

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL
Tuesday, October 30, 2007

MINUTES OF THE GOVERNING COUNCIL meeting held on Tuesday, October 30, 2007 at 4:30 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, University of Toronto.

Present:

Mr. John F. (Jack) Petch (In the Chair)	Mr. Gary P. Mooney
Dr. Alice Dong, Vice-Chair	Mr. George E. Myhal
The Honourable David R. Peterson, Chancellor	Mr. Richard Nunn
Professor C. David Naylor, President	Ms Jacqueline C. Orange
Professor Varouj Aivazian	Mr. Alexandru Rascanu
Mr. P.C. Choo	Professor Doug W. Reeve
Professor Brian Corman	Mr. Timothy Reid
Dr. Claude S. Davis	Professor Arthur S. Ripstein
Mr. Ken Davy	Ms Lorenza Sisca
Miss Saswati Deb	Mr. Stephen C. Smith
Ms Susan Eng	Miss Maureen J. Somerville
Mr. Arya Ghadimi	Dr. Sarita Verma
Professor Vivek Goel	Ms B. Elizabeth Vosburgh
Professor William Gough	Mr. Larry Wasser
Dr. Gerald Halbert	Mr. Robert S. Weiss
Professor Ellen Hodnett	
Professor Glen A. Jones	Mr. Louis R. Charpentier, Secretary of the Governing Council
Mr. Alex Kenjeev	
Dr. Joel A. Kirsh	Secretariat:
Professor Ronald H. Kluger	
Dr. Stefan Mathias Larson	Mr. Matthew Lafond
Professor Louise Lemieux-Charles	
Professor Michael R. Marrus	
Mr. Geoffrey Matus	
Ms Florence Minz	

Absent:

Ms Diana Alli	Professor Ian Orchard
The Honourable William G. Davis	Ms Estefania Toledo
Dr. Shari Graham Fell	Mr. Yang Weng
Ms Judith Goldring	Mr. W. David Wilson
Mr. Joseph Mapa	

In Attendance:

Mr. David Palmer, Vice-President, Advancement
Ms Cathy Riggall, Vice-President, Business Affairs
Ms Judith Wolfson, Vice-President, University Relations
Professor Paul Young, Vice-President, Research
Professor Robert Abraham, Professor, Department of Astronomy and Astrophysics
Professor Cristina Amon, Dean, Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering

Mr. Daniel Atlin, Assistant Vice-President, Government, Institutional and Community Relations
Mr. W. G. Tad Brown, Finance and Development Counsel, Office of the Vice-President, Advancement
Dr. Louise Cowin, Warden, Hart House
Mr. Jim Delaney, Director, Office of the Vice-Provost, Students
Ms Sheree Drummond, Assistant Provost
Professor Joan Foley, University Ombudsperson
Professor Emeritus Jonathan Freedman, Vice-Provost, Student Life
Ms. Nora Gillespie, Legal Counsel, Office of the Vice-President and Provost
Dr. Anthony Gray, Special Advisor to the President
Professor Edith Hillan, Vice-Provost, Academic
Ms Deepa Jacob, Research and Policy Analyst, Office of the Vice-President, Business Affairs
Ms Annabelle Ko, LIVE 2007 Conference Co-Chair, Management & Economics Students' Association, University of Toronto at Scarborough
Ms Rosanne Lopers-Sweetman, Director, Strategic Initiatives and Priorities, Office of the Vice-President and Provost
Ms Bryn MacPherson-White, Director, Office of the President and University Events
Professor Ian McDonald, past Interim University Ombudsperson
Dr. Tim McTiernan, Assistant Vice-President, Research
Mr. Steve Moate, Senior Legal Counsel
Mr. Henry Mulhall, Assistant Secretary of the Governing Council
Professor Peter Pauly, Vice Dean, Research and Academic Resources, Joseph L. Rotman School of Management
Ms Christina Sass-Kortsak, Assistant Vice-President, Human Resources
Ms Vijaya Selvaraju, LIVE 2007 Conference Co-Chair, Management & Economics Students' Association, University of Toronto at Scarborough
Mr. Nadeem Shabbar, Chief Real Estate Officer
Professor Pekka Sinervo, Dean, Faculty of Arts and Science
Ms Elizabeth Sisam, Assistant Vice-President, Campus and Facilities Planning
Ms Nancy Smart, Judicial Affairs Officer
Ms Meredith Strong, Interim Special Assistant to the Vice-President, University Relations
Ms Mae-Yu Tan, Assistant Secretary of the Governing Council
Ms Mary-Ellen Yeomans, Assistant Dean, Administration and Chief Administrative Officer, Joseph L. Rotman School of Management
Professor Safwat Zaky, Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget

