

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

**REPORT NUMBER 322 OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

**January 24, 2000**

To the Governing Council,  
University of Toronto.

Your Committee reports that it held a meeting on Monday, January 24, 2000 at 7:00 p.m. in the Board Room, Simcoe Hall, with the following members present:

Ms Wendy M. Cecil-Cockwell (In the Chair)	Ms Nancy L. Watson
Mrs. Mary Anne V. Chambers (Vice-Chair)	Dr. Alexander R. Waugh
Professor J. Robert S. Prichard, President	
Ms Shruti Dev	Mr. Louis R. Charpentier
Dr. Robert J. Kyle	
Professor Brian Langille	<u>Secretariat:</u>
Dr. John P. Nestor	
Professor Wendy Rolph	Ms Margaret McKone
Mrs. Susan M. Scace	

Regrets:

Professor Jack Carr  
Dr. Joseph L. Rotman  
Mr. John H. Tory

In Attendance:

Mr. Brian C. Burchell, Chair, University Affairs Board  
Professor John T. Mayhall, Chair, Academic Board  
Mr. Amir Shalaby, Chair, Business Board  
Professor Adel S. Sedra, member, Governing Council, and Vice-President and Provost  
Ms Wendy Talfourd-Jones, member, Governing Council  
Dr. Jon S. Dellandrea, Vice-President and Chief Development Officer\*  
Professor Michael G. Finlayson, Vice-President, Administration and Human Resources  
Ms Susan Girard, Chief Returning Officer, Governing Council Elections, and Assistant Secretary of the Governing Council  
Mr. Kasi Rao, Director of the Office of the President and Director of Government Relations

\* Participated by conference call for item number 1.

**Chairman's Remarks****(a) Congratulations**

The Chairman congratulated Mr. Brian Burchell, on the recent birth of his second son, and Ms Shruti Dev on her recent marriage.

**(b) Time of Adjournment**

On motion duly moved and seconded, it was resolved

THAT the meeting adjourn no later than 9:20 p.m.

**(c) Vary Order of Business**

The Chairman sought members' permission to vary the order of business for the meeting so that the Committee could consider agenda item 6 - Naming of an Endowed Chair - at the beginning of the agenda. This was proposed because Dr. Dellandrea, who was currently out of town on University business and who had been invited by the President to participate in the discussion of this item, was available to participate by conference call between 7:00 and 7:30 p.m.

On motion duly moved and seconded, it was resolved

THAT the order of business be varied, as described by the Chairman.

**ITEM NUMBER 1 WAS CONSIDERED *IN CAMERA*.****1. Naming: Endowed Chair**

After discussion,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

The naming of an endowed chair, as outlined in the Committee Secretary's memorandum of January 18, 2000.

**2. Reports of the Previous Meetings**

The Chairman noted that members had received the report of the special meeting held on November 30, 1999 and the report of the Committee's last regular meeting held on December 3, 1999.

A member drew attention to two typographical errors as well as an error in the Report of the December 3 meeting. The Chairman responded that the Report would be amended to correct the items noted.

Report Number 320 (November 30, 1999) and Report Number 321 (December 3, 1999), as amended, were approved.

**3. Business Arising from the Reports of the Previous Meetings**

There were no items of business arising from the reports of the previous meetings.

**4. Minutes of Governing Council Meetings held on November 30, 1999 and December 15, 1999**

Members had received for information the Minutes of the special Governing Council meeting held on November 30, 1999 and the regular meeting held on December 15, 1999.

**5. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council: Arising from the Academic Board Meeting of January 13, 2000 (Report Number 98)**

**(a) Item 4 - Growing Ontario's Innovation System: The Strategic Role of University Research: University's Response**

Professor Mayhall noted that Professor Munroe-Blum had received many complimentary remarks on her report at the meetings of the Academic Board and its Planning and Budget Committee and Committee on Academic Policy and Programs. He continued that following Professor Munroe-Blum's presentation of the highlights of the report, there had been lively discussion in all three meetings. The motion had passed unanimously at the committee level and had received the full support of the Academic Board, with one abstention recorded.

