

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL  
**REPORT NUMBER 109 OF**  
**THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD**

**September 24, 2002**

To the Governing Council,  
University of Toronto.

Your Board reports that it met on Tuesday, September 24, 2002 at 5:00 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, with the following members present:

Dr. John P. Nestor (In the Chair)  
Ms. Durré Hanif, Vice-Chair  
Dr. Thomas Simpson, Chair, Governing Council

Dr. Sheldon Levy, Vice-President,  
Government and Institutional Relations,  
and Interim Vice-Provost, Students

Ms. Catherine Riggall, Vice-President,  
Facilities and Services

Mr. John Badowski

Dr. Robert M. Bennett

Dr. Shari Graham Fell

Ms. Margaret Hancock

Mr. Jason Hunter

Professor Bruce Kidd

Ms. Françoise Ko

Ms. Karen Lewis

Professor Michael Marrus

Mr. Sean Mullin

Mr. Colm Murphy

Ms. Parissa Safai

Ms. Cheryl Shook

Ms. Maggy Stepanian

**Non-voting Members:**

Mr. Felix Chee, Vice-President, Business Affairs

Ms. Susan Addario, Director of Student Affairs

Mr. John Bisanti, Chief Capital Projects Officer

Mr. Louis R. Charpentier, Secretary of the Governing Council

Ms. Marilyn Van Norman, Director of Student Services

Professor Ron Venter, Vice-Provost,  
Space and Facilities Planning

**Office of the Governing Council:**

Ms. Cristina Oke

Mrs. Beverley Stefureak, Secretary

**Regrets:**

Mr. Janakan Satkunasingham

Dr. John Wedge

Ms. Geeta Yadav

**In Attendance:**

Mr. Tad Brown, Finance and Development Counsel

Mr. Jim Delaney, Assistant Director, Student Affairs

Mr. Davis Elisha, Executive Assistant to the Director of Student Services

Mr. Mohammad Hashim, University Affairs Commissioner, Students' Administrative Council

Professor Paul Perron, Principal, University College

Mr. Kyle Winters, Associate Director, Marketing and Licensing

ITEM 6 IS RECOMMENDED TO THE GOVERNING COUNCIL FOR APPROVAL.

ALL OTHER ITEMS ARE REPORTED FOR INFORMATION.

### **1. Chair's Remarks and Introductions**

The Chair welcomed members to the first meeting of the new governance year, facilitated introductions and provided a brief orientation.

### **2. Report of the Previous Meeting – Report Number 108, June 4, 2002**

Report Number 108 of June 4, 2002 was approved.

### **3. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting**

There was no business arising from the previous meeting.

### **4. Code of Conduct for Trademark Licensees – Annual Report Presentation**

The Chair introduced Mr. Tad Brown, Finance and Development Counsel, and Mr. Kyle Winters, Associate Director, Marketing and Licensing and invited them to give an overview of the implementation of the *Code of Conduct for Trademark Licensees* over the past two years. (Their PowerPoint presentation is attached as Appendix “A”.)

Mr. Brown began by explaining that while he had oversight responsibility for the policy on trademark licensing, Mr. Winters had the day-to-day responsibility for its implementation. Mr. Brown gave a brief background to the policy development, noting that it evolved out of a process initiated by the administration in 1999 and involved Students Against Sweatshops. While similar policy development had been occurring in the United States during the mid to late '90s, the University of Toronto was the first Canadian university to approve a policy. Following the policy approval, the *Code of Conduct for Trademark Licensees* was developed setting standards for working conditions, hours of work and prohibiting child labor.

Mr. Winters continued, outlining the services of and processes within the Office of Marketing and Licensing Programs. He said that the Office aimed for a quick process for licensees, making forms and processes available online, while preserving the objective of a more cohesive U. of T. brand. He demonstrated how a typical application would proceed and spoke about the challenges in maintaining contact with all licensees. The original 300 had been narrowed down to improve feasibility of a more fully accountable operation. The online processes and the digital library of trademarks help to provide a mechanism for trademarks accountability and the capability to review the history of any trademark.

