

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

Thursday, December 20, 2001

MINUTES OF THE GOVERNING COUNCIL meeting held on Thursday,
December 20, 2001 at 4:30 p.m. in the Council Chamber, University of Toronto at
Mississauga.

Present:

Ms Wendy M. Cecil (In the Chair)	Professor Ian R. McDonald
Dr. Thomas H. Simpson, Vice-Chair	Mr. David Melville
Professor Robert J. Birgeneau, President	Mr. Andrew Morgan
The Honourable Henry N. R. Jackman, Chancellor	Professor Heather Munroe-Blum
Professor Mary Beattie	Dr. John P. Nestor
Dr. Robert Bennett	Ms Jacqueline C. Orange
Professor Philip Byer	Ms Rose M. Patten
Professor Brian Corman	Mr. Kashif Pirzada
Professor W. Raymond Cummins	Ms Patricia Ricci
Mr. Brian Davis	Professor Adel S. Sedra
Dr. Claude Davis	Mr. Amir Shalaby
The Honourable William G. Davis	Ms Wendy Swinton
Professor Sherwin Desser	Professor Donna Wells
Dr. Alice Dong	Ms Geeta Yadav
Dr. Inez Elliston	Mr. Louis R. Charpentier, Secretary of the Governing Council
Ms Susan Eng	
Professor Luigi Girolametto	<u>Secretariat:</u>
Professor David Jenkins	Mr. Neil Dobbs
Ms Françoise Ko	Ms Cristina Oke
Ms Karen Lewis	
Mr. Gerald A. Lokash	

Absent:

Ms Mary Anne V. Chambers	The Honourable Robert K. Rae
Professor Jack Carr	Dr. Joseph L. Rotman
Dr. Shari Graham Fell	Mrs. Susan M. Scace
Mr. Paul V. Godfrey	Ms Heather Schramm
Ms Shirley Hoy	Ms Carol Stephenson
Professor Brian Langille	Mr. John H. Tory
The Honourable David R. Peterson	Professor John Wedge
	Mr. Robert S. Weiss

In Attendance:

Mr. Felix P. Chee, Vice-President, Business Affairs
Dr. Jon S. Dellandrea, Vice-President and Chief Advancement Officer
Dr. Sheldon Levy, Vice-President, Government and Institutional Relations
Professor Carolyn Tuohy, Vice-President, Policy Development and Associate Provost
Dr. Beata FitzPatrick, Director of the Office of the President and Assistant Vice-President
Professor Vivek Goel, Vice-Provost, Faculty
Professor Derek McCammond, Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget

In Attendance (cont'd):

Professor Robert McNutt, Principal, University of Toronto at Mississauga
Professor Ian Orchard, Vice-Provost, Students
Professor Rob Baker, Vice-Principal (Research & Graduate Studies) and Associate Dean (Sciences), University of Toronto at Mississauga
Professor Michael Lettieri, Vice-Principal (Academic) & Associate Dean (Humanities & Part-time Studies), University of Toronto at Mississauga
Ms Mary Ann Mavrinc, College Librarian, University of Toronto at Mississauga
Ms Diane Borowski, Director, Development, Alumni and Public Affairs
Ms Susan Girard, Assistant Secretary of the Governing Council
Ms Mary McGee, Assistant Provost
Mr. Elan Ohayon, former member of the Governing Council
Mr. Len Paris, Manager, Police Services, University of Toronto at Mississauga
Ms Emily Sadowski, President, Association of Part-Time Undergraduate Students
Ms Maureen Somerville, Chair, College of Electors
Mr. Jorge Sousa, President, Graduate Students' Union
Mrs. Beverley Stefureak, Assistant Secretary of the Governing Council

IN ACCORDANCE WITH A DETERMINATION BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE PURSUANT TO SECTION 38 OF BY-LAW NUMBER 2, THE GOVERNING COUNCIL CONSIDERED ITEMS 3 AND 20 *IN CAMERA*.

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

The Chairman welcomed members and guests to the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM), and thanked Principal Robert McNutt and his colleagues for hosting the meeting of the Governing Council on the Mississauga campus.

The Chairman reported that she had received two speaking requests and that, if members had no objection, she would allow these requests at the appropriate time in the agenda.

(b) The Honourable Pauline M. McGibbon

The Chairman asked members to pause for a moment to remember the life and contributions of The Honourable Pauline M. McGibbon, who had died on December 14th at the age of 91 after a long illness. Pauline McGibbon had graduated from the University of Toronto in 1933 with a degree in modern history. She served as the first female Chancellor of the University of Toronto from 1971 to 1974, as well as a member of the Senate from 1952-1961, as President of the University of Toronto Alumni Association, and as President of the Victoria College Alumni Association. She had received an honorary degree from the University of Toronto in 1975.