A member commented on the University's endorsement of the report, inquiring if other Ontario universities were contemplating similar resolutions. The President responded that the provincial government had urged Ontario universities to respond to the report. He added that the level of response would vary given that some Ontario universities were less research-intensive than others. He expected that university responses would be submitted to the Council of Ontario Universities (COU) by mid-February, at which time COU would formulate a position that was informed by the collective university views.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED

to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation

Whereas research and scholarship are central to both the mission of the University and the benefit and prosperity of the Province; and

Whereas the University applauds the articulation of a provincial policy framework for the support of research and scholarship; and

Whereas the University agrees that a policy framework premised on university autonomy, peer review, excellence and accountability together with appropriate funding is best suited to the dynamic world of knowledge and innovation; and

Whereas, within the context of the urgent need for improved operating funding, the University applauds the identification of the need for substantially increased resources for research;

Therefore:

The University of Toronto welcome the issuance of the report, *Growing Ontario's Innovation System: The Strategic Role of University Research* (1999), prepared for the Government of Ontario by Professor Heather Munroe-Blum, and strongly endorse the directions recommended therein.

**5. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council: Arising from the Academic Board Meeting of January 13, 2000 (Report Number 98)** (cont'd)

- (b) **Item 5 - School of Graduate Studies: Master of Science in Planning Program - New Field in Urban Design**
- Item 6 - School of Graduate Studies: Proposal for a New Master of Urban Design Studies (MUDS) Program**
- Item 7 - School of Graduate Studies: Proposal for a New Master of Urban Design (MUD) Program**

Professor Mayhall introduced these three items as a group because they concerned a suite of programs that had been proposed in the area of Urban Design. He noted that the first recommendation, the approval of a new field in an existing program, could have been approved at the Committee level. But it had been decided to bring the programs forward together. The three programs presented various way of studying urban design at the master's level, ranging from a field in a planning degree program to a full professional practitioner's program. These programs had been recommended in the Provost's Task Force on Graduate Programs in Architecture, Landscape Architecture, Planning and Urban Design. Resources for the new programs were already in place, or in the case of the MUD degree, were part of the Faculty's academic plan and had received funding through the Academic Priorities Fund. Professor Mayhall congratulated Deans Richards and Amrhein and Professors Sedra and Tuohy on their considerable efforts to make this discipline stronger and more distinctive.

A discussion ensued on the proposed abbreviations for two of the three degree programs: "MUD" and "MUDS", during which the Provost undertook to report to the Governing Council on whether these abbreviations existed within other North American universities and/or whether any modification could be contemplated.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

**YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED**

to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendations

THAT the proposal for the establishment of a new field in Urban Design in the Master of Science in Planning (MScPl), effective September 1, 2000, as described in the submission from the School of Graduate Studies, dated November 1999, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 98 of the Academic Board as Appendix "B", be approved.

THAT the proposal for the establishment of a new Master of Urban Design Studies (MUDS) program, effective September 1, 2000, as described in the submission from the School of Graduate Studies, dated November 1999, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 98 of the Academic Board as Appendix "C", be approved.

THAT the proposal for the establishment of a new Master of Urban Design (MUD) program, effective September 1, 2000, as described in the submission from the School of Graduate Studies, dated November 26, 1999, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 98 of the Academic Board as Appendix "D", be approved

**5. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council: Arising from the Academic Board Meeting of January 13, 2000 (Report Number 98)** (cont'd)

**(c) Item 8 - Capital Project: Gerstein Science Information Centre: Phase 2**

Professor Mayhall recalled that the previous year, the Governing Council had approved the users' committee report for renovations to the Gerstein Science Information Centre. The renovations were to be completed in a number of phases at a total cost of \$20 million. The phases were to be undertaken as funding became available. Phase 2, the east addition and renovation, with an increased scope, was now being recommended. A private donation had been received which would cover 40% of the cost of the project, to a maximum of \$5.6 million. After consultation, it had been proposed to increase significantly the study space proposed for this phase. The cost of phase 2 had therefore been revised from \$8.2 million to a total of \$12 million. The University would look for additional funding through donations and through the SuperBuild Growth Fund. Any shortfall in funding would be met by an allocation from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund. The Library would provide the funds for detailed designs.

