

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO  
**THE GOVERNING COUNCIL**

**Monday, March 29, 2004**

MINUTES OF THE GOVERNING COUNCIL meeting held on Monday, March 29, 2004 at 4:30 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall.

Present:

Dr. Thomas H. Simpson (In the Chair)  
Ms Rose M. Pattern, Vice-Chair  
Professor Robert J. Birgeneau, President  
Mr. Sachin K. Aggarwal  
Mr. Muhammad Basil Ahmad  
Professor Mary Beattie  
Dr. Robert M. Bennett  
Ms Murphy Browne  
Professor Philip G. Byer  
Mr. Bruce G. Cameron  
Professor John R. G. Challis  
Professor Brian Corman  
Professor W. Raymond Cummins  
Dr. Claude S. Davis  
Mr. Brian Davis  
The Honourable William G. Davis  
Dr. Alice Dong  
Dr. Inez N. Elliston  
Ms Susan Eng  
Dr. Shari Graham Fell  
Mr. Mike Foderick  
Professor Vivek Goel  
Dr. Gerald Halbert  
Ms Shirley Hoy  
Professor David J. A. Jenkins

Ms Françoise D. E. Ko  
Ms Karen Lewis  
Mr. Joseph Mapa  
Professor Michael R. Marrus  
Professor Ian R. McDonald  
Dr. John Nestor  
Ms Jacqueline C. Orange  
Mr. John F. (Jack) Petch  
The Honourable David R. Peterson  
Mr. Chris Ramsaroop  
Professor Arthur Ripstein  
Dr. Susan M. Scace  
Mr. Amir Shalaby  
Professor Barbara Sherwood Lollar  
Professor Jake J. Thiessen  
Mr. Adam Watson  
Professor John Wedge  
Mr. Robert S. Weiss

Mr. Louis Charpentier,  
Secretary of the Governing Council

Secretariat:  
Mr. Neil Dobbs  
Ms Susan Girard

Absent:

Professor Pamela Catton  
Dr. Paul Godfrey  
Mr. George E. Myhal  
The Honourable Vivienne Poy

Mr. Timothy Reid  
Dr. Joseph Rotman  
Mr. W. David Wilson

In Attendance:

Ms Holly Andrews-Taylor, member-elect of the Governing Council  
Ms Shaila Kibria, member-elect of the Governing Council  
Mr. Ari Kopolovic, member-elect of the Governing Council  
Mr. Stefan Neata, member-elect of the Governing Council  
Mr. Andrew Pinto, member-elect of the Governing Council  
Dr. Jon S. Dellandrea, Vice-President and Chief Advancement Officer  
Professor Angela Hildyard, Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity  
Ms Catherine J. Riggall, Interim Vice-President, Business Affairs  
Professor Carolyn Tuohy, Vice-President, Government and Institutional Relations  
Mr. John Bisanti, Chief Capital Projects Officer  
Ms Sheree Drummond, Assistant Provost and Special Assistant to the Provost

Mr. Andrew Drummond, Assistant Secretary, Office of the Governing Council  
Dr. Beata FitzPatrick, Director of the Office of the President and Assistant Vice-President  
Ms Rivi Frankle, Assistant Vice-President, Alumni and Development  
Ms Bryn Macpherson-White, Director of University Events and Presidential Liaison  
(Advancement)  
Mr. David Melville, former member of Governing Council, Treasurer of the Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students  
Ms Rosie Parnass, Quality of Work Life Advisor and Special Assistant to the Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity  
Ms Christina Sass-Kortsak, Assistant Vice-President, Human Resources  
Professor Ronald Venter, Vice-Provost, Space and Facilities Planning  
Professor Safwat Zaky, Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget

#### Chair's Remarks

The Chair announced the appointment of two new Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council appointees, Mr. Joseph Mapa and Mr. David Wilson. Both had been appointed for three-year terms beginning March 10, 2004. He welcomed Mr. Mapa who was the President and Chief Executive Officer of the Mount Sinai Hospital. Mr. Mapa was a four-time graduate of the University and brought to Council extensive knowledge and experience in health care education and health sciences research. Mr. Wilson, who was not able to be present today, was the Vice-Chairman of the Bank of Nova Scotia and a graduate of Victoria College. He was currently a member of the College's campaign cabinet. He had broad and deep experience in the financial sector and was a member of the University of Toronto Press Board.

