

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

Monday, December 12, 2005

MINUTES OF THE GOVERNING COUNCIL meeting held on Monday, December 12, 2005 at 4:30 p.m. in the Council Chamber, University of Toronto at Scarborough.

Present:

Ms Rose M. Patten (In the Chair)
Mr. John F. (Jack) Petch, Vice-Chair
The Honourable Vivienne Poy
Professor C. David Naylor, President
Mr. Husain Aboghodieh
Ms Holly Andrews-Taylor
Dr. Robert M. Bennett
Professor Philip H. Byer
Mr. P.C. Choo
Professor Brian Corman
Professor W. Raymond Cummins
Mr. Brian Davis
Dr. Claude S. Davis
The Honourable William G. Davis
Dr. Alice Dong
Ms Susan Eng
Dr. Shari Graham Fell
Professor Vivek Goel
Mr. Ran Goel
Dr. Gerald Halbert

Mr. Geoffrey Matus
Professor Ian R. McDonald
Ms Florence Minz
Mr. George E. Myhal
Professor Ian Orchard
The Honourable David R. Peterson
Professor Arthur S. Ripstein
Professor Barbara Sherwood Lollar
Miss Maureen J. Somerville
Mr. Mahadeo Sukhai
Ms B. Elizabeth Vosburgh
Professor John Wedge

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

Secretariat:

Mr. Henry T. Mulhall
Ms Cristina Oke

Absent:

Mr. Navine K. Aggarwal
Mr. Ryan Matthew Campbell
Professor Pamela Catton
Mr. Shaun Chen
Miss Coralie D'Souza
Professor Glen A. Jones
Dr. Joel A. Kirsh
Mr. Joseph Mapa
Professor Michael R. Marrus

Professor Linda McGillis Hall
Mr. Richard Nunn
Ms Jacqueline C. Orange
Mr. Timothy Reid
Ms Marvi H. Ricker
Mr. Stephen C. Smith
Mr. Robert S. Weiss
Mr. W. David Wilson

In Attendance:

Dr. John R. G. Challis, Vice-President, Research and Associate Provost
Professor Angela Hildyard, Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity
Ms Catherine Riggall, Vice-President, Business Affairs
Professor Kwong-loi Shun, Vice-President and Principal, University of Toronto at
Scarborough
Professor William Bowen, Chair, Department of Humanities, University of Toronto at
Scarborough
Mr. Brian Burchell, President, University of Toronto Alumni Association
Mr. Curtis Cole, Director, Academic Advising and Career Centre, University of Toronto at
Scarborough

In Attendance (cont'd):

Dr. Chris Cunningham, Special Advisor to the President
 Mr. Neil Dobbs, Deputy Secretary of the Governing Council
 Ms Sheree Drummond, Assistant Provost
 Professor David Farrar, Deputy Provost and Vice-Provost, Students
 Professor Jonathan Freedman, Acting Vice-Principal (Academic) and Dean, University of Toronto at Scarborough
 Dr. Anthony Gray, Judicial Affairs Officer, Office of the Governing Council
 Professor Edith Hillan, Vice-Provost, Academic
 Ms Janis Jones, Secretary to the Committees of Council, University of Toronto at Scarborough
 Mr. Jaan Laaniste, Director, Department of Physical Education and Athletics, University of Toronto at Scarborough
 Ms Lesley Lewis, Assistant Principal (Academic) and Director of the Office of the Vice-President and Principal, University of Toronto at Scarborough
 Dr. Jeanne Li, Special Assistant to the Vice-President, Business Affairs
 Ms Margaret McKone, Administrative Manager, Office of the Governing Council
 Mr. Tom Nowers, Assistant Principal, Student Affairs, University of Toronto at Scarborough
 Ms Hilda Seedanee, Office of Advancement, University of Toronto at Scarborough
 Professor Aysan Sev'er, Department of Sociology, University of Toronto at Scarborough
 Mr. Shuaib Sherman, Police and Parking Services, University of Toronto at Scarborough
 Professor Howard Sobel, Department of Philosophy, University of Toronto at Scarborough.
 Ms Michelle Verbrugghe, Director of Student Housing and Residence Life, University of Toronto at Scarborough
 Ms Mary Ward, University Ombudsperson

1. Chair's Remarks

(a) Welcome

The Chair welcomed members and guests to the meeting and to the campus of the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC). She indicated that a number of members, including the President, were still en route to the meeting, and that she would adjust the order of the agenda as necessary until his arrival.