In response to a member's question, Professor Sedra undertook to report to the Governing Council on the amount of funding the University had sought from the SuperBuild Growth Fund in support of this initiative.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

**YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED**

to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation

THAT the revised scope of Phase 2 of the Users' Committee Report for the Gerstein Science Information Centre approved on May 17, 1999 as described in Professor McCammond's memorandum dated December 2, 1999, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 98 of the Academic Board as Appendix "E", at an estimated cost of \$12 million to be derived from the SuperBuild Growth Fund, private donations, and the University Infrastructure Investment Fund, be approved; and

THAT as funding is received from the SuperBuild Growth Fund and private donations, any shortfall be met by an allocation of not more than \$7 million from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund.

**(d) Item 9 - Capital Project: Flavelle House – Interim Users' Committee Report**

Professor Mayhall noted that the Faculty of Law was proposing to renovate the currently empty attic of Flavelle House to accommodate 12 faculty offices. Flavelle house was a heritage building and the only change planned to the facade was the addition of one dormer window. An elevator with access to all floors was also included in the project. The cost of

the project was \$2.14 million, which would be met by funds from the Ontario Research and Development Challenge Fund, the University Infrastructure Investment Fund, and the Faculty of Law.

Dean Daniels had noted that this was an interim report and that issues of space for classrooms and student activities would be considered in the next phase.

**5. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council: Arising from the Academic Board Meeting of January 13, 2000 (Report Number 98)** (cont'd)

**(d) Item 9 - Capital Project: Flavelle House – Interim Users’ Committee Report**  
(cont'd)

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED

to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation

THAT the Interim Report of the Users’ Committee for the Attic Renovation, Flavelle House, dated December 2, 1999, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 98 of the Academic Board as Appendix “F”, be approved in principle at a cost of \$2.14 million, with the sources of funds as described in Professor McCammond’s memorandum dated December 2, 1999; and

THAT an allocation of \$600,000 from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund, be approved.

**(e) Item 10 - Capital Project: Heart and Stroke/Richard Lewar Centre for Excellence for Cardiovascular Research - Users’ Committee Report**

Professor Mayhall reported that this proposal called for the renovation of the basement of the FitzGerald Building (which was actually at ground level) to house specialized cardiovascular analysis laboratories. The space would be located adjacent to the Medical Sciences Building and the planned Centre for Cellular and Biomolecular Research. Highly specialized facilities and equipment would make the Centre one of only a few in the world equipped for such innovative research. The cost of the renovation, \$1.47 million, would be funded from donations from the Lewar family and the Ontario Heart and Stroke Foundation, and expected funding from the Canada Foundation for Innovation and the Ontario Research Development Challenge Fund.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED

to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation

THAT the Users’ Committee Report, dated December 1999, for the Lewar/HSFO Centre, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 98 of the Academic Board as Appendix “G”, be approved in principle at a cost of \$1.47 million, with funding to be provided by donations from the Lewar family, the Ontario Heart and Stroke Foundation, and

funds obtained from the Ontario Research and Development Challenge Fund, and the Canada Foundation for Innovation.

**6. University Affairs Board: Special Meeting – *Elections Guidelines 2000***

The Chairman noted that documentation concerning this matter had been sent to members earlier in the day by courier. The University Affairs Board would be having a special meeting prior to the next meeting of the Council to resume its consideration of a proposal for web-based voting in Governing Council elections for undergraduate students. She clarified that the Executive

**6. University Affairs Board: Special Meeting – Elections Guidelines 2000** (cont'd)

Committee was being asked to place this proposal on the agenda of the next Governing Council, subject to the endorsement of a proposal for web-based voting by the University Affairs Board.

