be referred back to the Business Board.

The vote was taken on the motion to refer back.  
The motion failed.

The Provost replied to a number of concerns that had been raised:

- The 5% increase in fees for graduate programs amounted to \$235.
- The tuition fee for graduate programs at the University of Toronto was the third lowest in Ontario.
- For most doctoral programs, beginning in September 2001, minimum financial support totaling \$12,000 plus tuition would be provided for 4 years of a doctoral program plus one year of a Master's program leading to a doctoral program. Some departments might be in a position to provide more than this amount.
- It was hoped that within three years, the departments at OISE/UT would be in a position to offer equivalent financial support to all doctoral students.

The President supported the remarks of the Provost.

**7. Tuition Fee Schedules for Publicly Funded Programs (cont'd)****(d) Questions for Clarification (cont'd)**

A member suggested that the members of the Governing Council who were bank employees had a conflict of interest in this matter. Another member replied that banks did not in fact enjoy earnings from student loans. Another member said that members of the Governing Council who represented student constituencies had a more direct conflict of interest on tuition.

The Chairman, noting the time and the number of items remaining for consideration, stated that she would call the question.

A member raised a point of order, arguing that all members were entitled to speak for five minutes on matters before the Governing Council and that there were individuals yet to speak. The Secretary of the Governing Council stated that the Chairman had made her ruling to put the question to the Council.

On motion, duly moved and seconded, the Chairman's ruling was challenged. The challenge was defeated.

The question was put on the main motion. The motion was carried.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT the proposed tuition-fee schedules for publicly funded programs for 2001-02, copies of which are attached as Appendix "A" to Report Number 111 of the Business Board, be approved.

**8. Tuition Fee Schedule for Self-Funded Programs**

Mr. Shalaby explained that the self-funded programs, by definition, received no government support. Therefore, tuition fees were set at the level required to enable each program to recover its own cost. He noted that, for most of the self-funded programs, the increase was 5% or less, but in three cases, the increases were larger. For the University of Toronto Schools (UTS) and the Institute of Child Study (ICS) Laboratory School, the increase included the second phase of a levy adopted the previous year to pay for facilities renovation and expansion.

A member expressed concern about tuition fee increases being approved in a cumulative fashion and requested that the administration be requested to prepare a report on tuition fees similar to that prepared on Student Financial Assistance each year. This tuition fee report could include information on tuition fees and enrolment in similar programs across the country as well as information on the income prospects of students enrolled in the University of Toronto programs. The Provost replied that, while members of the administration were always open to advice on improved reporting to members of the Governing Council, it was his opinion that sufficient information on the effect of tuition fee increases on enrolment had already been provided.

**8. Tuition Fee Schedule for Self-Funded Programs (cont'd)**

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT the proposed tuition-fee schedule for self-funded programs for 2001-02, a copy of which is attached as Appendix "B" to Report Number 111 of the Business Board, be approved.

**9. Budget Report 2001-02**

Professor Carr reported that the Planning and Budget Committee had spent several meetings discussing in detail the various parts of the budget, and had sent it forward with strong support. He noted that, at the Academic Board meeting, debate had centred on the establishment of an endowment for graduate student support, tuition fees including the international student fees, rising utilities costs, and the effects of budget reductions on departmental infrastructures.

Professor Sedra reviewed the highlights of the Budget Report, 2001-02 using a powerpoint presentation, a copy of which is attached hereto as part of Appendix "B". Among the highlights were the following:

- the University was entering the fourth year of a six-year planning period ending in 2003-2004;
- the forecasted annual deficit for 2003-04 would, in the absence of corrective strategies, be \$14.1 million instead of the previously forecasted \$1.2 million;
- the amount of the provincial operating grant for 2001-02 had not yet been announced;
- there could be significant increase in revenue through new funding for enrolment growth and research overhead;
- a one-time-only deficit control reduction of 2.5% would be applied, if needed, in the fourth quarter of 2001-2002.

The Chairman noted that a motion was required to extend the length of the meeting.

It was duly moved and seconded,

THAT the time of adjournment be extended to 7:30 p.m.

The motion was carried with the necessary two-thirds majority.

The President commended the work done by the Provost and his colleagues, and commented that he was cautiously optimistic that circumstances would not be bad enough to require the implementation of the proposed deficit control reduction.