Immediately after her term as Chancellor, she had become the first woman Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario – the first woman in the British Commonwealth to hold such a position.

Members observed a minute of silence in memory of The Honourable Pauline McGibbon, remembering especially her dedication to public service, and her life-long commitment to this University.

1. Chair's Remarks (cont'd)

(c) Principal Robert McNutt

The Chairman noted that, since Professor McNutt was retiring as Principal on June 30, 2002, this was the last meeting of the Governing Council that he would host as Principal. She recognized his achievements during his term of office, which included leading UTM through two very ambitious planning cycles, repositioning the campus for the challenge of capital development, as exemplified in the Communication, Culture and Information Technology (CCIT) project, and for enrolment growth and distinguishing himself in fundraising initiatives for the campus. She also acknowledged how invaluable his ability to relate effectively with the surrounding community had been. She thanked Professor McNutt and his wife Paula for graciously hosting numerous events at Lislehurst, and for all their contributions to the University.

The Chairman thanked members of the Conference Services Department and the Principal's Office, who had worked closely with the Governing Council Office on the logistics of the meeting - particularly Antonia Maughn, Conference Assistant, David Taylor, Audio-Visual Technician, and Colleen McColeman, Assistant to the Principal.

(d) Announcements

The Chairman congratulated two members of the Governing Council on their recent appointments – Ms Shirley Hoy as Chief Administrative Officer of the City of Toronto, and Ms Rose Patten as Executive Vice-President of Human Resources of the Bank of Montreal.

The Chairman extended congratulations to Dr. Robert Bennett and his wife who had recently celebrated their 39th wedding anniversary, and to Ms Heather Schramm and her fiancé, who were in Calgary preparing for their wedding in December.

She noted that Professor John Wedge had been elected on October 29 as a teaching staff member from the Faculty of Medicine but was unfortunately unable to attend the meeting.

The Chairman welcomed the Chair of the College of Electors to the meeting.

(e) Meeting Procedure

The Chairman drew member's attention to item 3 on the agenda, and indicated that the Executive Committee had determined that the consideration of that item would take place *in camera*. All non-members of Council would be asked to leave the meeting after the Principal had concluded his remarks.

2. Principal's Remarks

At the invitation of the Chairman, Principal Robert McNutt introduced the senior members of his staff who were in attendance. He then welcomed members of the Governing Council to the Mississauga Campus. He said that the UTM was pursuing 60% growth, from 6,500 students to 10,000 students. That would involve the addition of four or five major buildings, and considerable work was being put into planning and fundraising for the expansion. Concerted efforts were underway to secure capital funding from the Province of Ontario, and Principal McNutt was confident that the Province would support enrolment growth at Mississauga, which was a key region of high population growth in the Ontario.

2. Principal's Remarks (cont'd)

This was, therefore, a unique time in the history of UTM, and Professor McNutt envied his successor, who would have the opportunity to bring this growth to fruition. He noted that the Governing Council would be receiving a number of Project Planning Reports over the next few months, and he urged the Council's support for the growth of the Mississauga and Scarborough campuses, which would enable them to develop critical mass in more areas and to become academically much richer places. He urged members to become familiar with the extraordinary beauty of the Mississauga Campus and to visit Lislehurst, one of the jewels of the University's properties, for the reception following the meeting.

IN ACCORDANCE WITH A DETERMINATION BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE PURSUANT TO SECTIONS 38 AND 40 OF BY-LAW NUMBER 2, ITEM 3 WAS CONSIDERED BY THE GOVERNING COUNCIL *IN CAMERA*.

3. Report of the Committee for Honorary Degrees

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT seventeen of the recommendations contained in Report Number 42 of the Committee for Honorary Degrees be approved.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT the Chancellor and the President be empowered to determine the degree to be conferred on each candidate and the date of the conferral.

The Chairman reminded members that nominees' names and the discussion of nominations was strictly confidential. When all individuals had responded to their offers, the President would report to the Governing Council. Following that report, a public announcement would be made.

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL RETURNED TO OPEN SESSION.

4. Minutes of the Governing Council Meeting held on October 25, 2001

The minutes of the previous meeting held on October 25, 2001 were approved.

5. Business Arising from the Minutes of the Previous Meeting

There was no business arising from the previous meeting.

6. Addresses by Non-Members

(a) President, Graduate Students' Union

Mr. Sousa expressed his pleasure with the substantial improvements in graduate student funding, and he urged that the provision of funding packages to all doctoral-stream graduate students be established as a matter of policy. He referred to the need for a settlement between the University and the locals of the Canadian Union of Public Employees representing teaching assistants and OISE/U.T. graduate assistants, and encouraged the resumption of negotiations.