Invited by the Chairman to comment on the matter, Mr. Burchell referred members to the background memorandum written by the Secretary of the Governing Council. He continued that at its January 11 meeting, the University Affairs Board had discussed a proposal from the Elections Committee to change the method by which undergraduate students would vote in the Governing Council elections for 2000. Specifically, it had been recommended that the elections be conducted entirely by web-based voting. This had been necessitated by the introduction of the TCard, which had not been designed for identification of students for election purposes. He continued that a majority of University Affairs Board members had expressed initial concerns with the proposal. Those concerns had included: lack of consultations, security issues, lack of access, and the potential for a lower profile of the elections given the absence of polling stations. Debate of the motion had, therefore, been adjourned to provide an opportunity to look into and address the concerns raised. Mr. Burchell noted that Ms Talfourd-Jones, Chair of the Elections Committee, had called a meeting of the Elections Committee, which was to take place later in the week, to consider a hybrid model which contemplated two options for voting in the 2000 Governing Council elections: web-based and ballot-box voting. Assuming this proposal was endorsed by the Elections Committee and by the University Affairs Board, at a special meeting yet to be announced, he asked that this item be placed on the agenda of the February 10 meeting of the Governing Council. He clarified that the Executive Committee was not being asked to endorse a motion at this time, but rather, it was being asked to approve the inclusion of any motion concerning web-based voting on the February 10 agenda of the Governing Council.

Invited to elaborate, Ms Talfourd-Jones noted that the Elections Committee had been in favour of the move to web-based voting and indeed had been considering it for some time. She had, therefore, been surprised by the level of concern expressed by members of the University Affairs Board. As indicated, debate of the motion had been adjourned, which she believed was appropriate under the circumstances. Additional information was being gathered and the Elections Committee would meet to consider an alternative proposal. She added that the President of the Graduate Students' Union had been one of those who had expressed reservations about the proposal; however, graduate students would not be among those affected. There were no plans to change the current mail ballot method of voting for graduate students.

During discussion, the President clarified that if web-based voting were to be undertaken for the 2000 Governing Council elections, the proposal would need to be approved by the Governing Council at its next meeting on February 10, 2000. He also noted that the proposal was in line with recommendations outlined in the Report of the Review of the Governing Council Secretariat which had called for greater use of information technology.

A member noted her support for a proposal that that would include options for voting. The objective was to ensure maximum voter participation.

A member asked what information technology would be available to support the election. For example, could candidates use e-mail to distribute promotional literature. Mr. Charpentier and Ms Girard responded. The profiles of the candidates would be posted on the Governing Council web site, which would contain a link to the University of Toronto home page during the election period. Students would be asked to state their email addresses as well as the web site for the Governing Council on their campaign literature. Advertisements placed in campus press would also refer to the Governing Council web site. Additional means of advertising would also be explored.

**6. University Affairs Board: Special Meeting – Elections Guidelines 2000** (cont'd)

A member suggested the use of information technology to scan candidates' statements to prevent the need for re-typing this information. Mr. Charpentier agreed that this was a good suggestion, adding that candidates could also be encouraged to supply their statements by e-mail.

A member asked if any other universities had made the move to web-based voting. Ms Girard responded that a similar initiative had been undertaken at the University of Western Ontario. Initially, web-based voting had been provided for Board and Senate elections only; however the student societies had expressed an interest in participating following the successful implementation of web-based voting. Mr. Charpentier added that a number of American universities had also moved to web-based voting; however, these were not necessarily for governance elections.

A member suggested that there might be a perception among potential voters that the record of their vote could be linked with their student identification and stored within the computer system. Mr. Charpentier responded that a firewall had been created between voters' identification and ballots cast to protect the secrecy of individual voters. The only record maintained would be that an individual student had in fact voted. This information would be deleted from the system 21 days following the election (i.e. after the appeal period).

In response to a member's question, Ms Girard noted that the program for the web-based voting would be tested by staff from Student Information Systems in March.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

THAT any motion concerning web-based voting arising from the special meeting of the University Affairs Board be placed on the agenda of the February 10 Governing Council meeting.

**7. Requests from Non-members to Address the Governing Council**

The Chairman drew attention to two requests from non-members who wished to address the Governing Council, copies of which had been included in members' agenda packages. In addition, she drew attention to three additional requests, copies of which had been placed on the table. She summarized the requests as follows: Mr. Chris Turner (potential elimination of the three-year degree); Professor Chandrakant P. Shah (diversity within the faculty); Mr. Tam Goosen (inclusive hiring and promotion policy); Mr. Benjamin Tam (employment status of faculty); and Mr. Paris Gardos (funding for disability services). She noted that Mr. Gardos had sought permission to address the February 10 meeting or the subsequent meeting of the Council.