(b) Audio Web-cast

The Chair reminded members that the meeting was being broadcast on the web, and that private conversations might be picked up and broadcast. She asked all members, senior administrators, and guests who were invited to speak during the meeting to use a microphone, so that their comments could be heard by those listening to the audio web cast.

2. Principal's Remarks

At the invitation of the Chair, Professor Kwong-loi Shun, Vice-President and Principal of the University of Toronto at Scarborough welcomed members and guests to the campus. He outlined some of the transformative changes that had been taking place at UTSC in the past few years. Many new buildings and facilities had been opened including the Arts and Administration Building, the Management Building, the Academic Resource Centre, Joan Foley Hall student residence, the student centre, and the Doris McCarthy Art Gallery. More facilities were still needed because of the continuing rapid enrolment growth. UTSC had opened in 1964 with 500 students; currently there were 9,700, and a 50% increase had occurred in the last three years alone. Professor Shun outlined some of the unique programs and opportunities offered at UTSC, including its co-op program for 1,500 students in Arts and Science and in Management, the International Development

2. Principal's Remarks (cont'd)

Studies program, the UTSC Scholars Society, the UTSC Faculty Lecture Series, and the new graduate program in Environmental Science that would begin in January 2006. He stated that all this expansion and activity had been made possible due to the hard work of staff, faculty, and student leaders, and concluded by introducing a variety of members of the UTSC community who were in attendance.

3. Minutes of the Previous Meeting

The minutes of the meeting of October 27, 2005 were approved.

4. Business Arising from the Minutes of the Previous Meeting

There was no business arising from the previous meeting.

5. Report of the President

(a) Awards and Accomplishments by Faculty, Staff and Students

The President stated that it was always a pleasure to visit the UTSC campus, and that he wished to begin his report by highlighting a number of very positive milestones that had occurred recently in the broad University of Toronto community. For future meetings, a written report of such accomplishments would be provided to members of the Governing Council for their information, and as a means of providing recognition for the many positive developments which occurred on an ongoing basis.

To begin with examples from the student body, two students at the Faculty of Law, Yousuf Aftab and Mark Elton, had in October taken first place in the 2005 Commonwealth Moot Championship, an international competition held in London, England, as part of the Commonwealth Law Conference. In November, Carmela Murdocca, a Ph.D. student at OISE/UT had been awarded a prestigious Canada-U.S. Fulbright Fellowship and planned to spend one year at Columbia University exploring the relationship between race, criminal sentencing and nationalism.

The President was also pleased to report that in athletics, the Varsity Blues had been successful in multiple sports, having already won three Ontario championship banners in women's tennis, men's water polo, and women's field hockey. The groundbreaking for the new Varsity Centre for Physical Activity and Health had occurred in November, a very positive indication of the University's commitment to the enhancement of the student experience. In support of the view that it was possible to recruit top athletes who were also outstanding scholars, over 160 Varsity Blues had been honoured in November as Canadian Interuniversity Sport (CIS) academic all-Canadians for maintaining a minimum average of 80 percent.

As examples of recent achievements by staff members at the University, Robert Chambers and Eugene Siciunas of Computing and Network Services had in June been among the nine inaugural winners of the Ontario Research and Innovation Optical Network (ORION) Award for their leadership in educational computing. Pierre Piché, controller and director of financial services, received the Leadership Award of the Council of Finance Officers, an affiliate of the Council of Ontario Universities for his contributions to the organization and management of higher education. In November, the University's swim coach Byron MacDonald had won a Gemini Award for coverage of swimming events at the 2004 Olympic Games in Athens. In December, University staff had won multiple communications awards from the Council for Advancement and Support of Education, including an award for press releases from the Department of

5. Report of the President (cont'd)

Public Affairs; a Gold Award for *Edge*, published by the Office of Research; and a Visual Design in Print award for the Trinity College alumni magazine.

The President cited a number of 'top lists' to which members of the University's faculty had been named. Professor Maydianne Andrade of Life Sciences at UTSC had been listed among the Brilliant 10 in a *Popular Science* magazine annual feature in October. In November, Professor Ted Sargent of Electrical and Computer Engineering had been named to the 2005 *Scientific American* 50, an annual list recognizing outstanding leaders in science and technology worldwide. In December, the Women's Executive Network had named four women closely associated with the University, along with 18 alumnae, to its 2005 list of Canada's Most Powerful 100 Women. These had included the new Principal of University College, Professor Sylvia Bashevkin; Ms Karen Caputo, a business, engineering and medical student; the Chair of the Governing Council, Ms Rose Patten; and Professor Gail Erlick Robinson of the Department of Psychiatry and the University Health Network.