Mr. Sousa noted that in many departments there was no direct student participation in faculty appointments. He requested that provision be made for student membership of all search committees. Finally, Mr. Sousa stated the strong opposition of the Graduate Students' Union to the proposal for a student levy to fund the redevelopment of Varsity Stadium and Varsity Arena. While the planned development was a very good one, it would be wholly inappropriate to call on students to provide a large part of the funding for it. Students were already facing substantially increased tuition fees, with proposals apparently forthcoming for still further increases. Proceeding with a referendum to seek support for a levy in the face of the opposition of the Graduate Students' Union and other student groups would not promote partnership. He asked for improved consultation with respect to such matters.

The President observed that during Mr. Sousa's term as President of the Graduate Students' Union, there had been extraordinary improvements for graduate students, for which Mr. Sousa could well take a good deal of credit.

(b) President, Association of Part-Time Undergraduate Students

Ms Sadowski reported on numerous activities undertaken by the Association of Part-Time Undergraduate Students (APUS) including: a highly successful orientation event called "a Taste of the Caribbean," which had been intended to reach out to groups that had traditionally suffered systemic barriers; a town-hall meeting on the issue of funding for part-time students; and vigorous lobbying activities - including support for the work of the Ontario Undergraduate Student Alliance and the Canadian Federation of Students - to advocate the reinstatement of Ontario Student Assistance Program (OSAP) eligibility for all part-time students. APUS would participate in the National Day of Student Action on February 6, 2002, and it would hold a conference on part-time student issues, including another town-hall meeting, which would focus on part-time students' work for social change. The Association was planning a participatory workshop on the part-time student experience, which Ms Sadowski hoped would yield an anthology of experiences. Finally, APUS was surveying its membership to develop demographic data on the group and to arrive at a better understanding of the membership's views on various matters.

7. Report of the President

(a) Federal Budget

Indirect costs of research. The President reported his great pleasure at the announcements relating to research funding in the December 10 federal budget. For the first time, the Government of Canada had allocated funding to support the indirect costs of the research

7. Report of the President (cont'd)

sponsored by the national research-granting councils. While the allocation was for one year only, the President was confident that the decision to provide funding for the indirect costs of research would not be reversed. He anticipated that, based on its research grants, that the University (excluding the teaching hospitals) would receive approximately \$16-million of the total of \$200-million in funding for the year. The amount of funding for indirect costs worked out to be 20 cents for each dollar of research grants earned. While this proportion was somewhat disappointing because the University's actual indirect costs were closer to 40 cents, the principle of support for indirect costs had been established, and the universities would work for an increase in the amount to match actual costs. The President and Vice-President Munroe-Blum would make the case during forthcoming visits by the Deputy Minister of Finance and by the Minister of Industry. The Minister would be speaking to the University's students on Innovations Canada. The President commended the efforts of Professor Munroe-Blum, carried out over many years, as well as those of Professor Martha Piper, President of the University of British Columbia, and Dr. Robert Giroux, President and C.E.O. of the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, who had played key roles in advocating funding to cover the indirect cost of research.

Increased funding for the research granting councils. The Budget had included a 14% increase in funding for the Canadian Institutes for Health Research and a 7% increase in the funding for the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council and the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council. While, again, the University community had hoped for larger increases, the President was pleased with the progress that was being made.

Canadian Institute for Advanced Research (C.I.A.R.). The Federal budget had announced \$25-million of funding over five years for the C.I.A.R., which represented not only a substantial increase but also a guarantee of funding over five years. The announcement was very important for research in Canada.

The Chairman congratulated the President and Professor Munroe-Blum. They had both put an enormous amount of work into their advocacy, and the outcome had made history in Canada. It would change the future of the University, and of universities in general.

(b) Provincial Government Relations

Capital funding. The President reported that he and Dr. Levy were making every effort to secure from the Province of Ontario the capital funding that would be essential for the full realization of the enrolment expansion planned on the Mississauga and Scarborough campuses. Pending Provincial approval of full capital funding, it was necessary for the University to stage the expansion plan for the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM) and the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC). The Mississauga and Scarborough campuses had developed good plans for phasing their expansion. The President expressed his hope that the resignation of the Premier and the hiatus during the process of choosing his successor would not delay a Provincial decision.

Operating funds. The President said that the Province had made a commitment to increase operating funding to support the expansion of undergraduate and graduate enrolment by an amount of \$220-million per year across the system by 2003-04. There was some concern, however, that the number of additional students who would seek university enrolment had been underestimated.