The Chairman noted that the Governing Council's *Procedures for Non-Members to Address the Governing Council, its Boards and Committees* provided that up to fifteen minutes at each

meeting of the Council could be devoted to non-members who wished to speak to matters not on the agenda.

A full discussion ensued on the *Procedures*, during which members considered: (a) the overarching need for the Governing Council to conduct its business within a limited number of two-and-one-half hour meetings; (b) the need to ensure proper processing of issues, and channeling of discussion through established governance processes -- and the need to avoid short circuiting those processes; (c) the need for the Council to hear from recognized campus groups;

**7. Requests from Non-members to Address the Governing Council** (cont'd)

(d) any previous opportunities for non-members to address various Boards and Committees of the Governing Council on various issues; (e) the appropriateness of speakers being redirected to address the relevant Board or Committee; (f) the level of detail provided in the speaking requests; (g) the timing of addresses by non-members in relation to agenda items; (h) past experience in applying the *Procedures*; and (i) the permissible length of time for non-members to address the Governing Council.

Following discussion,

On motion duly moved and seconded, it was resolved

THAT, in its application of the *Procedures for Non-Members to Address the Governing Council, its Boards and Committees*, part B, "With Respect to Items not on Agendas", the Executive Committee would be guided by the following principles.

1. Statements from individuals are permitted at the discretion of the Executive Committee and are not granted as of right. In light of experience, the Committee is of the view that applicants for such speaking privileges should demonstrate that there exists a sound reason for the request from the individual to speak to this topic (i.e. that there would be real value added to the Council's deliberations and without damage to, or duplication of, normal governance procedures);
2. Statements by individuals and groups who wish to address the Governing Council on items not on the agenda will normally be heard at the outset of the meeting;
3. Consistent with *By-law Number 2*, speakers will be required to limit their remarks to five minutes. There will be no exceptions to this rule;
4. There will be no Governing Council debate or discussion of statements by non-members at the time of the speaker's address. Members of the Governing Council may comment under "Other Business"; and
5. Speaking privileges will be considered only for non-members who provide reasonably well-developed proposals meeting the above criteria in a timely fashion, normally for the Executive Committee meeting at which the Governing Council agenda is set. Speakers should outline their reasons for wishing to address the Council and their particular role with respect to the issue they are bringing forward.

The Committee then considered the five speaking requests. Following discussion,

On motion duly moved and seconded, it was resolved

THAT the speaking request from Dr. C. P. Shah to address the February 10 meeting of the Governing Council be granted.

The requests from Mr. Goosen and Mr. Tam would be declined given the Committee's decision to grant speaking privileges to Dr. Shah on a similar topic and in light of Dr. Shah's leading role in raising the issue on campus. Mr. Turner's request would also be declined since he had presented his position at the Academic Board meeting held on December 2, 1999. Mr. Turner would be informed that the Executive Committee would consider a further request from him if specific enrolment plans were brought forward that address the issue of the three-year degree.

**7. Requests from Non-members to Address the Governing Council** (cont'd)

Normally, these would be considered first at the Planning and Budget Committee, then by the Academic Board. Finally, Mr. Gardos would be encouraged to speak with Professor Ian Orchard, Vice-Provost, Students, who was responsible for student services. The Chairman asked the Secretary of the Governing Council to communicate the Committee's decision to the non-members.

**8. Reports for Information:**

Members received the following reports for information.

- Report Number 97 of the Academic Board (December 2, 1999)
- Report Number 98 of the Academic Board (January 13, 2000)
- Report Number 102 of the Business Board (December 6, 1999)
- Report Number 88 of the University Affairs Board (November 1, 1999)
- Report Number 89 of the University Affairs Board (January 11, 2000)

**9. Report of the President**

The President reported on the following matters.

- Professor Sedra had been awarded the Golden Jubilee Medal of the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers for exceptional contributions toward advancing in various forums the Society's goals during the first 50 years of its history. The Committee extended its congratulations.
- Labour relations matters, and in particular the strike by the University's teaching assistants, had been the subject of lengthy discussion at recent meetings of the Business and Academic Boards. Professors Finlayson and Sedra and the President were continuing to seek a fair settlement with the teaching assistants. The President continued to be very concerned about damage to the education of the University's undergraduate students as a result of the strike. He indicated that he would be happy to answer questions members might have on this very important matter.

