

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

Thursday, May 29, 2003

MINUTES OF THE GOVERNING COUNCIL meeting held on Thursday, May 29, 2003
at 4:30 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall.

Present:

Dr. Thomas H. Simpson (In the Chair)
Ms Rose M. Patten, Vice-Chair
Professor Robert J. Birgeneau, President
Professor Mary Beattie
Dr. Robert M. Bennett
Mr. Mark R. Braun
Professor Philip H. Byer
Professor Brian Corman
Professor W. Raymond Cummins
Mr. Brian Davis
Dr. Claude S. Davis
Professor Sherwin S. Desser
Dr. Alice Dong
Dr. Inez N. Elliston
Ms Susan Eng
Dr. Shari Graham Fell
Mr. Gerald Halbert
Professor Ellen Hodnett
Professor David J.A. Jenkins
Professor Brian Langille
Ms Karen Lewis
Professor Michael R. Marrus
Professor Ian R. McDonald

Mr. David Melville
Mr. Sean Mullin
Mr. George E. Myhall
Dr. John P. Nestor
Professor Shirley Neuman
Mr. Elan Ohayon
Ms Jacqueline C. Orange
Mr. Joshua S. Paterson
Mr. John F. (Jack) Petch
Mr. Chris Ramsaroop
Mr. Timothy Reid
Mrs. Susan M. Scace
Mr. Amir Shalaby
Professor John Wedge
Mr. Robert S. Weiss

Mr. Louis R. Charpentier, Secretary of
Governing Council

Secretariat:

Mr. Neil Dobbs
Ms Margaret McKone

Absent:

The Honourable Henry N.R. Jackman
The Honourable William G. Davis
Professor Luigi E. Girolametto
Mr. Paul V. Godfrey
Ms Durré Hanif
Ms Shirley Hoy
Mr. Colm Murphy

The Honourable David R. Peterson
Dr. Joseph L. Rotman
Ms Carol Stephenson
Mr. John H. Tory
Professor Carolyn Tuohy

In Attendance:

Mr. Mohammed Hashim, Member-elect, Governing Council
Professor Jake Thiessen, Member-elect, Governing Council
Mr. Felix Chee, Vice-President, Business Affairs
Dr. Jon Dellandrea, Vice-President and Chief Advancement Officer
Professor Angela Hildyard, Vice-President, Human Resources
Dr. Sheldon Levy, Vice-President, Government and Institutional Relations
Professor Ian Orchard, Vice-President and Principal, University of Toronto at Mississauga

In Attendance (cont'd):

Professor Rona Abramovitch, Director, Transitional Year Program
Ms Alexandra Artful-Dodger, External Affairs Commissioner, Students' Administrative Council
Ms Sue Bloch-Nevitte, Director of Public Relations and Advancement Communication
Professor David Farrar, Vice-Provost, Students
Dr. Beata FitzPatrick, Director of the Office of the President and Assistant Vice-President
Ms Rivi Frankle, Assistant Vice-President, Alumni and Development
Professor Vivek Goel, Deputy Provost, and Vice-Provost, Faculty
Ms Georgina L. Gray, Director of University Events and Presidential Liaison (Advancement)
Ms Lesley Lewis, Assistant Provost and Special Assistant to the Provost
Ms Janice Martin, Coordinator, Accessibility Services
Professor Derek McCammond, Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget
Mr. Ashley Morton, President, Students' Administrative Council
Ms Julia Munk, Vice-President, Equity, Students' Administrative Council
Ms Maureen Somerville, Chair, College of Electors
Professor Ronald Venter, Vice-Provost, Space and Facilities Planning
Ms Nicole Wahl, Department of Public Affairs

Chair's Remarks

The Chair indicated that, pursuant to Section 38 of *By-Law Number 2*, the Executive Committee had determined that items 1 and 2 would be considered by the Governing Council *in camera*.

Vary the Agenda

The Chair noted that at its special meeting held immediately prior to the Governing Council meeting, the Executive Committee had determined that a recommendation for an additional senior appointment be placed on the agenda in the *in camera* session. Accordingly, a revised agenda had been placed on the table.

1. Senior Appointments

(a) Chancellor Emeritus

The President noted that in recognition of the Chancellor's extraordinary service and in keeping with the tradition of appointing the retiring Chancellor as Chancellor Emeritus, the College of Electors had proposed that the Governing Council appoint the Honourable Henry N.R. Jackman Chancellor Emeritus, effective July 1, 2003. The College's endorsement had been unanimous.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was Resolved

THAT the Honourable Henry N.R. Jackman be designated Chancellor Emeritus effective July 1, 2003.