The Chair also recognized and welcomed the new members-elect in attendance – Ms Holly Andrews-Taylor, Ms Shaila Kibria, Mr. Ari Kopolovic, Mr. Stefan Neata and Mr. Andrew Pinto.

#### **1. Minutes of the Previous Meeting , February 11, 2004**

The minutes of the meeting held on February 11, 2004 were approved.

#### **2. Business Arising from the Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

There was no business arising from the previous meeting.

#### **3. Report of the President**

##### **a) Government Relations**

The President said that the first federal budget brought down under Prime Minister Martin continued the strong support for post-secondary education and health begun when he was Minister of Finance. In particular, there was a \$90 million or 6 percent increase in funding for the three research-granting councils. Because of the increased number of talented new faculty across the country, there was an increased demand on the granting councils to support research projects. Genome Canada had received \$60 million one-time-only funding and, when combined with the \$38 million increase in base budget support for Canada Institutes for Health Research, showed the importance given to health research.

The President noted that the smallest allocation for research, an additional \$20 million to fund the indirect costs of research, was perhaps the most significant. It had been expected that there would be no increase; therefore this was a very important indication that the government recognized that costs were rising. Finally, the budget provided \$50 million over five years to improve commercialization of research and more funding to support venture capital financing to develop new intellectual property.

### 3. Report of the President (cont'd)

#### a) Government Relations (cont'd)

With respect to student financial aid, the following initiatives were part of the budget:

- the creation of the Canada Learning Bonds program: families with incomes under \$35,000 would receive a \$500 bond per child, born after 2003, that would grow by \$100 per year for 15 years to a total of \$2000.
- the Canada Education Saving Grant: on the first \$500 contributed to a child's Registered Education Savings Plan (RESP), beginning in 2005, the government matching would be enhanced from the current 20 percent to 40 percent for families with incomes up to \$35,000 and from 20 percent to 30 percent for families with incomes between \$35,000 and \$70,000.
- introduction of a grant for first-year, low income (under \$35,000) students: this grant would cover up to one-half of the cost of tuition up to a maximum of \$3000. The President noted that the provincial government had promised in its election campaign to cover the costs of one-half of the cost of tuition for 10 percent of the bottom income students.
- grant for students with disabilities: low income students with disabilities would be eligible for a new grant of up to \$2000.
- Canada student loan program changes: there would be an increase of \$45 in the weekly loan limit for full-time student borrowers from \$165 to \$210. Also expected parental contributions from middle-income families would be reduced making it easier for students to qualify for the student loan program.

The President said that the University did not want to see a rise in student indebtedness and these provisions were a step in the right direction.

The President did not have any information about the expected provincial budget. He believed the tuition-fee freeze would be implemented but there was no indication of the amount of replacement funding that could be expected to offset lost income. He noted that the current Deputy Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities, Mr. Bob Christie, had resolved an issue that had arisen under the previous government about the flow of \$6 million in slip-year funding.

#### b) Varsity Stadium Update

The President reported that despite outstanding efforts by all parties, discussions of the proposal for Varsity Stadium could not be resolved so as to provide a profit for the investors and be acceptable to the University. The University was currently pursuing a purely publicly-funded option that could involve agreements with the Canadian Soccer Association and the Toronto Argonauts. Without the participation of the Argonauts, the whole issue of Varsity Stadium would have to be rethought. He invited Dr. Dellandrea to address Council. Dr. Dellandrea said that the University was engaged in discussions with the provincial government; it was important to know what the outside limit of its participation would be. It was clear that there could be no draw on the University's operating budget to support this project.