Mr. Winters spoke to the importance of maintaining person-to-person contact with licensees and students groups, and the ongoing dialogue with Students Against Sweatshops. He noted that, because the U. of T. *Code* was in place before others in Canada, the University has had a leadership role in this field. This was becoming increasingly significant as the University spearheaded efforts toward developing a consortium model for working with the organizations that actually do the monitoring by visiting factories, assessing how they measure up and reporting back. Collaboration in Canada was important and the University had organized a one-day event, Brand-Aid, on September 30 with participation from a wide breadth of Canadian universities

#### **4. Code of Conduct for Trademark Licensees – Annual Report Presentation** (cont'd)

Mr. Brown, in concluding remarks, said he thought remarkable progress had been made in a short time pointing to the Brand-Aid conference where eight Canadian universities who had their own codes would meet with others who were in the process of developing codes. It was significant, too, that the University had not received a single complaint from a licensee within the time the *Code* had been operational. Goals for the near future were to maintain good communication with involved parties, to develop an effective and cost-effective Canadian monitoring system and to continue working toward a completely digitized library. He invited members to visit the licensee fair at Hart House three weeks from today and to visit the website at [www.trademarks.utoronto.ca](http://www.trademarks.utoronto.ca)

A member expressed the hope that the newly established structure was not so cumbersome that new licensees could not be included. The details sounded admirable but he wondered also how the process guarded against monitoring organizations that had political agendas motivated by self-interest. Mr. Brown agreed that the monitoring processes in place had political elements with opposing views. The University had not engaged anyone and was working toward an objective, cost-effective Canadian model. He recognized the challenge but was hoping to avoid politicization.

The Chair thanked Mr. Brown and Mr. Winters for their presentation and for their work over the past two years, which had helped make the University of Toronto a leader in the trademark licensing area.

#### **5. Calendar of Business for 2002-03**

The Chair referred members to the Calendar of Business for 2002-03 which had been circulated with the Agenda. He saw the Calendar as a living document, changing as needed with each agenda planning meeting. He encouraged members to identify items of business in which they were particularly interested and take note of the timing for these to be brought forward to the Board. If a member wished to have input to the decision, the appropriate time to contact the assessor involved would be well in advance of the date on which the item was expected to be on the Board's agenda.

Dr. Levy reinforced the Chair's comments and asked members to become involved in items of interest as early as possible.

To ensure that members were kept abreast of changes in the Calendar, the Secretary was asked to inform them of updates electronically.

#### **6. Capital Project – University College Residence – Revised Project Planning Report**

The Chair referred to the memorandum and executive summary which had been circulated with the Agenda and which had highlighted the changes in this project since the first Project Planning Report had been approved in principle in June 2002. He invited Professor Venter to comment. Professor Venter noted that the primary reason why this report had been revised was because of objections from the City to the site that had been proposed in the June 2000 Report. The building was now to be located on site 22, immediately adjacent and to the north of Sir Daniel Wilson residence and was to be an eleven storey high building rather than the previously planned lower residence. There was some confidence, but no guarantee, that the City of Toronto would approve the current site.

## **6. Capital Project – University College Residence – Revised Project Planning Report (cont'd)**

Professor Venter informed the Board that the Planning and Budget Committee had reviewed this report last week and approval in principle had been recommended to the Academic Board. This report had more depth than what was normally presented when a project planning report came forward for approval in principle. That was because of the long history of consultation with the project, the need to change sites and the subsequent need to hire an architect to determine site feasibility. Thus, recommendations for approval in principle were coming forward to the three Boards almost at the same time that the recommendation would be going forward to the Business Board for execution. Cost estimates were difficult in the planning stage and future reports would come forward with a cost range rather than a single figure. As this moved forward, a cost analysis would have been done and there was a likelihood that the project cost might vary slightly from the cost shown in the motion. A cost variation, if any, would be covered by a small number of additional beds. However, the elements of the proposal that were within the responsibility of this Board would not change.