1. Senior Appointments (cont'd)

(b) Vice-President, University of Toronto at Scarborough - Interim Appointment

The President recalled the Council's appointment on May 8, 2003 of Professor Kwong-loi Shun as Vice-President and Principal of the University of Toronto at Scarborough. This appointment would not commence until January 1, 2004 and therefore it was necessary to make an interim appointment.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was Resolved

THAT Professor John Youson be appointed Interim Vice-President for the University of Toronto at Scarborough for a six-month term from July 1, 2003 to December 31, 2003

2. Board and Committee Assignments 2003-04

The Chair said that the Governing Council's *By-Law Number 2* required that the Governing Council appoint members of the Council to the Boards and to the Standing Committees reporting to the Boards. Also, Council was required to appoint the Chair and Vice-Chair of a Board from among the members of the Council on the Board. The Chairs and Vice-Chairs of the standing Committees were appointed by the body to which the Committee reported.

The Chair continued that a recommendation for the Executive Committee assignments would be brought to that Committee's next meeting.

Following discussion,

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was Resolved

THAT the Board and Committee assignments for 2003-2004, as described in the chart dated May 16, 2003, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 361 of the Executive Committee as Appendix "A", be approved.

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL MOVED INTO OPEN SESSION.

3. Chair's Remarks

The Chair welcomed members and guests to the meeting and reported on the senior appointments approved during the *in camera* session of the meeting.

The Chair informed the Council that Ms Crowe, a non-member of the Council who had been granted permission to address members at the conclusion of the agenda, had sent her regrets earlier in the day to the Secretariat.

Finally, the Chair reminded members that the open session portion of the meeting was being broadcast on the web.¹

¹ The open session portion of Governing Council meetings is broadcast over the World Wide Web. It is accessible at <http://www.utoronto.ca/govcncl/>.

4. Minutes of the Previous Meetings

The Chair noted that the Minutes of the previous regular meeting held on May 1, 2003 had been distributed by email the previous day; the Minutes of the special meeting held on May 8, 2003 had been distributed one week earlier with members' agenda packages

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was Resolved

THAT the minutes of the May 1, 2003 and May 8, 2003 meetings be approved.

5. Business Arising From the Minutes of the Previous Meetings

The Chair recalled that two notices of motion had been given at the May 1, 2003 meeting of the Council. A record of the disposition of these notices was contained in the Executive Committee Report.

A member noted that he believed concerns raised at the previous meeting regarding two of the proposals were not adequately reflected in the Minutes.

The Chair clarified that the Minutes had been approved by the Governing Council.

The member continued that he believed it was important for the Council to illustrate its commitment to accessibility issues and he therefore put a proposal to the Council.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was proposed

THAT in recognition of National Awareness Week the University of Toronto's commitment to physical accessibility be placed on the agenda.

The vote was taken on the motion.

The motion did not receive the required two-thirds majority.

The Chair noted that the President had already planned to discuss accessibility issues during his report. The Chair encouraged members who wished to bring motions directly to the Council to provide notice of their intentions to the Office of the Governing Council prior to the meeting.

A member expressed his disagreement with the Chair's advice.

6. Report of the President

The President gave a report on some of the highlights of the past year.

(a) Provincial Government Relations

Much of the administration's attention during the past year had focused on preparation for the double cohort, which would arrive at the University this coming September. Extensive planning had been undertaken both internally, at all levels of administration within the University, and externally, with the provincial government. Discussions with the provincial government had culminated in the following initiatives.

6. Report of the President (cont'd)

(a) Provincial Government Relations (cont'd)