A member expressed his concern over approaching the government for support for this issue. The University was making its case on a number of issues including replacing lost tuition revenue and providing inflationary increases. Would asking for funding for the Varsity Stadium project weaken the efforts in other areas? Did the University wish to pursue Varsity Stadium funding over what the member perceived to be core issues? What were the priorities?

The President agreed that it was important to determine priorities. It was frustrating that the government would not support athletic facilities for students. He reported that he and Mr. Ashley Morton, President of the Students' Administrative Council, had met with the minister of Tourism and Recreation, and presented the case for a facility that would serve the entire community. Mr. Morton had been very effective in presenting the students' case and the

### 3. Report of the President (cont'd)

#### b) Varsity Stadium Update (cont'd)

meeting had been very positive. Dr. Dellandrea said that any funding would be provided from general capital funding and not from operating funds.

A member noted that a number of plans had now been considered for the Varsity site and discarded. Had the administration considered using the site instead for affordable housing? The President said that the current proposal did not include any development of the Bloor Street frontage, but the administration was open to any suggestions.

#### c) Vice-Presidential Searches

The President reported that a committee to advise him on the appointment of a Vice-President and Provost has been struck. It was a large and broadly representative committee, including five members of the Governing Council – Ms Patten, Professors McDonald and Cummins, Mr. Ahmad and Ms Ko. The committee had met twice. A position announcement had been posted widely in the University and in *University Affairs* and the *Chronicle for Higher Education*. The committee would not be using a search firm except perhaps at the final stages. A large number of possible candidates had been generated by the committee. The University was at an exciting stage with its academic planning process recently launched, and the committee was looking for a Provost with the vision and leadership to move the process forward. The President encouraged members to make nominations to the committee.

The advisory committee on the appointment of a Vice-President, Business Affairs was at an earlier stage in the process than other committee. This committee would likely be using the search firm that had been used in the previous search for this position. They were seeking a person with the extensive business experience and high standards exemplified by Mr. Chee.

Both positions were key appointments for the University to attain its goal of ranking with the top public teaching and research universities in the world.

A member asked if the term for the Provost would be coordinated with the term of the President who was currently in his fourth year. The President said that the usual term was seven years but the successful candidate might wish a five-year term.

#### d) Academic Planning

The President reported that he had been meeting with small groups of chairs to discuss the next stages of the academic planning process and that the meetings had been very productive. It was important to remember that *Stepping UP* was a framework for academic planning, and the real academic planning was a bottom-up process beginning in the departments. Faculty deans and departmental chairs would be drafting visionary plans for each discipline. They would be studying the best departments in the world. He was not advocating copying others, but the departments should be able to make the intellectual justification for doing what they propose to do. Part of the planning process was the determination of benchmarks to measure the success in reaching the stated goals. In his discipline, physics, such benchmarks would, for example, include the number of international prizes and the number of citations of University of Toronto faculty in research publications. The latter would show that research done at the University played a seminal role in advancing knowledge. In the humanities, citations were not as valuable a benchmark. In Engineering, the number of patents arising from research would be important. The academic planning process should be a deep intellectual exercise.

It was also essential that departments identify what to focus on and what could be reduced or dropped. The planning process would ensure that the University offered the best education,

### 3. Report of the President (cont'd)

#### d) Academic Planning (cont'd)

comparable to the best public universities in the world. The President emphasized that this was not a one-time-only exercise. Although the plans would be submitted to the Provost by the end of June, the plans would evolve depending on the successes and the changes as needed.

A member asked about tuition fees for international students. Professor Goel said that the Business Board, at its next meeting, would consider a recommendation to increase those fees by five percent.