IN ACCORDANCE WITH A DETERMINATION BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE PURSUANT TO SECTION 38 OF BY-LAW NUMBER 2, ITEMS 13 AND 14 WERE CONSIDERED BY THE GOVERNING COUNCIL IN CAMERA.

1. Chair's Remarks**(a) Welcome**

The Chair welcomed new and returning members, and guests, to the first regular meeting of the Governing Council of the governance year. He noted that this was his first regular meeting as Chair, and thanked members for their support.

(b) Appointment of Lieutenant-Governor-In-Council members to the Governing Council

The Chair announced that the Lieutenant Governor had issued the order that Mr. Gary Mooney and Ms Judith Goldring be appointed as members of the University of Toronto Governing Council for a period of three years, effective from the 1st day of July, 2007, to the 30th day of June, 2010.

(c) Audio Web-cast

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

2. Minutes of the Previous Meetings

The minutes of the meeting of June 25, 2007, were approved.

3. Business Arising from the Minutes of the Previous Meeting

There was no business arising from the previous meeting.

4. Report of the President**(a) LIVE 2007 Business Conference**

The President introduced Ms Vijaya Selvaraju and Ms Annabelle Ko, Co-Chairs of the Leading Innovative Visions to Execution (LIVE) 2007 Business Conference and members of the Management and Economics Students' Association (MESA) at the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC). The President noted that it had become a tradition to introduce individuals engaged in enhancing the student experience at the University. He remarked that the LIVE Conference was an extraordinary student-focused initiative, now in its second year.

Ms Selvaraju and Ms Ko explained that the mission of the LIVE Conference was to increase external recognition of UTSC and to equip student delegates with a realistic perspective of the demands in today's business world. They reported that LIVE was a two-day national conference, hosting 150 undergraduate students from across Canada. This year's conference would be held November 15 and 16, and the keynote speaker would be Mr. David Kincaid, CEO and President of Brand Finance. Ms Selvaraju and Ms Ko encouraged members to visit the LIVE Conference website.¹

¹ <http://www.live-conference.ca>
42296

4. Report of the President (cont'd)

(b) Awards and Honours

The President drew Governors' attention to the list of Faculty and Staff Awards and Honours that had been included in the agenda package, commenting on the extraordinary achievements that were celebrated by the University.

Professor Peter St. George-Hyslop had been among four international associates elected to the Institute of Medicine in the United States, one of the highest honours in the fields of Medicine and Health.

Furthermore, three faculty members had been named Fellows of the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS). Professor James Donaldson, of the Department of Chemistry at UTSC, Professor Jean Zu of Mechanical and Industrial Engineering, and Professor Peter Zandstra, Canada Research Chair in Stem Cell Bioengineering, were selected by their peers for their achievements in advancing science or its application.

The President highlighted the fact that of the 417 AAAS Fellows named this year, 23 came from outside the United States, and 6 of those were from Canadian universities. He noted that the University of Toronto, with approximately 8% of the nation's faculty complement, accounted for 50% of the nation's appointments to the AAAS this year.

(c) Darfur Petition

The President noted that on May 29, 2007, he had received a petition from students Kenneth Lee and Judith Coburn, on behalf of the group Students Taking Action Now: Darfur (STAND). The petition had described the humanitarian crisis in Darfur, and proposed a course of action through which the University could influence the situation in Darfur by means of selective divestment from certain companies.

In response, the President had appointed an Advisory Board on Divestment in Sudan to consider the petition. The Board had been chaired by Ms Catherine Riggall, Vice-President of Business Affairs, and included Governors from each of the University's constituencies. The President had recently received their Report and recommendations.