A member asked whether the new planning guidelines that would be developed in the fall of 2001 would include changes to the requirements for the amount of the deficit allowed within the budget. The Provost replied that a multi-year budget planning model had been used since 1990, and that no problems had been encountered with respect to the deficit. The cumulative deficit had invariably been brought back within the policy limit of 1.5% of operating revenue by the originally scheduled end of the six-year planning period. The member suggested that the Business Board re-examine the policy governing the maximum allowable deficit.

**9. Budget Report 2001-02 (cont'd)**

A member expressed his concern about the negative effects that the budget reduction would have. He noted that class size and student/faculty ratio had been increasing, which was, in his opinion, an indication that the quality of education was decreasing. He mentioned the possibility that the endowment for student financial aid might not be realized if the stock market continued its current performance. The member suggested transferring funds from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund to the operating fund.

Another member of the Governing Council suggested that consideration of the budget be deferred until the provincial budget had been released on May 9 to determine whether it would provide any relief that might, for example, reduce the need for tuition increases.

It was duly moved and seconded,

THAT the proposed budget be referred back to the Academic Board.

The vote was taken on the motion to refer back.  
The motion failed.

The Provost stated the commitment of the University that funds for student financial assistance would be guaranteed, and would not depend on the performance of the stock market to build up an endowment.

The President commented that, while it was necessary to reduce the expenditure projections in the University's budget model, the actual expenditures per unit were increasing by 7% per year. Over the next ten years, the University expected to appoint one hundred new faculty members per year. It was therefore imperative that the University Infrastructure Investment Fund continue to be used to fund improvements in the University's physical plant to ensure that campus facilities not deteriorate any further. The President also noted that the proposed budget was very conservative in its assumptions.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT the proposed Budget Report for 2001-02 be approved.

**10. Capital Project: Sidney Smith Hall, Patio Enclosure – Users' Committee Report**

At the request of the Chairman, in light of time constraints, Professor Carr presented and proposed omnibus motions dealing with groups of capital projects. The Sidney Smith Hall Patio enclosure would close in the space on the podium level of the existing overhang on both the east and west faces of Sidney Smith Hall to accommodate student activities.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

- (i) THAT the Users' Committee Report for the Sidney Smith Hall Patio Enclosure be approved in principle to accommodate student activities including food facilities, lounge space, study space and club space;

---

**10. Capital Project: Sidney Smith Hall, Patio Enclosure – Users' Committee Report**  
(cont'd)

- (ii) THAT the project scope as described in the Users' Committee Report be approved, at a total cost of \$1,647,000 including furnishings for the east enclosure (\$400,000 to be from ancillary services contingent upon a new food service being present) and an equal cost for the west enclosure; and,
- (iii) THAT the project be recommended for implementation at such time as funding has been identified and becomes available.

**11. Capital Project: Sidney Smith Hall, Infill Project – Users' Committee Report**  
**University Infrastructure Investment Fund: Allocation**

The Sidney Smith Hall Infill Project would add space on the third floor level of the Sidney Smith Hall above the existing two-story lobby, adjacent to existing departmental space, to create additional space for the Departments of History and Political Science.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

- (i) THAT the Users' Committee Report for the Sidney Smith Hall Third Floor Infill Project be approved in principle;
- (ii) THAT the project scope as described in the Users' Committee Report, to construct approximately 670 gross square metres, be approved at an estimated cost of \$2,164,000;
- (iii) THAT phase 1 be recommended for implementation with funding of \$455,000 from the Faculty of Arts and Science, \$100,000 available for the construction of the seminar room, and \$1,289,000 from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund, with phase 2 recommended to proceed when the source of additional funding of \$320,000 is identified; and
- (iv) THAT an allocation of \$1,289,000 from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund be approved.

**12. Capital Project: Bahen Centre for Information Technology – Link to Koffler Student Services Centre**  
**University Infrastructure Investment Fund: Allocation**

The link from the Bahen Centre for Information Technology to the Koffler Student Services Centre would provide convenient access for students to a major classroom and laboratory area.

A member asked why the link between the Bahen Centre and the Koffler Centre was necessary. The Provost referred to the discussion reported in Report 334 of the Executive Committee, and noted that it would be advantageous to students to be able to use the two buildings as one.

A member raised concerns about the accessibility of older buildings on campus.

A member expressed the hope that long-term planning would overcome short-term allocations for capital projects.

**12. Capital Project: Bahen Centre for Information Technology – Link to Koffler Student Services Centre**  
**University Infrastructure Investment Fund: Allocation (cont'd)**

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

- (i) THAT a link between the Bahen Centre for Information Technology (BCIT) and the Koffler Student Services Centre be included in the scope of the BCIT project;
- (ii) THAT an additional \$750,000 from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund be allocated to the project.