- **Enrolment Target Agreement.** The University had signed an enrolment target agreement, which committed to an intake of 10,000 additional students at full average funding. This amounted to over \$80-million in additional operating funding to meet the demands of the double cohort.
- **Quality Enhancement Fund.** As members were aware, the University had not received inflationary increases in either the provincial operating grants or tuition fees in regulated programs for some time. This continued to have a damaging effect, most especially on the Faculty of Arts and Science. Fortunately this year, the provincial government had introduced the Quality Enhancement Fund, which would lead to an increase in the University's operating budget of approximately \$40 million in a steady state. These additional funds would help to offset the continuous decline in the inflation-adjusted value of the operating grant. While this was considered to be extremely good news for the University, there still remained a continuing need for increased provincial funding.
- **SuperBuild Fund.** The President recalled that two years ago the University had been informed that it would not receive funding in the next round of SuperBuild Funds. However, after two years of concerted effort, the University had successfully managed to win 37% (\$55-million) of the total allotment of these funds. Combined with the funds realized for the double cohort, the additional funding was enabling a significant expansion of the University of Toronto at Scarborough and the University of Toronto at Mississauga.
- **Ontario Student Opportunity Trust Fund (OSOTF).** The Honorable Ernie Eves had announced in the budget a commitment of \$400-million for a second round of the OSOTF, a needs-based financial-aid program designed to guarantee accessibility in Ontario universities. If Ontario universities were able to raise matching private-sector funds equal to the provincial government's commitment, there would be endowed funds of \$800-million for scholarships exclusively dedicated to students in financial need. In anticipation of this announcement, the administration had established a list of donors who had indicated a willingness to donate to needs-based student aid programs at the University of Toronto. The University was awaiting the new rules concerning this initiative. One element of the program that remained unclear was whether the funds would be available for students or for institutions. The University of Toronto had been advocating strongly that the funds be allocated for students.

(b) Federal Government Relations

Over the last few years, through the federal government's innovation agenda, there had been a remarkable growth in support for universities. In this year's budget, there had been the following three critical items for research universities.

- **Funding for Indirect Costs of Research.** Universities would now receive base funding toward the indirect costs of research. At the University of Toronto, this would amount to approximately \$15.8-million per annum. This was nominally capped for the next three years; however, the President remained optimistic that the amount could increase.

6. Report of the President (cont'd)

(b) Federal Government Relations (cont'd)

- **Canada Graduate Scholarships Program.** In equilibrium, this new program would provide
 - 2000 one-year Master's degree fellowships with funding at the level of \$17,500 per student per year; and
 - 2000 three-year Ph.D. fellowships with funding at the level of \$35,000 per student per year.

While this was exceptionally good news, the Master's fellowships had been implemented hurriedly for this September by SSHRCC without time for real consultation. The President was hopeful that changes would be made to ensure a better method of distribution for the fellowships next year.

- **Increase in Budget for Granting Councils.** The three granting councils --- the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC), the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council (NSERC) and the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR) --- had received a ten percent increase in their budgets. This was good news for the University's faculty as well as its graduate students.

(c) Capital Construction

There remained an unprecedented number of capital projects being undertaken at the University. Recent ceremonies had included:

- the opening of the Bahen Centre and the Morrison Pavilion;
- the groundbreaking ceremonies for the Centre for Cellular and Biomolecular Research (CCBR) and the Leslie L. Dan Pharmacy Building; and
- the groundbreaking for the Student Centre and the Management Building at the University of Toronto at Scarborough.

Construction was underway on many residence projects and the President also noted the purchase of the Colony Hotel to be opened for this September as a student residence.

A major challenge remained to make further progress on the former site of the Varsity Stadium.

In response to a member's inquiries, Professor Hildyard reported on the status of negotiations between the University and the union representing the employees of the Colony Hotel. She believed the University enjoyed an excellent relationship with the union and a transition process had been developed for those employees who would remain and for those that would be leaving. The University was working with the union as well to facilitate its application to the federal government for funds to assist hotel workers in the City of Toronto impacted by Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS). Professor Hildyard would be meeting with the head of the union to discuss ongoing issues the following week.

6. Report of the President (cont'd)

(d) Academic Planning

Professor Neuman had produced a series of green papers, which had created a “buzz” on all three campuses. In addition to a series of town-hall meetings set up for the University of Toronto community to consult on the papers, the Provost had also received extensive written submissions in response to her planning exercise. On behalf of the Provost, the President thanked those who had contributed thus far, including the student societies. The green papers and responses would form the basis of the white paper, which would also be made available to the University community for discussion. The final plan would set the stage for the University until the end of this decade.

The administration was still in the process of implementing the tri-campus administrative structure for the University’s three campuses. Changes had been made to create new departments at UTM and UTSC. The new opportunities for the two campuses had enabled the University to attract leaders of the caliber of Professor Ian Orchard and Professor Kwong-loi Shun, and, in the short term, Professor John Youson.

The administration had also been working proactively with departmental chairs to strengthen the tenure review process. The President had noted this year a significant improvement in the quality of the documentation presented.