The President extended his appreciation to the petitioners for their strong advocacy on an important cause. Further, he thanked the Advisory Board for their service in this difficult matter. He emphasized that the University condemned the atrocities that had occurred in Darfur.

The Advisory Board had considered the STAND petition under the terms of the University's *Policy on Social and Political Issues with Respect to University Investment*, which had been adopted by the Governing Council in 1978. The Board had articulated its deep concern about the situation in Darfur. The President noted, however, that the issue was not the scope of the humanitarian crisis, but rather the nature and impact of any investments held by the University. Accordingly, the Board had determined that the facts in the present case had not met the requirements articulated in the *Policy* to warrant divestment.

The President reported that the two investments held by the University were only remotely and indirectly connected to the region, and did not qualify as "financially significant." One company was no longer active in Sudan, and the other generated less than 1% of its revenue indirectly from Sudan. Given those findings, the Advisory Board concluded that divestment was not justified under the *Policy* and accordingly recommended against it.

4. Report of the President (cont'd)**(c) Darfur Petition (cont'd)**

The President advised that he had accepted their recommendation.

In conclusion, the President reaffirmed the University's concern about the situation in the western Sudan, and joined with the Advisory Board and the greater community in hoping for a lasting peace in the area. Furthermore, this issue had once again raised questions about how these processes were handled and managed at the University. He noted that the current *Policy* was not the most agile or appropriate tool for resolving such issues. A revised *Policy* would be considered by the University Affairs Board in November, and would likely be before Governing Council in the near future.

(d) China Trip

The President reported that in the next week, he would be visiting China, together with Ms Judith Wolfson, Vice-President, University Relations, and Dr. Lorna Jean Edmonds, Assistant Vice-President International Relations. The timing of the delegation also coincided with the visit of three senior faculty members. The President reported that in Shanghai, the delegation would be visiting Fudan University and Shanghai Jiao Tong University. In Beijing, there would be visits to Tsinghua University and a meeting with officials from Beijing University.

(e) Towards 2030

The President reported that Phase I of the *Towards 2030* initiative was winding down. The background document had been downloaded more than two thousand times, from nearly 60 countries.

With the help of the Provost, almost 30 consultations and presentations had been conducted since June, which had generated a great deal of feedback.

The President noted that he was awaiting one final response before confirming and announcing the Task Force memberships, and anticipated officially launching Phase II on a revamped *Towards 2030* website within the next week.

The President reminded members of the focus of the five Task Forces:

- Task Force on Long-Term Enrolment
- Task Force on University Resources
- Task Force on Institutional Organization
- Task Force on University Relations and Context
- Task Force on University Governance

The President extended special thanks to Governors for their leadership in chairing and serving on the various Task Forces.

5. Report of the Interim University Ombudsperson (July 1, 2006 – June 30, 2007), and Administrative Response (for information)

The Chair welcomed Professor Ian McDonald, past Interim University Ombudsperson, to the meeting and introduced Professor Joan Foley, University Ombudsperson, to the Governing Council.

5. Report of the Interim University Ombudsperson (July 1, 2006 – June 30, 2007), and Administrative Response (*for information*) (cont'd)

The Chair noted that the University Ombudsperson is responsible to the Governing Council through the Chair, and that as part of this responsibility, the Ombudsperson reports annually on his or her activities. The administration had prepared its response to

the Report of the Interim Ombudsperson, and both documents had been circulated to members for their information and comment.

A member commented that she had found the report refreshing in its clarity and analysis of cases. She hoped that there would be increased awareness of the Ombudsperson's office at the University as a result.

6. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units – Annual Report (*for information*)

The Chair reminded members that they received a copy of the Reviews of Academic Programs and Units 2005-2006 in their agenda package. These reviews had been discussed at the May 25, 2007 meeting of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs, and also at the September 17, 2007 meeting of the Agenda Committee. The Chair invited Professors Marrus and Goel to comment on the report.

Professor Marrus noted that the review of academic programs was a particularly important governance exercise in ensuring appropriate oversight of the University. He hoped that Governors would read the reviews and consider the extensive amount of work required to prepare them. The Committee on Academic Policy and Programs had extensively scrutinized the Report, which went forward to the Academic Board in summary form. He noted that the Agenda Committee had expressed concern regarding the length of time required for the Reviews to reach governance.