A member noted that the academic planning was being done in the context of budget reductions for each of the next several years. For small departments, this would mean the loss of at least one staff position. However, if the provincial government provided financial support at the level sought by the universities, the planning context would improve. He hoped the planning could be contextual and not detailed, given the current state of flux. It was difficult to make the hard decisions when there was a possibility they would be unnecessary. The President responded that the University was entering a period of applying cost containment measures while at the same time planning to improve its position in the international ranking of universities. He had personally experienced departments improving their rankings in a time of budget reduction. The departments must do the detailed planning to identify their areas of strength and the faculty and other resources needed to support those chosen areas. In fact, most departments would not suffer budget reductions but rather a reduction in the funding that would be forthcoming if government funding were to increase with the rate of inflation. He had every hope that the University would be able to overcome the situation resulting from a lack of inflation funding from the provincial government. Professor Goel added that the departmental and divisional plans, showing where the University's strengths lay, would, in fact, help make the case to government. The plans were needed to set the priorities for advocacy and fundraising. The member said that this information should be made clear to the departments.

A member urged the University to assist students earning less than \$35,000 and only able to attend university on a part-time basis. Student aid for programs such as the Transitional Year Program (TYP) and the Academic Bridging program was essential to ensure accessibility. Dr. Dellandrea spoke about the Ontario Student Opportunity Trust Fund (OSOTF) which matched dollar for dollar donations made to endowments to support student aid. A recent donation to TYP of \$500,000 had been turned into \$1.5 million for that program's student aid with government matching and University matching. He urged all governors to give to the OSOTF program and make a difference in these special accessibility programs. Professor Goel added that the administration was looking at its outreach programs to ensure that they were designed and delivered to greatest advantage.

### 4. Health and Safety Policy: Revisions

(Arising from Report Number 131 of the Business Board [January 19, 2004] and Report Number 371 of the Executive Committee [March 12, 2004])

Ms Orange noted that the current Health and Safety Policy had been approved in 1993. The objective of the proposed revisions was to emphasize the importance of close cooperation among University management, employees, students, joint health-and-safety committees, contractors, tenants, and visitors to promote a safe workplace. That included ensuring the integration into all University activities of the requirements of the *Occupational Health and Safety Act* and its related regulations, other legislation, and University policies and procedures. Among other things, employees were required to report all unsafe and unhealthy conditions.

**4. Health and Safety Policy: Revisions (cont'd)**

At the Business Board, Dr. Claude Davis had recommended some strengthening of the wording of the policy, which had been incorporated into the version now before Council.

Ms Patten reported that at its February meeting, the Executive Committee had considered this Policy for endorsement and forwarding to the Governing Council. In the course of discussion, several questions were raised by members, and it was agreed that the Executive Committee would defer, until its March meeting, the endorsement and forwarding of the Policy. As a result of discussions after the February meeting of the Executive Committee, the Policy was revised to include a reference to the *Policy for Safety in Field Research*.

A member commented that in the Executive Committee report, it was noted that Professor Farrar, Vice-Provost, Students, had undertaken a review of policies related to student health and safety issues. He asked when Council might expect to see the results of the review. This was an important matter, and he informed members that there had recently been a workshop on this topic. Professor Goel responded that a review of current policies was underway and no decision had yet been made on what, if anything, would need to come forward to Council.

On motion duly moved and seconded

It was RESOLVED

THAT the Health and Safety Policy dated March 12, 2004, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 371 of the Executive Committee as "Appendix A", be approved, replacing the policy approved by the Governing Council on June 23, 1993.

**5. Capital Project: Downsview Library Storage Facility – Project Planning Report**  
(Arising from Report Number 126 of the Academic Board [February 26, 2004])

Professor Cummins reported that at the Academic Board questions had been asked about the options that had been considered before the administration proposed this site and this method of storage. Robotic retrieval had been considered and discarded as too expensive. The modular design of the building copied that used by Harvard University. A site on the same block as the Robarts had been considered but found to present serious design problems and the need for City approvals. There was not enough land at either UTM and UTSC to accommodate this facility. Renovating Robarts to support the weight of more books had been ruled out as impractical and too costly, and it would only accommodate a small portion of the books to be stored. Professor Cummins concluded that the Downsview site was the most suitable site available.