**13. Academic Transitional Fund: Allocation - Faculty of Law**

On behalf of the Academic Board, Professor Carr proposed a loan to the Faculty of Law to allow construction to begin on two projects while the Faculty continued to raise funds to meet its current shortfall in funding for these projects.

A member asked whether the loan to the Faculty of Law would be a prudent investment, given the expense of the project and the shortfall in fundraising. The Provost replied that the historical designation of the property required that renovations be done with caution. He had no doubt that the Faculty of Law would repay the loan with interest.

A member expressed concern that the Faculty would continue to grow and require still further space at a very high cost. A member explained that the recent external review of the Faculty of Law highlighted its desperate need for space.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT an allocation of \$850,000 be approved from the Academic Transitional Fund to the Faculty of Law as a loan to be repaid by the Faculty over the next three years.

**14. Capital Project: Botany Greenhouse Relocation – Users' Committee Report**

The Users' Committee Report on the Botany Greenhouse Relocation called for the relocation of botany activities from the greenhouses on the corner of College and University to new ones at the Earth Sciences Building. It had been suggested that the historically-significant greenhouses might be moved to the Scarborough Campus but that decision and any related costs of moving them were not part of this project.

**14. Capital Project: Botany Greenhouse Relocation – Users' Committee Report (cont'd)**

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

- (i) THAT the Users' Committee Report for the Relocation of the Botany Greenhouse be approved in principle; and,
- (ii) THAT the project scope as identified in the Users' Committee Report be approved at a cost of \$6,065,810 with funding of \$2,760,800 from each of the Canada Foundation for Innovation (CFI) and the Ontario Innovation Trust (OIT), and the remainder of \$544,210 to be funded as a secondary effect from the Pharmacy Building Project.

**15. Capital Project: Woodsworth College Residence – Change in Scope  
University Infrastructure Investment Fund: Allocation**

The original design for the new residence project at the corner of Bloor and St. George Streets had not included a basement. It was proposed to modify the design to create an additional 1,315 net assignable square meters below grade. The new space would accommodate video and film storage for the University of Toronto Library. Mechanical services would be relocated from the first floor to the basement.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

- (i) THAT the change of scope in the Woodsworth College Residence of 1,315 nasm be approved;
- (ii) THAT an allocation of \$1,360,000 from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund be approved.

**16. School of Graduate Studies: Disestablishment of the Institute of Medical Science  
Faculty of Medicine: Re-establishment of the Institute of Medical Science  
Academic Priorities Fund and Enrolment Growth Fund: Allocations**

Professor Carr explained that this proposal would move the Institute of Medical Science from the School of Graduate Studies to the Faculty of Medicine. There were no financial implications to the move because the budget of the Institute would also be transferred.

The allocation from the two funds to the Institute of Medical Science was in recognition of significant enrolment growth in the Institute.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

- (i) THAT the Institute of Medical Science be disestablished as an academic unit in the School of Graduate Studies and re-established as the Institute of Medical Science in the Faculty of Medicine, effective May 1, 2001; and

**16. School of Graduate Studies: Disestablishment of the Institute of Medical Science**  
**Faculty of Medicine: Re-establishment of the Institute of Medical Science**  
**Academic Priorities Fund and Enrolment Growth Fund: Allocations (cont'd)**

- (ii) THAT an allocation of \$120,000 in base from the Academic Priorities Fund and of \$25,000 in base from the Enrolment Growth Fund to the Faculty of Medicine for the Institute of Medical Science be approved.

**17. School of Graduate Studies: Disestablishment of the Institute for the History and Philosophy of Science and Technology**  
**Faculty of Arts and Science: Re-establishment of the Institute for the History and Philosophy of Science and Technology**

Professor Carr explained that this proposal would move the Institute for the History and Philosophy of Science and Technology from the School of Graduate Studies to the Faculty of Arts and Science. There were no financial implications to the move because the budget of the Institute would also be transferred.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT the Institute for the History and Philosophy of Science and Technology be disestablished as an academic unit in the School of Graduate Studies and re-established as the Institute for the History and Philosophy of Science and Technology in the Faculty of Arts and Science, effective May 1, 2001.

**18. University Infrastructure Investment Fund: Allocation - Faculty of Nursing**

Professor Carr informed members of the Governing Council that the proposed allocation from the UIIF would facilitate much needed renovations to the administrative areas of the Faculty of Nursing, making available more space for reception, alumni and development services, and improved space for student services.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT an allocation of \$354,000 from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund for renovations to the Faculty of Nursing Building be approved.