7. Report of the President (cont'd)

Queen's University Principal Leggett's proposal concerning de-regulation of all tuition fees. The President commented on the proposal by Professor William C. Leggett, Principal of Queen's University, that all tuition fees be deregulated on the condition that 30% of the proceeds of tuition-fee increases would be devoted to increasing student financial aid to needy students. If such deregulation were granted, Queen's University would commit a second amount of 30% of the proceeds of the increase to need-based aid. Principal Leggett had made his proposal for two reasons. First, he was passionately committed to increasing aid to the neediest students. Second, with the real costs of university education increasing by 4% per year, a 2% annual increase in tuition fees would represent a real decline of 2% per year in the revenue from that source. The President stated that the University of Toronto had made no comment on the proposal. The President and the Provost would be discussing it with the Principals and Deans. The University had no plan like that proposed by Queen's University's Principal, and the University was not a partner in making that proposal.

In response to questions, the President and the Provost said that the University's position had been and continued to be that the Governing Council was in the best position to set tuition fees. By taking proposals through the Governing Council there were opportunities for discussion and debate with elected students, faculty, alumni and other representatives. The administration would bring a proposal for the University of Toronto's tuition fee schedule to the Business Board, likely at its meeting early in March. At present, however, no change could be made to the currently regulated tuition fees, beyond the permissible 2% increase, without the Government of Ontario's approval. University officers had been asked whether the University of Toronto would, like Queen's University proposed to do, provide funds to match the increase to need-based student aid equal to 30% of the proceeds of tuition-fee increases. The President and the Provost reminded members that the University of Toronto's policy guaranteed that no student offered admission to a program at the University should be unable to enter or complete the program due to lack of financial means.

(c) Merit-Based Student Aid

The President reported that he had been working very hard to achieve his strongly held view that the amounts available for student support should be directed towards those in financial need. The objectives were (i) to ensure accessibility to all qualified students, and (ii) to enable students to leave their programs in a more equitable position with respect to debt load. In a situation of limited resources, achieving those objectives would require the redirection of some funding now used for merit-based awards to need-based awards. That would by no means involve the elimination of merit-based aid. First, many merit-based awards were funded by endowments that were governed by trust agreements, in which the donors had specified the use of the proceeds of the endowment for merit-based scholarships. Second, merit-based scholarships could be continued, but the dollar amount could depend on an assessment of financial need.

Several efforts were underway to achieve this goal. First, an internal working group had been charged with reviewing the student awards currently available within the University. Many awards were within the control of the federated universities as well as the various faculties and colleges. Second, the University would work with the Province to encourage an evolution of the Ontario Student Assistance Program (OSAP), in particular the development of an improved method of evaluating need - one that would take a realistic view of the cost of living. Third, representatives of the University would be meeting with representatives of five other universities - Guelph, McMaster, Queen's, Waterloo and

7. Report of the President (cont'd)

Western Ontario - to develop a co-operative strategy with respect to scholarship offers among universities. Finally, the University would continue its efforts to gather support from alumni and other benefactors for need-based student aid.

(d) Alumni and Donor Relations

The President reported that he had attended events for alumni and benefactors in Victoria, Vancouver, Hong Kong and Singapore. The events had been very successful, with attendees manifesting great enthusiasm for the University. The President had been particularly gratified by the loyalty of alumni in Hong Kong and Singapore. At a special convocation held in Hong Kong, Dr. David Chu had given the address.

(e) National University of Singapore

During his visit to Singapore, the President had met with the leaders of the National University of Singapore and had worked to establish a collaborative relationship with them. That University had currently established a special institutional relationship with a number of U.S. universities: Stanford, Johns Hopkins and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. It had expressed an interest in a similar relationship with the University of Toronto. Such a relationship could lead to co-operative programs and exchanges, and the President thought that it would be a very desirable one.

(f) Advisory Committee for the Vice-President and Provost

The President reported that the search for the new Vice-President and Provost was well underway. Consultants had been engaged - a partnership consisting of the Canadian firm of Landmark and the U.S. firm of Baker Parker. The principals of the two firms had spent two days at the University, becoming familiar with its needs, and would be meeting again with the Committee in January.

(g) Equity Issues Advisory Group

The President observed that a very special feature of the University of Toronto was the broad range of officers working to ensure equity and to prevent discrimination based on gender, sexual orientation, physical disability and many other factors. The Report of the Equity Issues Advisory Group had recently been published and was available on the University's website. The President noted that the University's Status of Women Officer, Professor Judy Globerman, had resigned from the position and was currently at the University of British Columbia. A search was underway for a new Officer, chaired by the Vice-President, Human Resources, Professor Angela Hildyard. The President commended the work of Ms José Sigouin as Interim Status of Women Officer over the past few months.