(e) Campaign

Under the leadership of Dr. Jon Dellandrea, the Campaign continued to do extraordinarily well. Gifts and pledges to date were in excess of \$950-million.

(f) Appointments

A number of exceptional senior appointments had been made recently, including the following:

Professor John Challis, Vice-President, Research and Associate Provost;
Professor Professor Kwong-loi Shun, Vice-President and Principal, University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC);
Professor Jane Gaskell, Dean, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto (OISE/U.T.); and
Senator Vivienne Poy, Chancellor.

(g) Equity

Professor Hildyard’s recent report on employment equity had indicated that the University was working assiduously for equity and inclusion in faculty hiring but that there were areas where challenges remained. Professor Neuman had been extraordinarily proactive in supporting female faculty and in specifically encouraging women to join the ranks of academic administrators. Much positive feedback had been received in response to the Provost’s leadership in this area.

Professor Hildyard had organized a successful international equity conference on campus in March to raise the University’s profile on equity matters with the broader academic community.

6. Report of the President (cont'd)

(g) Equity (cont'd)

This year the University of Toronto had been the recipient of a national award for accessibility from the Foundation for Physically Disabled People. The President attributed much of the credit for this award to the University's students and specifically, to the Students' Administrative Council Wheelchair Access Committee (SAC WAC).

Invited by the President, at the conclusion of his report, to expand upon the University's efforts for barrier-free accessibility at the University, Professor Hildyard reported on the following initiative.

- **Ontarians with Disabilities Act: University Submission.** Professor Hildyard had been leading the University's response to this Act for the past few months. An advisory committee had been established comprising twenty-five members, including faculty, staff and students and representative of the three campuses. This committee had created a number of sub-committees that would continue their focus on key areas over the course of the summer, including technology, architecture, attitudes, policy, communication, structural design and student life. The names of the committees and their co-chairs would be posted on the Human Resources web site and an invitation would be issued within the next few weeks to the University community for participation and/or input into the committee. Each sub-committee would look at past practices, examine all types of barriers to accessibility as they related to faculty, staff and students, identify gaps and identify elements for a five-year plan to address areas in need. The plan would be brought to governance in September prior to its submission to the Government of Ontario.

In response to a member's inquiry regarding a report dealing with accessibility issues that had been released two years ago, Professor Hildyard confirmed that there was a process for looking at the accessibility of buildings on campus. One of the priorities for the coming year would be to review the check list for new buildings and update it where necessary. Invited to comment, Ms Janice Martin, Coordinator, Accessibility Services confirmed that the recommendations of the report would be further developed as part of the University's response to the Ontarians with Disabilities Act.

A member inquired about the composition of the committee that was working on the University's submission and asked whether students with disabilities were represented. Professor Hildyard clarified that at present the main committee was composed of three students, five faculty members and seventeen staff, including representatives of the areas that would be responsible for implementing the recommendations of the Committee. Two of the student members identified themselves as persons with disabilities. She added that the main committee and its sub-committees would be consulting broadly with persons who would be affected by the Act and the University's submissions.

The member who had posed the question commented that the process as outlined was very good. However, it was important to ensure that there was student buy-in to the process and he hoped there would be extensive consultations with students with disabilities. The optics of having only two members on the main committee with disabilities was not good.

A member noted that the University had good intentions with respect to accessibility; however, there were fifty-one buildings on campus that remained inaccessible. University funding was required to upgrade these locations.

6. Report of the President (cont'd)**(g) Equity (cont'd)**

A member asked if there was an identified cost to providing accessibility to the building that housed Admissions and Awards and for guaranteed barrier-free housing to students with disabilities.

Invited to respond, Professor Venter recalled that in 2001 the Governing Council had approved a barrier-free accessibility committee, which was chaired by Ms Susan Addario, Director of Student Affairs. An accessibility report would be brought to the next meeting of the Planning and Budget Committee, which would identify projects and expenditures relating to accessibility. Professor Venter acknowledged the support of the SAC WAC fund to date, and the Accommodations and Facilities Directorate (AFD) had made a commitment again to match SAC WAC funding, at \$70,000 per year for five years, for accessibility projects. While this amount would not be nearly sufficient to ensure accessibility of all buildings on campus, it did represent a further University commitment to accessibility. With respect to individual projects, Professor Venter noted that Ms Addario had tabled at AFD recent initiatives for the buildings which housed the Graduate Students' Union and University College Union. In each case, an assessment had been made to compare the required funding to ensure accessibility (and deferred maintenance) as compared to demolishing the buildings in their entirety and rebuilding. In conclusion, he clarified that a recent assessment of the building that housed Admissions and Awards had not been conducted; the administration was also looking for an alternative space that was accessible.