In response, Professor Goel emphasized the significant amount of work required to complete the review process. He noted that hundreds of reviews were conducted every year, and that the Annual Report was simply a summary. He observed that while the reviews were up to two years old by the time they were received in governance, there had been timely responses to issues raised in the interim. In fact, it was at the request of governance that the reviews had been submitted with responses from the appropriate academic administrators. This had included trying to obtain, where possible, the views of the newly appointed administrator. A member added that as part of this process, Department Heads and Deans had been invited to the relevant meeting of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs and had been asked whether they had acted on the recommendations in the Report, if any.

A member pointed out that there had been specific concerns with regards to the reviews of New College and the Commerce program, which he felt had not been fully addressed. Professor Goel drew the Council's attention to Report Number 130 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs,² at page 3, where it noted that the Principal of New College had indicated that attention had been given to all of the recommendations in the Report. With regards to the Commerce program, Professor Goel pointed out that following the Review, substantial work had been done by the Deans of the Rotman School of Management and the Faculty of Arts and Science in addressing these concerns. Significant investment had been made in the program and its governance process had been reformed.

²<http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/Assets/Boards+and+Committees/Committee+on+Academic+Policy+and+Programs/2006-2007+Academic+Year/r0525.pdf>
42296

7. Items for Governing Council Approval**(a) School of Graduate Studies / Faculty of Arts and Science: Proposal for Master of Science and Doctor of Philosophy Degree Programs in Ecology and Evolutionary Biology**

Professor Marrus reported that the reorganization of biological sciences in the Faculty of Arts and Science in 2006 had resulted in the formation of the Departments of Cell and Systems Biology (CSB) and Ecology and Evolutionary Biology (EEB). The proposed Masters of Science (M.Sc.) and Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) degree programs in EEB were intended to provide more focused graduate studies that were well-aligned with student interest and demand.

There had been extensive consultation during the development of the proposed programs. Professor Marrus noted that the Academic Board strongly supported the proposal.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was Resolved

THAT the proposal to establish the Master of Science and Doctor of Philosophy programs in Ecology and Evolutionary Biology within the Faculty of Arts and Science be approved, effective September, 2008.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 152 of the Academic Board as Appendix "A".

(b) School of Graduate Studies / Faculty of Arts and Science: Proposal for Master of Science and Doctor of Philosophy Degree Programs in Cell and Systems Biology

Professor Marrus reported that as with the previous item, this proposal had arisen from the reorganization of biological sciences in the Faculty of Arts and Science. The proposed programs in CSB had been tailored to the research interests of faculty members and current graduate students in the Department, and were intended to provide training and mentoring to students in the fields of cell, molecular, and systems biology.

During the development of the programs, there had been extensive consultation both within the Department and with other divisions in the University. At the Academic Board, a member had asked how it had been determined that the program had no resource implications. The Chair of the Planning and Budget Committee had explained that the proposals involved a reorganization of existing faculty, staff, and students. Therefore, no significant budgetary changes were required.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was Resolved

THAT the proposal to establish the Master of Science and Doctor of Philosophy programs in Cell and Systems Biology within the Faculty of Arts and Science be approved, effective September, 2008.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 152 of the Academic Board as Appendix "B".

7. Items for Governing Council Approval (cont'd)**(c) School of Graduate Studies / Faculty of Arts and Science: Joint Master of Spatial Analysis Program (University of Toronto Department of Geography and Ryerson University) – Proposed Closure**

Professor Marrus advised that the joint Master of Spatial Analysis (M.S.A.) program between the University of Toronto and Ryerson University had been established in 1999. Since then, the academic focus on the Department of Geography had changed, a number of core faculty involved with the program had left, and there were no University of Toronto students currently enrolled in the program.

There had been extensive consultation with Ryerson University, and it had been agreed that Ryerson would assume full responsibility for the program. Professor Marrus noted that the original purpose of the joint relationship (*i.e.*, to assist Ryerson in its initial development and delivery of graduate-level programs) was no longer relevant, as the program was now well-established at that institution.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was Resolved

THAT the proposal from the School of Graduate Studies and the Faculty of Arts and Science to close the Joint Master of Spatial Analysis Program at the University of Toronto be approved, effective immediately.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 152 of the Academic Board as Appendix "C".