(h) President's Other Activities

The President reported that he had recently completed a very interesting and useful process at Columbia University. In the 1960s, every science department in that University had ranked among the best in the world, but the ranking of many of its science departments had more recently slipped. The President had chaired a committee of distinguished scientists who had participated in a long-range planning process designed to enable Columbia to return towards its former pre-eminence. The President observed that some elements of their planning initiative could be of value to the University of Toronto. In the course of his comments on the matter, the President noted that Columbia University had just completed a campaign, which had succeeded in raising \$2.4-billion.

7. Report of the President (cont'd)**(i) Appreciation**

The President thanked members for their remarkable support. He had found the University's unicameral system of governance to be an extraordinarily good one. He offered members his best wishes for the season and for 2002.

**8. Capital Project: 500 University Avenue - Project Planning Report
University Infrastructure Investment Fund: Allocation**

Professor Wells informed members that this proposal concerned the renovation of 500 University Avenue, which had been bought over the summer to house the rehabilitation science sector of the Faculty of Medicine. Phase I of the project would be completely financed by a loan of \$10.4 million from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund, and it was expected to be completed by August 2002. An architect had already been retained. In discussion at the Academic Board, members had asked about the possibility of donors contributing to this project.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

- a) THAT the Project Planning Report for the proposed space program and the necessary renovations identified to accommodate the Rehabilitation Sector in the Faculty of Medicine at 500 University Avenue be approved in principle (an executive summary of which is attached to Report Number 109 of the Academic Board as Appendix "C").
- b) THAT Phase I of the Project which represents a renovation of 4502 nasm be completed immediately at a cost of \$11,123,400, and that Phase II of the project which is an additional 2265 nasm be undertaken at a future date.
- c) THAT an allocation of \$10,423,400 from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund to fund Phase 1 of the 500 University Avenue project be made, which is scheduled to be repaid by the Faculty of Medicine.
- d) THAT the total capital allocation made, namely the sum of the allocation in c) above and the earlier \$700,000 approval in June, 2001 [total of \$11,123,400] will be repaid by the Faculty of Medicine to the University Infrastructure Investment Fund over a fifteen year period; with no interest costs for a period of five years following the date of completion of Phase 1 [anticipated to be September, 2002]. The Faculty of Medicine will assume responsibility for the interest charges on the outstanding balance after five years, starting on September 2007.
- e) THAT the interest costs on the total allocation of \$11,123,400 for Phase 1 will be carried by the Operating Budget of the University for the period through to September, 2007. Thereafter all interest costs will be the responsibility of the Faculty of Medicine.

9. Capital Project: Leslie L. Dan Pharmacy Building - Revised Project Planning Report
University Infrastructure Investment Fund: Allocation

Professor Wells reported that the Academic Board had considered a proposal for approval of the Leslie L. Dan Pharmacy building on the northeast corner of College Street and University Avenue. The building would cost \$70 million, of which all but \$17 million was in hand. In fact, there had been news of a further donation that would reduce the shortfall significantly. Part of the funding included an allocation from the UIIF. The new building would be a state-of-the-art research and support facility and would accommodate the Faculty's expected expansion of enrolment to 240 students. Mr. Shalaby reported that the Business Board had recently approved a proposal, subject to Governing Council approval of the project, to begin design and site-development work on this project.

Three matters arose in discussion.

Proceeding without full funding. A member asked whether approval of the proposal would set a precedent whereby projects could be approved and commenced without full funding in place. He asked about the likelihood of the University's securing the necessary \$17.4-million in future donations and about the University's contingency plan if it failed to do so. Professor Sedra replied that approval of the proposal would not set a precedent. A precedent had previously been established with the commencement of the Bahen Centre for Information Technology with a significant funding gap. That gap had, since the commencement of construction, been reduced significantly, and Professor Sedra anticipated that it would be reduced further. With respect to the Pharmacy building, the University would continue its strenuous efforts to secure further donations. Indeed, the gap had already been reduced by an additional donation of \$5-million and it would be reduced further. The back-up plan was that any gap would be covered by operating funds derived from the additional income earned by doubling enrolment in the undergraduate program in Pharmacy. A financial plan demonstrated that the enrolment increase would generate sufficient additional funding both to provide teaching to the additional students and, if necessary, to repay the loan for the new building. Mr. Shalaby added that the Business Board had been convinced by the Provost and by the Dean of the Faculty of Pharmacy that the building should proceed. It was a high-priority project. The Dean had provided assurances concerning the prospects for further fundraising and concerning the ability of the operating budget to handle repayment should there remain a gap. The Board had concluded that proceeding with the project represented a risk, but one that was being well managed and worth taking.

Donated computer system. A member reported that computer systems for use in the new building would be donated by a pharmacy chain. Student leaders in the Faculty of Pharmacy had expressed concern that use of the system would give that particular chain an unfair advantage over independent pharmacies in recruiting graduates. Professor Sedra indicated that he had no knowledge of any donation tied to the use of a proprietary computer system.