Ms Orange commented that the Business Board had reviewed this project and discussed it at some length. Subject to Governing Council approval today, the Board had approved spending of \$1-million for design, site preparation and other work on the project. The project depended wholly on borrowed funds. The University was now at the limit of its borrowing capacity – as currently understood by the Business Board. Therefore, the Board was awaiting a review of borrowing capacity before authorizing further spending on the project. That review of borrowing capacity was scheduled for the Business Board's May meeting.

A member asked whether the land at Downsview had been designated for a particular use before this project was proposed or whether it was undesignated. Professor Venter said that there was some expansion scheduled for the Institute for Aerospace Studies but that this particular land was undesignated. Some toxic waste had been stored there but it was being removed. It was easier and cheaper to use this land and build a new structure than to buy an existing structure and

**5. Capital Project: Downsview Library Storage Facility – Project Planning Report**  
(cont'd)

modify it. In response to a question about the toxic waste, Professor Venter said that 20 years ago, transformers had been stored in two separate sites. One site had been cleared and the second one was being dealt with now. There was no soil contamination.

A member said that he had been struck by the discussion of this item in the Business Board report. It appeared that the Board was prepared to authorize the expenditure of \$1 million for design and site preparation, pending approval of the project by the Governing Council, but that it had reservations about the financing of the project. The Chair commented that the Academic Board recommended to Council the need, site, cost and sources of funding for a project and the Business Board considered the financing. Ms Orange confirmed that the Business Board would be looking at a full analysis of the University's borrowing capacity at its May meeting. The University had reached its currently approved level of borrowing capacity. Pending this analysis, Mr. Bisanti had recommended that design and site preparation work proceed and the Business Board had approved that recommendation, subject to Council's approval of the project.

A member asked whether the books in the new facility would be catalogued. That is, would it be a valuable research site? Professor Venter responded that the Library would spend \$396,000 to ensure that all books sent to the Downsview facility would be fully catalogued and retrievable.

On motion duly moved and seconded

It was RESOLVED

1. THAT the Project Planning Report for the Library Storage Facility at Downsview, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 126 of the Academic Board as Appendix "A", be approved in principle.
2. THAT the proposed Library Storage Facility be located on the Downsview campus.
3. THAT the project scope identified in the Project Planning Report, to establish a 2700 gross square meter storage facility to house 2 million volumes with the appropriate shipping, receiving and processing areas to service the facility be approved at a cost of \$6,000,000 with the funding source as follows:
  - (i) A mortgage in the amount of \$6,000,000 to be amortized over a period of 20 - 40 years and to be repaid from the University of Toronto operating budget.

**6. Capital Project: University of Toronto at Mississauga, Phase 8 Residence – Project Planning Report, Initial Design Work**

(Arising from Report Number 126 of the Academic Board (February 26, 2004) and Report Number 119 of the University Affairs Board (February 24, 2004))

Professor Cummins reported that in response to questions at the Academic Board, members had learned that the new residence would contain a mix of students, not just those in first year. It would also contain a dining room and be able to offer a meal plan. Day care facilities were not included in this project. It was noted that this project would come back to the Planning and Budget Committee and through the governance system when the sources of funding were identified. Design work would be undertaken at this time.

Mr. Ahmad said that the University Affairs Board concurred with the recommendation of the Academic Board to proceed with preliminary work on Phase 8, but reiterated that it would

**6. Capital Project: University of Toronto at Mississauga, Phase 8 Residence – Project Planning Report, Initial Design Work (cont'd)**

need to see a full proposal brought before it at the appropriate time. In particular, although the Board members understood the impossibility of accurate projections of residence rates at this point in the process, they were concerned that the rates be brought forward for approval when ready.