(d) Capital Project: Project Planning Report – University of Toronto at Scarborough Balcony Enclosures

Professor Marrus reported that there was a serious shortage of office space at the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC), particularly in the Sciences Wing. The Project Planning Committee had identified two unused balconies in the Sciences Wing which, if enclosed, would provide space for sixteen new faculty and staff offices. The total estimated cost of \$3,614,900 included all fees and contingencies, and would be funded entirely through UTSC operating funds.

Discussion at the Academic Board focused on the rationale for the proposal and the importance of maintaining the appearance of the building. Ms Sisam had informed the members that the balconies were not presently in use. She explained that the proposed project would provide a logical solution to the problem of limited space in the Sciences Wing, and reiterated that the Design Committee had twice reviewed the preliminary designs.

Mr. Nunn reported that the Business Board had authorized the execution of the project subject to Governing Council approval. There had been discussion regarding the cost of the project and possible alternatives. He noted that the Board had been assured that the proposal was the most effective solution, in part because it served the dual purpose of eliminating the need for some of the deferred maintenance on the exterior of the building in the area of the project.

A member commented that the most acute shortage of space at UTSC was of classrooms and student spaces, and asked what was being done to address this issue. Professor Goel

7. Items for Governing Council Approval (cont'd)**(d) Capital Project: Project Planning Report – University of Toronto at Scarborough Balcony Enclosures (cont'd)**

replied that the need for office space in the Sciences Wing was urgent. He noted that UTSC had a critical shortage of professors, and was constrained in its ability to hire new faculty because of the lack of space. Furthermore, he advised that a Project Planning Committee would be reporting shortly with regards to a classroom building project at UTSC. Finally, discussions were underway with the community regarding the potential development of an athletics facility on the campus.

In follow-up, a member asked whether there were any plans for the creation of student facilities on-site. Professor Goel replied that there were few sites available at UTSC for further development. However, he noted that a new Student Services Centre was opened on the Scarborough campus a few years ago, and that the new classroom project would include additional space for students.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was Resolved

1. THAT the Project Planning Report for the Balcony Enclosures at the University of Toronto at Scarborough be approved in principle.
2. THAT the total project scope comprising approximately 455 gross square meters having a total project cost of \$3,614,900 be approved with funding to be provided from UTSC operating funds.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 152 of the Academic Board as Appendix "F".

(e) Declaration of Property as Surplus to the University's Requirements

The Chair noted that a number of letters and emails had been received on the topic of the David Dunlap Observatory, and that those which had been received in advance had been distributed to members of the Governing Council. A speaking request had also been received; however, because the Chair had determined that the subject of the request had been thoroughly covered in the correspondence, it had been declined.

Professor Marrus reported that the David Dunlap Observatory, located in the Town of Richmond Hill, had once been a world-class facility. However, urban encroachment, technological advances, and changes in research methods had diminished the academic usefulness of the Observatory. Therefore, the University, with the agreement of the Dunlap family, proposed to cease operations at the Observatory and to liquidate the site. The net proceeds from this sale would be invested in an endowment to create the Dunlap Institute of Astronomy and Astrophysics to further research, teaching, and training in this subject at the University.

Professor Marrus noted that there had been significant interest from the community in the planned use of the lands and the historical significance of the facility. These issues had been discussed by the Academic Board, however, the Board's primary consideration had been the academic mission of the University. The needs of the Department of Astronomy and Astrophysics were of primary importance, and Professor Marrus believed that the academic priorities of the Department had been fairly and accurately represented.

7. Items for Governing Council Approval (cont'd)**(e) Declaration of Property as Surplus to the University's Requirements (cont'd)**

Therefore, the Academic Board had recommended the approval of the motion to the Governing Council.

Mr. Nunn reported that the Business Board had authorized the sale of the land subject to its declaration as surplus by the Governing Council. Discussion at the Business Board had focussed upon the proposed disposition process. Ms Riggall had explained that the disposition would be in accordance with normal University procedures.

Invited to comment, Professor Goel noted that it was critical that the University be allowed to renew its infrastructure for education and research.