Use of existing buildings. In response to a member's question, Professor Sedra said that there was a real need for space that would be freed up by the move of the Faculty of Pharmacy to the proposed new Pharmacy Building. The administration would make a recommendation in due course.

9. Capital Project: Leslie L. Dan Pharmacy Building - Revised Project Planning Report
University Infrastructure Investment Fund: Allocation (cont'd)

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

- a) THAT the revised Project Planning Report for the Leslie L. Dan Pharmacy Building be approved in principle (a copy of the executive summary is attached to Report Number 109 of the Academic Board as Appendix "D"),
- c) THAT the revised project for the Leslie L. Dan Pharmacy Building with a project scope of 8,680 net assignable square meters, sited on College Street [near University Avenue], at a project cost of \$70,000,000 with funding as follows, be approved:

SuperBuild	\$28.800 million
SuperBuild interest	1.640 million
Leslie Dan contribution	8.000 million
Herb Binder contribution	2.000 million
UIIF contribution	7.200 million
Apotex contribution	5.000 million
Future donations to be sought through the Campaign, including naming opportunities, research funding possibilities through CFI and OIT sources.	
Funding from increased student enrolments	17.360 million

and

- c) THAT an allocation of \$7,200,000 from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund [UIIF] for the Pharmacy Building be approved.

10. Capital Program: University of Toronto at Scarborough - Classroom / Arts Building - Project Planning Report

Professor Wells indicated that this new building proposed for UTSC was needed to accommodate the expected enrolment expansion at this campus. The building would cost approximately \$15 million and would be funded by expected provincial capital support, donations, and the operating grants and tuition fees from the increased student enrolment. Professor Sedra had explained to the Academic Board that enrolment expansion was predicated on full average operating funding for enrolment growth over the 2000-01 levels plus a substantial government contribution toward the capital costs. The former had been announced earlier this year but the University was expecting a response on capital support in the near future.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

- a) THAT the Project Planning Report for the Classroom/Arts Building be approved in principle (a copy of the Executive Summary is attached to Report Number 109 of the Academic Board as Appendix "F").

10. Capital Program: University of Toronto at Scarborough - Classroom / Arts Building - Project Planning Report (cont'd)

- b) THAT the project scope of 2372 nasm in total on a site extending from the existing Humanities Wing be approved at an estimated cost of \$15.5 million (2003 dollars) excluding campus improvements. A loan will be required to advance this project with funding sources as follows:
- (i) Ontario Government support to be negotiated
 - (ii) External contributions through donors, and
 - (iii) Increased student enrolments on the UTSC campus.

11. Capital Project: University of Toronto at Scarborough - Management Building Project Planning Report

Professor Wells noted that this new building was also needed to accommodate the expected enrolment expansion at the UTSC campus. It would also cost approximately \$15 million and the funding sources were the same as those for the planned Classroom/Arts Building.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

- a) THAT the Project Planning Report for the Management Building be approved in principle (a copy of the Executive Summary is attached to Report Number 109 of the Academic Board as Appendix "G").
- b) THAT the project scope of 2436 nasm in total on a site adjacent to the existing Humanities Wing be approved at an estimated cost of \$15.4 million (2003 dollars) excluding campus improvements. A loan will be required to advance this project with funding sources as follows:
 - (i) Ontario Government support to be negotiated
 - (ii) External contributions through donors, and
 - (iii) Increased student enrolments on the UTSC campus.

12. Capital Project: University of Toronto at Scarborough - Student Centre - Project Planning Report University Infrastructure Investment Fund: Allocation

Professor Wells reported that the Board had considered a proposal for a much-needed student centre for the UTSC campus. The impetus for this building had come from the students, who had approved a levy to raise funds for the Centre. The building would cost approximately \$14 million to be funded by

- the student levy,
- a 50% match of the levy,
- \$1 million from fundraising,
- an allocation from the UIIF and
- the remainder from a mortgage.

The motion had been revised to reflect that, in part b (ii), the matching contribution to be provided by the Provost would come from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund.

12. Capital Project: University of Toronto at Scarborough - Student Centre - Project Planning Report
University Infrastructure Investment Fund: Allocation (cont'd)

Dr. Nestor reminded members that the role of the University Affairs Board related to capital projects was to review the Project Planning Reports within its areas of responsibility and to concur with the Academic Board in recommending approval in principle to the Governing Council. He reported that there had been enthusiastic support for the proposed student centre at the University of Toronto at Scarborough and that the motion to recommend approval had been carried unanimously.