The member who had raised the questions, expressed his dissatisfaction with the speed at which accessibility issues were being dealt with and the lack of funding available to address these issues. He therefore gave notice of the following motion.

THAT an amount up to \$5.2 million be allocated to guarantee a barrier free admissions and awards building.

THAT the University of Toronto will guarantee housing without physical barriers to all students (full-time and part-time) and for faculty who require physically accessible on-campus housing.

The Chair noted that the Executive Committee would consider the notice of motion at its next meeting.

(h) Faculty

The President noted that there had been extraordinary international recognition of the University's faculty during the past year including the following:

- The Sloan Research Fellowships had set a new standard for Canada;
- American Academy of Arts and Science (of the 29 people elected internationally, five were from the University of Toronto); and
- Structural Genomics Consortium, a joint University of Toronto and Oxford University project, with Toronto in as the lead institution, which would have a huge impact on health in Canada. This was funded in good part by the Wellcome Trust.

6. Report of the President (cont'd)**(i) President's Thank You**

It had been a very satisfying year on many fronts; however, there were a series of significant challenges before the University. The governance process had been fundamental to the University's successes and the President extended his gratitude to members of the Governing Council for its support and efforts. The President added that one of the most important challenges not only to persuade the government but also the citizenry of Ontario and Canada of the need to support post-secondary education.

A member echoed the President's desire that elected governments support education and in particular, for Canadians to have access to a world-class education in Canada, and he encouraged an even stronger stance.

7. Capital Project: Rotman Management Building Extension – Project Planning Report
(Arising from Report Number 119 of the Academic Board – May 8, 2003)

Professor Cummins noted that it was proposed that a fourth and fifth floor be added to the Rotman Management Building at a cost of between \$3.999 million and \$4.4 million. The new space would be used for academic staff offices. The underground garage would be re-enforced to support the new floors. Some funding was already in hand; the rest would be raised from external donors. He clarified that the project would not proceed until all funding was received.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was Resolved

1. THAT the project planning report for the Expansion to the Joseph L. Rotman Building, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 119 of the Academic Board as Appendix "A", be approved in principle.
2. THAT the project scope of 488 nasm, approximately 880 gsm, of new space be approved at an estimated total project cost of \$3,999,000 to \$4,400,000, with funding as follows:
 - (i) Contribution of \$3 million received from a supporter of the Rotman School of Management and assigned to this project.
 - (ii) Contribution of \$341,000 from the Rotman Building Construction Project. This represents the balance of funds allocated to the original Joseph L. Rotman Building project.
 - (iii) Contribution of \$658,000 or as requested to be raised from external donors to meet the complete project cost. Project will only proceed to construction once all funds identified in (ii) and (iii) are received.

8. Capital Project: Lash Miller Laboratories – Project Planning Report
(Arising from Report Number 119 of the Academic Board – May 8, 2003)

Professor Cummins noted that the undergraduate laboratories in the Chemistry building needed to be renovated and upgraded to meet the demands and safety considerations as a result of expanded enrolment. The Academic Board had been assured that the laboratories met current safety requirements.

8. Capital Project: Lash Miller Laboratories – Project Planning Report (cont'd)

A member referred to comments raised at the Academic Board concerning this item, specifically that an allocation was being recommended for a building which had undergone renovations previously. He reiterated his earlier stated concern that there were no funds being allocated to ensure the accessibility of the building which housed Admissions and Awards. Professor Neuman clarified that the proposal concerned allocation of funds to laboratories, which had not been renovated since the Lash Miller building had been constructed, some forty years ago. There were health and safety issues that necessitated the recommended renovations. Also, there was not sufficient space to teach the number of students registered in the Department of Chemistry as the laboratories were currently configured. The proposal therefore addressed access of students to courses and student safety.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was Resolved

THAT the Project Planning Report to Upgrade and Renovate the Undergraduate Chemistry Laboratories within the Lash Miller Building, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 119 of the Academic Board as Appendix "B", be approved in principle;

THAT the project scope to upgrade and renovate the undergraduate chemistry laboratories within the Lash Miller Building be approved at an estimated total project cost of \$5,300,000 to \$5,600,000 with funding as follows:

- (i) contribution of \$4,000,000 from approved enrolment growth funds to be allocated by the University of Toronto towards this project;
- (ii) contribution of \$700,000 from the Department of Chemistry; and,
- (iii) contribution of \$900,000 from the Faculty of Arts and Science.