A member asked about an allegation that teaching assistants would be fired from their positions should the strike continue past February 4. The President responded that this assertion was incorrect. Pursuant to the *University Grading Practices Policy*, the Provost had declared a disruption to the academic year. Given the concerns expressed by undergraduate students, professors had been requested to restructure their courses and to modify their grading schemes for the remainder of the year (i.e. indicate what term papers if any would be required, the length of term papers, and whether final examinations would be multiple-choice or essay questions). The revised grading schemes were to be determined and announced by February 4, day 30 of the term, after which they would be irreversible. In some instances, where courses had been taught solely by teaching assistants, courses had been cancelled following two weeks of the strike. For those teaching assistants, the work

had been lost. For the remaining teaching assistants, there would be a reduced workload, based on the modified grading schemes, when the strike was over.

A member suggested that a special meeting of the Governing Council be called prior to February 4 so that governors could be informed of and discuss the ramifications of the strike. The President responded that this would be for the Executive Committee to decide. However, he did not advocate a meeting of the Council to discuss the terms of the

**9. Report of the President** (cont'd)

negotiations. This matter had been discussed at the meeting of the Business Board immediately prior to this meeting. He continued that the conduct of the administration continued to be in strict compliance with Governing Council policies. If members believed there was a need to revise established policies, a recommendation should be brought to the Academic Board of the Governing Council. The Chairman of the Academic Board noted that a motion brought to that Board at its previous meeting urging action by the administration in this matter had been defeated. He was comfortable with the administration's actions in the matter to date. The Chairman agreed that it would undermine the negotiation process should the Governing Council intervene directly when it had delegated authority to the administration in this matter.

A member asked that the administration keep governors informed on any actions or decisions being made in relation to the strike. The President responded that he would be happy to provide governors with a full report on the matter. The Provost added that the administration was using the University's home page to communicate information on the strike. He encouraged members to consult this site at <http://www.utoronto.ca>.

A member commented that the actions taken by the administration to restructure grading schemes had been foreseeable at the outset of the strike and were in fact inevitable.

The Chair of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs (AP&P) noted that the Grading Practices Policy provided that, when the Provost declared a disruption of the academic program, he would report to the AP&P regarding the implementation of the procedures and changes to the status of academic programs. She noted that the next meeting of the AP&P was scheduled for February 23, at which time she expected that the Provost would be providing a full report on this matter.

- As reported *in camera* at the previous meeting of the Governing Council, Mr. Kenneth McMaster, a former employee of the University, was alleged to have established a number of dummy corporations and awarded them bogus contracts over nearly seven years while employed by the University. This matter had been reported in the Toronto press in early January. Mr. McMaster had been charged with one count of fraud and the University was undertaking legal action. The Internal Audit Department was conducting a review of the incident to determine what had occurred and what changes in procedure would be appropriate. Professor Finlayson was overseeing this project.
- There were continued delays in the completion of the Graduate / Second-Entry Residence and the Munk Centre for International Studies. Professor Finlayson was seeking advice on what steps the University should take to avoid the recurrence of these problems.
- The University had not experienced any Y2K-related problems with its automated systems. The President recalled that there had been considerable discussion at the time the University had made the decision to purchase the SAP software to manage its human resources, research, financial and student information systems. The purchase of this software had greatly enhanced the University's ability to be Y2K compliant. Also, in light

of reports from Canadian and American universities that had selected different suppliers, the decision to use SAP software had proven to be strategically correct.

- The President reported on a new development concerning the matter of Dr. Olivieri and the Hospital for Sick Children.

**9. Report of the President** (cont'd)

Dr. Gideon Koren, the Hospital's Director of Pharmacology, and a University faculty member, had confessed to writing anonymous, harassing letters to certain people at the hospital including Dr. Olivieri. He had been suspended from all duties at the hospital and the University, pending the outcome of a joint Hospital/University disciplinary process. A January 4 meeting had been adjourned to give Dr. Koren and his lawyer more time to examine new allegations. At the meeting, senior officials of both institutions, including the President, had received submissions containing new charges of misconduct against Dr. Koren, made by Dr. Nancy Olivieri and some of her colleagues at the Hospital. Officials had also received strong statements of support for Dr. Koren, all of which had to be studied during the adjournment.