Mr. Shalaby reported that the Business Board had also considered the project and had, subject to Governing Council approval of the project, approved expenditures for design and site-development work. The Board had congratulated Scarborough Campus Student Council President, Mr. Sundeep Singh, and the past-President, Mr. Hanif Thakor, on their leadership in getting this project underway and had congratulated all UTSC students on the initiative.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

- a) THAT the Project Planning Report for the Student Centre at UTSC be approved in principle (a copy of the Executive Summary is attached as Appendix "E" to Report Number 109 of the Academic Board).
- b) THAT the project scope of 2418 nasm in total, on a site facing Military Trail and adjacent to the Recreation Centre as identified in the UTSC Master Plan 2001, be approved at an estimated cost of \$13.92 million (2003 dollars) excluding campus improvements, with funding as follows:
 - (i) A mortgage, value \$6,270,885, to be amortized over 25 years at a 8% rate for an annual cost of \$580,796. Repayments to be made from the student levy as well as income derived from retail rentals within the Student Centre.
 - (ii) A matching contribution of \$3,748,695 from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund. [50% contribution for each student dollar raised. The \$3,748,695 represents the present value of the student contributions which span a 25-year period].
 - (iii) A one-time only contribution from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund of \$975,000 towards the cost of the project to ensure that the financial integrity of the model which requires a 25-year payback at an 8% rate.
 - (iv) A commitment from the University of Toronto at Scarborough to contribute \$1 million dollars toward the Student Centre from fundraising activities.

13. Governing Council Elections: Designation of Academic Ranks

Dr. Nestor informed members that there had been four items related to Governing Council elections considered by the University Affairs Board at its meeting of November 5. Two of these items were for information and the other two were recommended for approval by Governing Council. Report Number 102 of the University Affairs Board summarized the first two items: a Report on the 2001 Election Process and the Survey on Web-Based Voting; and a Report on Special Students. He noted that the Report of the University Affairs Board and the reports of the Elections Committee's meetings this fall were available on the web. The Elections Committee had made its decision on the matter of Special Students and had provided for a mechanism for students in the Transitional Year Program and in the Academic Bridging Program to self-identify as a group for the purposes of Governing Council elections. A report on consultations with the Director of these programs would be brought to the University Affairs Board at its January 22 meeting.

Dr. Nestor explained that the following motion designated three academic ranks, which had been recently created and defined in the *Policy and Procedures on Academic Appointments*, whose members would be eligible to vote and be candidates in Governing Council and Academic Board elections. It was essentially a housekeeping motion and there had been no discussion of the item at the University Affairs Board.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT Assistant Professor (Conditional), Athletics Instructor, and Senior Athletics Instructor be designated by the Governing Council as academic ranks for the purposes of clause 1 (1) (m) of the *University of Toronto Act, 1971*.

14. Governing Council Elections: *Election Guidelines 2002*

Dr. Nestor indicated that the following motion arose out of the Board's responsibility for policy and process related to Governing Council elections, and was a recommendation to approve the *Election Guidelines 2002*. Editorial or updating revisions were approved by the Board. However, the changes this year were significant amendments to the Guidelines and therefore required Governing Council approval.

Dr. Nestor reported that there had been spirited discussion at the Board about the original proposed demerit system that had linked demerits to vote penalties. An amendment had been made at the meeting to remove the linkage between demerit points and vote penalties. With the revision and a friendly amendment changing "public reprimand" to "public announcement," the motion to recommend approval had been carried unanimously.

The Chairman noted that, in the absence of objection from members, she had agreed to a speaking request on this matter from Mr. Elan Ohayan, a former member of the Governing Council. Mr. Ohayan said that, in his opinion, the proposal for web-based elections failed to meet appropriate standards of democracy and privacy and failed to comply with the *University of Toronto Act*. It was his view that the proposal would not provide fair access to the elections process because some students, often students from minority cultural groups, did not have equal access to, or feel comfortable with, computers. He also believed that web-based voting was not sufficiently secure, that university networks could be compromised, and that the web-based system was not sufficiently reliable. He also expressed his concern that the system provided no means of verification of counts. While

14. Governing Council Elections: *Election Guidelines 2002* (cont'd)

it was said that there would be no need for a recount on a computer-based system, the recent U.S. Presidential election had demonstrated the need for independent auditing of the outcome of elections. The *University of Toronto Act* required that elections be conducted by secret ballot. In his view, web-based voting did not, however, provide assurance of secrecy. Mr. Ohayon believed that, while computer-system administrators with access to the information had undertaken not to view students' votes, they could do so. He therefore recommended that no change be made in the voting system for graduate students and that voting for undergraduate students be returned to traditional ballot box elections. He noted that studies conducted by researchers at the California Institute of Technology and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and those at the National Science Foundation had recommended against use of the internet for voting.