9. University of Toronto at Mississauga: Establishment of Departmental Structure
(Arising from Report Number 119 of the Academic Board – May 8, 2003)

Professor Cummins recalled the approval in principle the previous year of the *Framework for a New Structure of Academic Administration for the Three Campuses*. Step one for the University of Toronto at Mississauga had been a constitutional change that had separated it from the Faculty of Arts and Science; this had been accomplished earlier in the current academic year. The next step was to establish departments, and that was the proposal currently before the Council. He added that there had been extensive consultation in the division and approval by the College Council.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was Resolved

THAT the Departmental Structure of the University of Toronto at Mississauga described in Professor McCammond's amended memorandum of March 28, 2003 a copy of which is attached to Report Number 119 of the Academic Board as Appendix "C", be approved, effective July 1, 2003.

10. School of Graduate Studies: Master of Arts in Teaching – Discontinuation
(*Arising from Report Number 119 of the Academic Board – May 8, 2003*)

Professor Cummins introduced the proposal that the Master of Arts in Teaching program in English be discontinued. Enrolment was low and departmental priorities had changed. Current students would be allowed to complete the program. The Board had been assured that there would be no significant financial implications.

A member voiced his dissent to the proposal. He did not support the closure of programs merely for reasons of low enrolment. He suggested instead that the University endeavour to better promote and advertise the program.

A member, who was Dean of the School of Graduate Studies, elaborated upon the process by which the process had been brought forward for the Council's approval. This was a matter of the academic priorities of OISE/UT and its largest department, and indeed the largest department in the University, the Department of Curriculum, Teaching and Learning (CTL). The proposal had been passed by the Executive Committee of Division II, on which students were represented, and by the Council of the School of the Graduate Students, on which students were represented, and on which the President of the Graduate Students' Union served. At the meeting of the Council of SGS, the Graduate Co-ordinator of CTL, Professor Thiessen had reported that the CTL had no less than six graduate programs and three collaborative programs. Of these, the MAT program had always been relatively small. There were currently 16 professional students registered in the program. The goals of this program were met by other programs offered by CTL and OISE/UT. Professor Thiessen had explained that the department had gone from 86 faculty members in 1996 to approximately 50-55 in the coming year. This program had been supported by faculty stipends, the budget of which had been affected by diminishing resources. With these considerations and with a pending report of the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies in which it was discerned that this was a weak program in the priority ranking of CTL it had been decided that this program should be eliminated. The member continued that if the University wanted to create new programs and seek innovation it must at the same time look to its programs that were no longer meeting the academic objective of their departments and faculties. In conclusion, he noted that full attention had been paid to students in the program to ensure that they could complete it this year or transfer to other programs offered by CTL.

A member expressed his support for the student involvement in this decision-making process. He asked if other teaching and research universities had also discontinued the Master of Arts in Teaching program. In response, the Dean of the School of Graduate Studies invited the member to correspond with him with respect to this level of detail. He continued that the best universities in the world were not only creating new programs but at the same time were looking carefully to determine whether the existing programs that they offered met their academic objectives and their standards of excellence.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was Resolved

THAT the proposal for discontinuation of the MA(T) degree in English, be approved, with no new students admitted to the program, effective immediately.

Documentation for this item is attached to Report Number 119 of the Academic Board as Appendix "D".

11. Reports for Information

The Governing Council received for information the following reports:

- Report Number 119 of the Academic Board (May 8, 2003)
- Report Number 126 of the Business Board (May 5, 2003)
- Report Number 114 of the University Affairs Board (April 29, 2003)
- Report Number 360 of the Executive Committee (May 8, 2003)
- Report Number 361 of the Executive Committee (May 20, 2003)

(a) Report Number 119 of the Academic Board (May 8, 2003)

A member expressed his dissatisfaction with the process by which his notice of motion to the Academic Board regarding accessibility had been dealt with by its Agenda Committee. The latter Committee met in closed session and this matter should have a full public debate.