- The President recalled that at the previous meeting of the Governing Council he had indicated that the administration would bring forward to the next meeting of the Council a recommended framework for enrolment expansion. The development of the framework had been delayed, in large part because of the extensive consultations being undertaken by the Provost and Deputy Provost, which included discussion with the President and Vice-Presidents, and the relevant Deans and Principals. It was anticipated that the framework would be completed and brought to the following cycle of governance.
- Dr. Dellandrea had briefed the University Affairs Board at its January 11 meeting on the administration's plans for developing a policy for the licensing of the University's name. This process was being undertaken to address concerns that some apparel bearing the University's name and crest was being manufactured in sweatshops. An all-day symposium on the issue had been scheduled for Monday, January 31, 2000. The President expressed his gratitude to Professor Brian Langille, an expert in international labour law, whose advice had helped guide the administration's thinking on this matter.
- The Canadian Federation of Students had organized a national demonstration – the Access 2000 Campaign – in support of increased public funding for post-secondary education. The administration had been asked by student groups to grant academic amnesty to any students who participated in the event (i.e. students would not receive academic penalties for missing classes or deadlines on this date). The President and the Provost would make a decision on the matter within the next few days. As had been past practice, they would take into account the level of anticipated participation in the demonstration as well as the objectives of the demonstration.
- Premier Harris had visited with University of Toronto President-Designate Robert Birgeneau on recent visit to Boston.
- The Council of Ontario Universities had been actively lobbying the provincial government for increased operational funding for post-secondary education on behalf of Ontario's universities. The President commended the Chairman for her excellent leadership on this matter.

**10. Date of Next Meeting**

The Chairman reminded members of the next meeting to be held on Monday, March 27, 2000 at 7 p.m.

**11. Other Business****(a) Request from a Member of the Governing Council to add various items to the agenda of the February 10 meeting of the Governing Council**

The Chairman drew attention to two memoranda from a member of the Governing Council that had been placed on the table. The first concerned a request to add various agenda items to the agenda of the February 10 meeting of the Governing Council.

Following discussion of the member's request, it was agreed that with respect to item 1: Labour-Management Negotiation, and item 2: the Canadian Federation of Students' Access 2000 Campaign, that the President would address these matters in his report to the Governing Council. With respect to item 3: the Shah and Svaboda Study, *A Question of Fairness*, the Executive Committee had earlier in the meeting decided to grant a request from Professor Shah to address the Governing Council at its next meeting.

**(b) Proposed Naming of Graduate/Second-Entry Residence**

The Chairman said that the member's second memorandum concerned a proposed naming of the new graduate/second-entry residence. She noted that the School of Graduate Studies had forwarded a request that the residence be named "Graduate House". This was to be circulated to members of the Governing Council later in the week for comment, as was customary practice for naming recommendations. The member had written to the Committee to propose an alternative naming in recognition of distinction. Following the normal deadline of one week for comments, the member's memorandum would be brought to the attention of the Committee on Namings.

The President noted that he had only received a copy of the memorandum today. As the Chairman had explained, it was proposed that the new residence be named "Graduate House" at this time; however, this would not preclude a future recommendation to name the residence in recognition of distinction to the University, as the member has suggested, or after a benefactor who wished to provide funding in support of another residence. He suggested that the Provost and he consider the member's suggestion, but that the proposed naming of Graduate House proceed at this time, following the customary approval process.

On motion duly moved and seconded, it was resolved

THAT unless new objections were raised in response to the proposal that the new Graduate / Second-Entry Residence be named "Graduate House", the Committee on Naming would proceed to approve this naming.

The President undertook to report back to the Executive Committee in due course on this matter.

The President and other Committee members discussed the appropriate use by Governors of letterhead that included the UofT name and crest. Following discussion, it was agreed that the Secretary of the Governing Council would review the matter and provide advice.

The meeting adjourned at 9:20 p.m.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Secretary

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chairman

February 4, 2000