Ms Orange explained that for residence projects, the Business Board normally reviewed a business plan and provided advice to the Governing Council at this stage. Because this particular Project Planning Report was proceeding to the Governing Council at an earlier stage than usual, a business plan had not yet been developed for the Board's review. However, subject to Governing Council's approval at this meeting, the Board had approved spending of \$300,000 from the UTM operating budget to begin conceptual design. The Business Board would review the business plan and assure itself about borrowing capacity before it approved any further spending for this project.

A member asked whether there would be a mandatory ancillary fee for the meal plan. Professor Venter said that the meal plan would be optional and only those who used the plan would pay the fee. He did not have any details about the cost at this time. The member had a second question about the need for part-time student housing and how it was being met. Professor Venter said that the new residence would free up space in the town-house-style residences that could be used for family and graduate student housing. This was not a perfect solution but a step in the right direction that could eventually lead to sufficient residence beds to begin to accommodate part-time student needs.

On motion duly moved and seconded

It was RESOLVED

Subject to the project returning to Planning and Budget Committee for consideration of further funding sources when those can be identified,

1. THAT the Project Planning Report for the Phase 8 Residence at the University of Toronto at Mississauga [UTM], a copy of which is attached to Report Number 126 of the Academic Board as Appendix "B", be approved in principle;
2. THAT the proposed residence be located on the UTM Campus on the site(s) identified for residence accommodation within the UTM Master Campus Plan;
3. THAT the project scope identified in the Project Planning Report, to establish a 418-bed student residence totaling approximately 11,000 gross square meters at an estimated cost of \$26.215 million, be approved;
4. THAT funding in the amount of \$300,000 to initiate the design of the Phase 8 Residence at UTM be from the UTM Operating Budget.

**7. Reports for Information**

The Council received the items for information contained in the following reports:

- Report Number 126 of the Academic Board (February 26, 2004)
- Report Number 132 of the Business Board (March 1, 2004)
- Report Number 119 of the University Affairs Board (February 24, 2004)
- Report Number 371 of the Executive Committee (March 12, 2004)

## 8. Date of the Next Meeting

The Chair reminded the members that the next regular meeting of the Governing Council was scheduled for Thursday, April 29, 2004.

## 9. Other Business

### Black Students' Association

A member wished to thank the President and the Vice-Provost, Students for their help in making an outreach program run by the Black Students' Association a reality. All worked together to ensure that the event went forward. The President said that he had attended a part of the event. It had indeed been a great event and he was proud of the leadership of the Association.

### Ontario Student Opportunity Trust Fund (OSOTF) Program

A member said that he had been asked to lead the approach to the members of Governing Council in support of the OSOTF program. He briefly reviewed the history of the Task Force on Student Financial Aid and the University's guarantee that "no student offered admission to a program at the University of Toronto should be unable to enter or complete the program due to lack of financial means." The provincial government's OSOTF program helped ensure accessibility by matching donations made to universities' endowments in support of student aid. The donation was also matched by the University so that three times the value of the original donation was endowed for student aid. He said that he would be contacting members to urge support of this program. Another member agreed that all governors should take this opportunity to support student aid and accessibility.

### Remarks of APUS Executive Member

Mr. David Melville thanked the Chair for the opportunity to address the Council. He said that an organization was judged by the way it treated its most vulnerable members, particularly in difficult times. He said that he had been inspired by a broadcast lecture by Professor Henry Giroux on the TV Ontario program *Big Ideas*. He commented that the Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students (APUS) had difficulties with the method for choosing the co-opted or non-Governing Council membership of the Boards and Committees. They were recommended by a Striking Committee to the appropriate Board after a call for nominations. He thought that members who were not accountable (that is, not chosen by election) were not helpful to democracy. He read several quotations about the perceived corporatization of the university. He said that he had been unable to obtain an answer to his question about the incremental revenue to the Office of Student Affairs from the student services fee resulting from the change in the definition of full- and part-time students.

The meeting adjourned at 5:55 p.m.

Secretary  
March 31, 2004

Chair