In response to suggestions received from community members that the limited scientific usefulness of the Observatory had been exaggerated, Professor Goel quoted from an article on the history of the Observatory available on the David Dunlap Observatory website.³ He noted that the article explained that light pollution had become a serious problem for the Observatory almost 40 years ago, and that in response, a large telescope had been erected in Chile in 1971. It had actually been at this facility, and not at the Richmond Hill site, that the often-cited identification of Supernova 1987A occurred.

Professor Goel noted that the creation of the Dunlap Institute would preserve the legacy of David Dunlap, and he re-emphasized that all of the net proceeds from the sale of the land would be invested in the proposed endowment. Furthermore, the proposal was moving forward with the full support of the Dunlap family.

With regards to the accuracy of the figure of \$800,000 quoted by the administration for the annual operating cost of the Observatory, Professor Goel explained that this reflected the full cost, including facilities services, insurance, and a number of other items.

Citing criticisms that the University had not engaged in consultations with the Town of Richmond Hill, Professor Goel advised that the municipal government had been made aware of the proposal in its early stages. Furthermore, the process had moved through governance in an open manner (a press release had been issued prior to consideration by the Planning and Budget Committee).

Professor Goel reported that should the present motion pass, the Vice-President, Business Affairs would issue a formal Request For Proposals. This document would highlight many of the issues raised in discussion (for example, the environmental and heritage aspects of the site, as well as the portion currently leased to the Town of Richmond Hill).

Professor Goel reminded the Council of the University's core mission of teaching and research. He also noted that although the University was one of the largest and proudest owners of heritage properties in the City and had gone to great lengths to preserve many of these properties, it was not in the business of maintaining these sites in other locations. Additionally, the University was sensitive to related environmental issues, and Professor Goel pointed to the Koffler Scientific Reserve as an example of a "green space" maintained for educational purposes, and noted that all three of the University's campuses provided significant amounts of open space for their communities.

The Chair invited Professor Sinervo, Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Science, to comment. Professor Sinervo indicated that he agreed with the Provost's comments

³ <http://www.astro.utoronto.ca/ddo.rasc.html>
42296

7. Items for Governing Council Approval (cont'd)**(e) Declaration of Property as Surplus to the University's Requirements (cont'd)**

regarding the University's approach to the issue. He advised that as part of the *Stepping Up* initiative, the Department of Astronomy and Astrophysics had participated in an intensely consultative planning exercise. The highest priority in the resulting Academic Plan had been the creation of the Dunlap Institute. Professor Sinervo disagreed with comments that the Observatory provided students with significant access to observational experience. He noted that students had access both to telescopes on the St. George campus, and at major international facilities.

A member asked how undergraduate and graduate students would be affected by the closure, and how they would benefit from the proposed Dunlap Institute. Professor Sinervo replied that undergraduate students obtained their most significant research experience using off-campus facilities. He acknowledged that the closure of the telescope would have an impact, but noted that the resources available in the Dunlap Institute would more than compensate for this loss. The member asked about whether the facility was truly becoming obsolete in light of the number of research papers being published by faculty associated with the Observatory. Professor Goel noted that quality of research was not just about the number of papers published. Professor Sinervo added that the last time a faculty member was hired whose primary focus was using the telescope at the Dunlap Observatory was in 1980.

A member asked how the closure of the Dunlap Observatory would impact administrative staff at the facility. In response, Professor Goel affirmed that the University would respect its obligations under its staff agreements. Where possible, staff would have the option of reassignment within the University.

A member inquired whether the Dunlap Institute would be self-sustaining, and wondered if the net proceeds of the sale would be sufficient to keep the University at the forefront of astronomical research. Professor Goel replied that it was not possible to provide a firm estimate for the net proceeds of the sale, however, it was expected that the endowment would be amongst the largest at the University. Furthermore, the additional funding for the Institute would be an incremental addition to the current funding for the Department of Astronomy and Astrophysics.