Invited to respond, the Chair of the Academic Board noted that the process for dealing with notices of motion raised at the Academic Board was to refer them to the Agenda Committee, which set the agenda for the Board. It had been the decision of the Agenda Committee not to place the member's motion on the agenda of the Academic Board, and the reasons for this had been outlined in the Report of the Agenda Committee. That Report would be brought to the Academic Board at its next meeting.

The member expressed his view that the substance of notices of motion should be debated at the Board rather than in closed session.

The Chair reminded the member that he was free to be present at the Agenda Committee when his notices of motion were being considered.

A member suggested that the member who had expressed concerns re accessibility speak with the Chair of the Business Board about setting up a members' off-line discussion meeting on accessibility issues.

A member agreed with concerns raised and encouraged open discussion on accessibility matters.

(b) Report Number 114 of the University Affairs Board (April 29, 2003)

A member asked about the status of the successful referendum undertaken by the Canadian Federation of Students, which sought to represent the University's students. The Chair of the University Affairs Board noted that this matter had been raised at the Board during its past three meetings and a record of these discussions was contained in the Reports of the Board. The matter would be further discussed at the Board's upcoming meeting, at which the University Affairs Board's responsibilities with respect to the issue would be confirmed.

(c) Report Number 361 of the Executive Committee (May 20, 2003)

A member drew attention to support expressed by several members of the Executive Committee that the accessibility of meetings of the Council be more broadly advertised. The member wondered if there could be student representatives on Accommodation and Facilities Directorate (AFD) to ensure that all the University's meeting rooms were fully accessible.

Invited to comment, Professor Venter reported that while he had not received a formal request for student representation on AFD, he would certainly entertain such a request.

12. Date of the Next Meeting

The Chair reminded members that the date of the next meeting was Thursday, June 26th at 4:00 p.m.

13. Question Period

(a) Admissions and Awards Building

A member asked if there were plans to address the accessibility of the Admissions and Awards building.

Invited to respond, Professor Venter commended to the earlier discussions concerning accessibility. This was an ongoing issue for the administration as was evidenced in part by the commitment of the AFD to allocate \$2.75 million in 2001 to accessibility-related projects. He continued that the building envelope immediately south of the Admissions and Awards building (Site 12) could possibly be used to better address the accessibility needs of Admissions and Awards. Regretfully, this solution was still years away so that relocation of Admissions and Awards might have to be considered. Professor Venter continued that he heard the concerns that this process was taking too long and agreed that the issue should be looked at again, with a view to an interim solution. He undertook to look into the matter.

A member expressed his dissatisfaction with the speed at which this matter was being dealt with.

14. Other Business

(a) Address by a Non-Member: Ms Julia Munk, Vice-President, Equity, Students' Administrative Council

Invited to address the Council, Ms Munk drew members' attention to housing issues being faced by students with disabilities. She outlined her own experience during the past year and her inability to obtain immediately family housing that was barrier free owing to a ten-month waiting list. Barrier-free housing off campus ran from \$900 - \$1000 a month, an amount that was not affordable to most disabled students, the majority of whom, she indicated, were living below the poverty line. She concluded her remarks by indicating that housing was an issue at the University that was blocking accessibility for disabled students and that was in need of immediate redress.

During the course of the discussion, Professor Farrar noted that arrangements were being made to accommodate Ms Munk in September.

During the course of the discussion concerning accessible housing, the following points were made by members of the senior administration:

- At 89 Chestnut Street (the former Colony Hotel), most of the rooms were accessible.
- In the Innis College residence, 50 rooms were totally accessible. During the past few years there had not been a great demand for these spaces.
- Graduate House had two suites (one male, one female), each of which had six spaces that were fully accessible. The University was in the process of refitting some aspects of Graduate House, for example, for people with low vision.

14. Other Business

(a) Address by a Non-Member: Ms Julia Munk, Vice-President, Equity, Students' Administrative Council (cont'd)

- Owing to the significant demand, the University did not leave apartments in the family housing empty. Students in need were given first call on accessible rooms; however, when the demand for accessible rooms did not exceed the supply, these rooms were allocated to other students at the beginning of the academic year. When a student applied late for an accessible room, some time was required to relocate someone from one of those rooms to another location.
- There was a significant demand for increased family housing in general, both for students with physical disabilities and those without.
- Provision for part-time students was being discussed by the Task Force on Student Housing; however, this remained a low priority given competing demands.

The meeting adjourned at 6:20 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

June 1, 2003