In response, it was noted that previous voting systems were not without fault, and that low voter turnout had always been a concern. Network security staff had observed the web-based system used in the undergraduate constituencies in 2001 and had found no attempt had been made to breach security. The system had in place safeguards to prevent the association of votes with particular voters. There had been a very good discussion of the matter in the University Affairs Board, and web-based voting had received solid support. A member noted that the Graduate Students' Union, while recognizing the need of the Governing Council to move to web-based elections, did not endorse the proposal. A member observed that the studies cited by the guest speaker, which had recommended against internet-based voting, had dealt with very large elections for public office rather than with elections within an institution with 50,000 student voters. Security problems were of an entirely different order for a U.S. national election.

A member asked for clarification of the status of communication with students in the Transition Year Program and Academic Bridging Program with respect to those programs being designated as programs of post-secondary study for purposes of Governing Council elections. Dr. Nestor replied that the University Affairs Board had at its previous meeting asked the Elections Committee to pursue the issue and to report to the January meeting of the University Affairs Board. It would, therefore, be premature for the Governing Council to consider the matter at this time. In response to a member's question, the Secretary said that it would probably be too late to implement any change for the 2002 elections.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT the *Elections Guidelines 2002* be approved.

The Chairman reminded members that, under the schedule set out in the *Election Guidelines 2002*, nominations for teaching staff and student members to the Governing Council opened on Tuesday January 29 and closed on Monday February 11. She also noted that nominations for alumni members of the Governing Council opened on Monday January 7 and closed on Tuesday February 26. She encouraged members to ask their colleagues to consider becoming involved in governance.

15. Annual Report of 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 Review of Academic Programs and Units, October 2001. The Chair complimented Professor Tuohy on the clarity of this very important report.

16. Reports for Information

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

- Report Number 109 of the Academic Board (November 15, 2001)
- Report Number 115 of the Business Board (November 19, 2001)
- Report Number 102 of the University Affairs Board (November 5, 2001)
- Report Number 103 of the University Affairs Board (November 26, 2001)
- Report Number 342 of the Executive Committee (December 11, 2001)

A question arose with respect to Report Number 115 of the Business Board. A member expressed concern about the absence of action with respect to ethical investing. Mr. Shalaby replied that a process was in place by which members of the University, with concerns about a particular aspect of the University's investments, could prepare a written brief arguing that the investment(s) caused social harm, and they could gather a stated number of signatures in support of that case. That would cause the President to strike a panel of members of the Governing Council to examine the matter and to recommend any action deemed appropriate. Mr. Shalaby observed that while any recommendation to take action would be made to the Business Board, which was responsible for investment matters, the jurisdiction with respect to the Policy on Social and Political Aspects of University Investments, which established the process he had just described, was within the jurisdiction of the University Affairs Board. Finally, Mr. Shalaby observed that while the matter had been cited as arising from Report Number 115 of the Business Board, there was no reference to the matter in that Report.

17. Date of the Next Meeting

The Chairman reminded members of the Council's next meeting, scheduled for Thursday, February 14 at 5:00 p.m.

18. Question Period

A member congratulated the President and Vice-President, Research and International Relations, on the success of the November 16 celebration of the 100th Anniversary of the Nobel Prize. Members applauded.

A member also congratulated the Vice-President, Research and International Relations, on hosting an event that introduced the provincial Minister of Finance to the investigators who had received grants from the province's funding programs.

A member expressed his concern about the lack of special bus transportation for students to this meeting of Governing Council. The Chairman noted that there had not been a strong demand for transportation to the meeting, and that the usual car pool arrangements had been made. She recalled that special bus transportation had been provided for a previous meeting at the UTM, and had been used by only a handful of students. Such transportation was very costly. A member noted that buses were not provided to members of the Mississauga and Scarborough campuses to transport them to Governing Council meetings at the St. George campus.

18. Question Period (cont'd)

A member congratulated the University's administration for its focus on need-based financial aid for students, and encouraged them to include student leaders in internal working groups. He noted that there had been reports in the press referring to a proposed increase in tuition for the Faculty of Law. Professor Sedra replied that tuition fees had not yet been approved, and that no decisions concerning recommendations for tuition fees had yet been made.

19. Other Business

There were no items of other business.

The Chairman wished members and guests happy holidays and best wishes for 2002.

IN ACCORDANCE WITH A DETERMINATION BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE PURSUANT TO SECTIONS 38 AND 40 OF BY-LAW NUMBER 2, ITEM 20 WAS CONSIDERED BY THE GOVERNING COUNCIL *IN CAMERA*.

20. Board and Committee Assignment: University Affairs Board

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT Professor John Wedge be appointed to the University Affairs Board for the remainder of the 2001-02 year, effective immediately.

The meeting adjourned at 7:00 p.m.

Secretary
January 17, 2002

Chairman