A member sought assurance that there had been consultation within the Department of Astronomy and Astrophysics in reaching the decision to support the proposal. Professor Sinervo noted that because the Observatory had a significant history, some individuals were strongly attached to it. However, he confirmed that there was a significant consensus within the Department that the most effective way for the University to support their scholarship and the student experience was to move forward with the creation of the Institute. Professor Goel added that the Chair of the Department had spoken to the academic planning implications at both the Planning and Budget Committee and the Academic Board.

Finally, Professor Naylor noted that through the tendering process, there would be an opportunity for the Town of Richmond Hill and other interested parties to intercede in the process. He commented that although the Dunlap Observatory had an auspicious history, the creation of the Dunlap Institute would allow the University to position itself as a leader in the field of astronomy and astrophysics.

7. Items for Governing Council Approval (cont'd)**(e) Declaration of Property as Surplus to the University's Requirements (cont'd)**

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was Resolved

THAT the David Dunlap Observatory lands be declared surplus to University requirements.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 152 of the Academic Board as Appendix "G".

(f) Capital Project: Project Planning Report – Expansion of the Rotman School of Management

Professor Marrus reported that there was a need for additional space at the Rotman School of Management due to dramatic growth in the School's student and faculty complement. The Academic Board had considered and recommended for approval the proposal to expand the Rotman School by a total of 13,280 net assignable square metres, with the space being divided between the existing building and a new development immediately to the south of the building, on Site 11. Various options had been considered to accommodate the Executive Development Programs (EDP), including locating the EDP with the proposed Varsity Centre for High Performance Sport and Student Commons on Site 12. The proposed expansion onto Sites 11 and 12 would require municipal approval.

Professor Marrus noted that expansion onto Site 11 would require the relocation of CIUT Radio and the Sexual Education and Peer Counselling Centre. A concern had been expressed to the Planning and Budget Committee that the secondary effects of the proposal had not been given sufficient consideration. Professor Goel had replied that there had been appropriate consultation throughout the process and reiterated the University's commitment to finding appropriate accommodation for services which were displaced as a result of the project.

Professor Marrus advised that funding for the project was being assembled primarily from external sources, but that it was intended that \$20 million be raised through Advancement. The allocation of long-term borrowing may be required on a contingency basis to accommodate cash-flow requirements. In response to a request for clarification on this issue, Professor Goel had explained that this financing may be required because payments from donors and the Government of Ontario were frequently provided over a period of several years.

Professor Marrus reported that the Academic Board was persuaded that the proposal should be approved and recommended it to the Governing Council.

Mr. Nunn advised that the Business Board had authorized the execution of the project subject to Governing Council approval. He reported that Mr. Brian Burchell, Station Manager of CIUT Radio, had addressed the Business Board with regard to the proposed relocation of the Station. There had also been discussion regarding the determination of the allocation of relocation expenses and the sources of funding.

A member commented that she wished to recognize Dean Roger Martin's vision in advancing the Rotman School, and Mr. Rotman's generosity in providing significant

7. Items for Governing Council Approval (cont'd)**(f) Capital Project: Project Planning Report – Expansion of the Rotman School of Management (cont'd)**

funding. She asked how much the University had raised to date towards the project and how this affected the \$20 million allocated as a contingency debt. Professor Goel responded that \$20 million was the maximum that might need to be allocated, primarily to accommodate cash-flow requirements. He advised that the majority of this funding had already been secured, and that Professor Martin was confident that the remainder of the funding would be received by the time construction commenced on the project. He noted that about \$70 million had already been committed, including a major \$50 million contribution from the Government of Ontario.

A member inquired why the Commerce program would not be allocated space within the Rotman expansion. Professor Goel replied that space for Commerce had been provided in the Woodsworth College Residence, but that future growth of the program would have to be accommodated outside the new complex. The member also asked about the nature of the relationship between the Department of Economics in the Faculty of Arts and Science, and the Rotman School of Management. Professor Goel advised that the sharing of the Commerce program between the Faculty of Arts and Science and the Rotman School was primarily through the Department of Economics. Furthermore, there were future plans for the Department of Economics to move into a new facility located across the street from the Rotman site.