**19. Report of the President**

The President reported on the following matters.

**(a) Status of Women Office**

The President announced that, as a result of his review of the office, he would request funding to increase the percentage of the administrative support position from 50% of full-time to 100%. The Status of Women Officer position would also be increased from 50%, up to as much as 80% depending on the preferences of the incumbent. The President thought it essential that the Officer continue with her/his academic or administrative work for some portion of her/his time.

**19. Report of the President (cont'd)****(b) Provincial Government**

The President reported that senior administrators from the University of Toronto were working diligently to bring the need for increased funding for universities to the attention of the provincial government.

**(c) Federal Government**

The President indicated that University representatives continued to make the case to federal government representatives for the funding of the indirect costs of federally funded research.

**(d) Faculty of Law**

The President reported that interviews with students involved in the alleged misrepresentation of marks to law firms had been completed.

**(e) Task Force on Technology-Assisted Learning**

The President commented that the open courseware initiative launched by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) provided clear guidance for the University of Toronto and other universities in this area.

**(f) Negotiations with the University of Toronto Faculty Association (UTFA)**

The President reported that no agreement had been reached with UTFA and discussions had been discontinued. Negotiations under the provisions of Article 6 of the Memorandum of Agreement would proceed next year. Pension issues were at the heart of the dispute and they intersected with a much publicized Statement of Claim launched by a number of retired female faculty members and librarians. The President stressed that any solution to the pension issue would be based on fairness of treatment of all groups of retirees – staff as well as faculty. The President referred to the letter that he had written to the Toronto Star in response to an article concerning the pensions of the retired female faculty.

**(g) Honorary Degrees Accepted**

The President was pleased to report that the following had accepted an offer to receive an honorary doctorate from the University of Toronto: Professor Harry Arthurs, President Emeritus Robert Prichard, and Dr. Cornel West.

**(h) Association of American Universities (AAU)**

The President noted that the main topic of discussion at recent AAU meetings had been the status of social sciences and humanities in higher education. He indicated that the University of Toronto was well-represented in the newly defined area of inter-cultural competence.

The Chairman noted that another motion was required to extend the length of the meeting.

It was duly moved and seconded,

THAT the time of adjournment be extended to 7:45 p.m.

The motion was carried with the necessary two-thirds majority.

**15. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units**

In accordance with the approved Accountability Framework for Reviews of Academic Programs and Units, the Governing Council received for information the following Review Summaries:

- (a) Reviews of Academic Programs and Units, 1995/6-1997/8 (July 1999);
- (b) Reviews of Academic Programs and Units, 1998/9-1999/2000, Volume 1, (October 2000)
- (c) Reviews of Academic Programs and Units, 1998/9-1999/2000, Volume 2, (January 2001)

**16. Reports for Information**

The Governing Council received the items reported for information in the following Reports:

- Report Number 105 of the Academic Board (March 29, 2001)
- Report Number 110 of the Business Board (February 19, 2001)
- Report Number 111 of the Business Board (April 2, 2001)
- Report Number 333 of the Executive Committee (March 22, 2001)
- Report Number 334 of the Executive Committee (April 16, 2001)

A member distributed documentation concerning the Law School Admission Test (LSAT), and the University of Toronto Asset Management Corporation (UTAM) investments. He noted that he had raised questions concerning the cost of investment management by UTAM relative to its benefits and about UTAM's application of ethical criteria in its investments. He urged that these questions be considered by the Business Board or the Governing Council.

A member asked for information regarding the election of part-time students to the Governing Council, and recalled the notices of motion that had been considered by the Executive Committee at its March 22 meeting. The Secretary noted that the matter of special students had been referred for advice to the University Registrar, and it was hoped that the reply would be submitted to the University Affairs Board in June after consideration by the Elections Committee.

**17. Date of the Next Meeting**

The Chairman reminded members of the next meeting of the Council scheduled for Thursday, May 31, 2001. This meeting would be held at the University of Toronto at Scarborough.

**18. Other Business**

A member asked what the University's response was to the class action launched by a group of retired female faculty. The President replied that the group was represented by the Faculty Association and that discussions were at an early stage. It was unlikely that the University would be required to respond to the legal action for a year or more.

The meeting adjourned at 7:45 p.m.

---

Secretary

Chairman

---

May 4, 2001