Professor Perron was invited to comment. He stressed to the Board the urgency of this project and the broad consultation that had occurred to bring this proposal forward. It had passed unanimously, with no abstentions, in both the College Council and within the student government. Students themselves had underlined the need for this new residence by voting in favour of an 8% increase in residence rates in each of the next three years. He urged support by this Committee

A member echoed Professor Perron's comments, noting that with this residence University College would still be able to accommodate no more than 20% of its students. He wished to commend the College on the degree of student involvement in this process and the fund-raising initiative that would see bursaries available for students who had difficulty meeting residence costs.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

**YOUR BOARD CONCURS WITH THE ACADEMIC BOARD**

Subject to the understanding that the rates of the University College residence ancillary operation are increased sufficiently to ensure that the operation continues to recover its costs,

1. THAT the Project Planning Report for the University College Residence Expansion be approved in principle;
2. THAT the project scope totaling approximately 7,400 gross square metres, allowing for the construction of the University College Residence Expansion on Site 22, an approved building site, be approved;
3. THAT the project cost of \$21,500,000 be approved, with the funding sources as follows:
  - (i) Donation from University College of \$2,500,000
  - (ii) University College Residence Ancillary allocation of \$1,485,000
  - (iii) University College Food Service allocation of \$800,000
  - (iv) University Infrastructure Investment Fund [UIIF] of \$70,000 and

- (v) Financing in the amount of \$16,645,000 to be repaid from residence fee revenues over a 25 year amortization period at 8% per annum.

## **7. Senior Assessor's Report**

Dr. Levy's report had been provided in writing to the members with their agenda packages. He added that with respect to the first item, the first-year guarantee for residence would need to continue through 2003-04 because of promotional literature that was already widely distributed. It would be a continuing challenge to determine how to meet the guarantee without slicing into the operating budget.

Mr. Bisanti provided a slide show update of residence capital projects underway, including New College Residence, Woodsworth College Residence, the Early Learning Centre, new residences at each of UTM (Phase VII) and UTSC (Phase IV). With the exception of the latter, all were within or under budget and most were on schedule. The UTSC Student Centre would be going out to tender in several months.

A member expressed concern about false economies that would generate a less-than satisfactory design, such as what occurred with Graduate House. Dr. Levy, Mr. Bisanti and Professor Venter replied that, though there were challenges, design was something that was in the foreground of planning. Lots of time was spent on balancing the competing objectives and there was now a rigorous design review process that it was hoped would give the best design possible for any given project. A member concluded by adding that comparators for the University of Toronto were global and that building form was closely related to quality of life within the institution.

In response to a member's question about what happened to residence fees once the 25-year mortgage was retired, Professor Venter explained that the intent was to build up equity for maintenance of the existing residence and replacement when needed. This was good planning. The University had often, and as was the case with University College, faced the need to subsidize the construction of new residences because this equity had not accumulated. While that may have been feasible in the past, it was not so in the new fiscal climate.

## **8. Reports of the Elections Committee**

The Chair noted that Professor Michael Marrus was present to answer questions on Reports 28 and 29 of 18 March and 13 September, 2002. There were no questions. Professor Marrus reminded members of the open forum for soliciting community input for the 2002-03 election process, taking place at noon on Wednesday, October 2 in Hart House.

On motion duly moved and seconded, the meeting moved *in camera*.

## **9. Service Ancillaries Review Group (SARG) - Appointment of UAB Members**

It was duly moved and seconded,

THAT Mr. Jason Hunter, Ms. Karen Lewis and Ms. Geeta Yadav be approved as UAB members to the Service Ancillaries Review Group for the term 2002-03.

## **10. Council on Student Services – Appointment of Chair**

It was duly moved and seconded,

THAT the term of Mr. Ted Everson, as Chair of the Council on Student Services, be extended to permit him to chair any meeting of that Council between now and the November 19 meeting of the University Affairs Board.

**11. Appointment of the Striking Committee**

It was duly moved and seconded,

THAT the following be approved as members of the Striking Committee for the 2002-03 year:

Dr. John Nestor, Chair  
Dr. Robert M. Bennett (alumni)  
Dr. Shari Graham Fell (Lieutenant Governor in Council)  
Ms. Karen Lewis (administrative staff)  
Ms. Parissa Safai (student)  
Professor John Wedge (teaching staff)

On motion duly moved and seconded, the meeting moved into open session.

**12. Other Business**

There was no other business.

**13. Next Meeting – Tuesday, November 5, 2002 at 3:00 p.m.**

The Chair reminded members that the next meeting of the Board was scheduled for Tuesday, November 5 commencing at 3:00 p.m. He noted that this was the meeting at which the equity reports were received. This was an important monitoring role for the Board and he hoped all members would be able to attend.

The meeting adjourned at 6:50 p.m.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Secretary

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chair

October 10, 2002  
22207