A member commented that he was impressed by the initiative demonstrated by the Rotman School, and urged the Governing Council to support their efforts by approving the motion.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was Resolved

1. THAT the Project Planning Report for the Rotman School of Management Expansion be approved in principle.
2. THAT the project scope of approximately 7400nasm (15,000gsm) new construction and additional renovation of existing facilities be approved with a total project cost of \$91,800,000 to complete Phase One.
3. THAT Phase Two renovations to existing spaces be approved in principle.
4. THAT the preliminary space program for the Executive Development Programs and affiliated research centers be approved in principle for the provision of approximately 2800nasm (5600gsm) to accommodate these functions.
5. THAT long-term borrowing capacity, maximum of \$20 million, be allocated on a contingency basis to accommodate cash flow requirements.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 152 of the Academic Board as Appendix "H".

8. *Towards 2030: Task Force on Governance – Terms of Reference*

The Vice-Chair noted that members had received the Terms of Reference for the *Towards 2030* Task Force on Governance in their agenda packages. The document provided an outline of the context within which the Task Force was being established, as well as a historical review of the establishment and evolution of the Governing Council over the last 30 years.

The Vice-Chair advised that the process would proceed in two phases:

- The first phase would result in a high-level report to the President and the Governing Council in early 2008, which would identify the issues which should be considered, and possible solutions.
- The second phase, proceeding with the approval of the Executive Committee and the Governing Council, would consider how those possible solutions could be realized and would make specific recommendations.

The Vice-Chair noted that the membership of the Task Force would be considered *in camera* as Item number 13 of the agenda. The mandate and membership of the Task Force had come forward to the Governing Council with the strong support of the Executive Committee.

There were no questions.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was Resolved

THAT the Terms of Reference for the Task Force on Governance, as described in the attached document dated October 11, 2007, be approved.

9. **Reports for Information**

Members received the following reports for information:

- (a) Calendar of Business 2007-08
- (b) Report Number 151 of the Academic Board (June 4, 2007)
- (c) Report Number 152 of the Academic Board (October 2, 2007)
- (d) Report Number 158 of the Business Board (June 21, 2007)
- (e) Report Number 159 of the Business Board (September 4, 2007)
- (f) Report Number 160 of the Business Board (October 1, 2007)
- (g) Report Number 143 of the University Affairs Board (May 29, 2007)
- (h) Report Number 407 of the Executive Committee (June 14, 2007)
- (i) Report Number 408 of the Executive Committee (June 25, 2007)
- (j) Report Number 409 of the Executive Committee (October 17, 2007)

The Chair noted that the Calendar of Business was posted on the Governing Council website and was updated throughout the year.⁴ Members had no questions arising from the Reports.

⁴<http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/Assets/Calendars+of+Business/Consolidated+Calendar+of+Business.pdf>
42296

10. Date of the Next Meeting

The Chair informed members that the next regular meeting of the Governing Council was scheduled for Thursday, December 6, 2007, at 4:30 p.m., in the Council Chambers, Simcoe Hall.

11. Question Period

There were no questions for members of the senior administration.

12. Other Business

There were no items of Other Business.

IN ACCORDANCE WITH A DETERMINATION BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE PURSUANT TO SECTION 38 OF BY-LAW NUMBER 2, ITEMS 13 AND 14 WERE CONSIDERED BY THE GOVERNING COUNCIL IN CAMERA.

13. *Towards 2030: Task Force on Governance – Membership*

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was Resolved

THAT the proposed membership of the Task Force on Governance, as described in Appendix B of the attached document dated October 11, 2007, be approved.

Ms. Rose M. Patten – Chair
Professor Vivek Goel – Vice-Chair

Mr. P.C. Choo
Professor Ray Cummins
Dr. Claude Davis
Professor Michael Marrus
Professor Arthur Ripstein
Mr. Stephen Smith
Ms Estefania Toledo
Mr. W. David Wilson

Mr. Louis R. Charpentier – Secretary

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

(a) First Recommendation for Expulsion

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was Resolved

THAT the President's first recommendation for expulsion, as outlined in the memorandum and supporting documentation from the Secretary of the Governing Council, dated October 17, 2007, be confirmed.

(b) Second Recommendation for Expulsion

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was Resolved

THAT the President's second recommendation for expulsion, as outlined in the memorandum and supporting documentation from the Secretary of the Governing Council, dated October 17, 2007, be confirmed.

Secretary

Chair

November 16, 2007