Professor Parham Aarabi of Electrical and Computer Engineering had been named among the world's Top 35 Innovators Under the Age of 35 by MIT's *Technology Review* magazine. University Professors *Emeritii* James Till and Ernest McCulloch had received the 2005 Lasker Award, the American equivalent of the Nobel Prize for basic medical research for their foundational work in discovering stem cells. In October, University Professor *Emeritus* Endel Tulving of Psychology had received the 2005 Gairdner International Award, Canada's top award for health research. Also in October, two faculty members, Professor Keren Rice of Linguistics, and University Professor Donald Stuss of Medicine and Psychology had been elected members of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. Professor Janet Rossant of Medical Genetics and Microbiology, and Vice-President, Research at the Hospital for Sick Children, received in November the 2005 Michael Smith Prize, the top individual award in Canadian health research.

The President also wished to recognize teaching excellence. He cited Mr. Corey Goldman, a senior lecturer and director of the first-year learning communities program who had received the Learning Partnership National Technology Innovation Award in two categories, for his pioneering BIOME online learning community for undergraduate life science students.

Eighteen of the University's top scholars had been elected in 2005 to the Royal Society of Canada, including Professor Alberto Mendelzon of Computer and Mathematical Sciences at UTSC, who, sadly, had died in June at the age of 53.

Numerous milestones related to equity and diversity, as well as to the arts and culture, had been achieved recently, and the President noted the following as examples. In October, Professor George Dei of OISE/UT had received the Ann Ramsey Award for Intellectual Initiative and Academic Action, in recognition of his work in anti-racism education. Professor George Elliott Clarke of English had received in October a Planet Africa Award, given to recognize individuals, organizations, businesses and agencies that made a profound difference in the lives of people of African heritage. In October, Professor John Mighton of Mathematics had been awarded the Elinore and Lou Siminovitch Prize in Theatre, named after University Professor *Emeritus* Lou Siminovitch and his late wife, Elinore, who was herself a playwright. Two Governor General's Awards had been won by faculty members in November, in drama by Professor John Mighton of Mathematics, and in visual arts and media by Professors Lisa Steele and Kim Tomczak of Fine Art.

5. Report of the President (cont'd)

Finally, the University had recently achieved a number of significant institutional milestones. It had been the first and only university to make the annual list of Canada's Top 100 Employers published in Maclean's magazine. In addition, *Today's Parent* magazine had listed the University as one of Canada's Top 10 Family-Friendly Employers. For the twelfth consecutive year the University had been ranked first in the Medical-Doctoral category of *Maclean's* magazine's annual survey. For the second year in a row, the University had been ranked by *The Scientist* as the best academic workplace outside the United States, finishing second overall. Finally, the University had placed 29th on the 2005 *Times Higher Education Supplement's* annual ranking of the world's top 200 universities, and had risen eight spots from its 2004 ranking.

(b) External Relations: PACER

The President's Advisory Committee on External Relations (PACER)¹ had begun its meetings and was considering, in particular, issues related to communications, advocacy, and relationship building. These related to strategic planning for the Division of University Advancement, as well as for the Vice-Presidential Government and Institutional Relations portfolio. The Committee had analysed organizational models from a wide variety of peer North American universities, and had drafted potential alternative structures for these portfolios at the University. It was expected that a search consultant would be retained in January.

(c) Funding Challenges and the Implementation of 'Reaching Higher'

The President reported that he had spent a great deal of time in recent weeks dealing with the challenging issue of how the *Reaching Higher* plan would be implemented. The Rae Report (*Ontario – A Leader in Learning*) on post-secondary education had contained two main themes: the first had been the importance of access and enhanced participation, including growth in graduate enrolment; and the second had concerned quality, excellence and differentiation. The Report had called for progress on both these themes simultaneously. Ontario needed to have some universities that were internationally competitive. The Report had also called for various modes for differentiation among the province's universities, including more flexibility for institutions to determine their own tuition fee levels. Thus far in the implementation of the *Reaching Higher* plan there had been an emphasis on access, there had been funding proposed for graduate enrolment expansion, but there had been developed no clear metric to assess excellence or quality. The issue of how to deal with unfunded Basic Income Units (BIUs) was also being addressed, but the proposed formula to do so could lead to a \$3.5 million disadvantage to the University.

Further, there seemed to be an emphasis on equity and equalization rather than differentiation in the implementation of the *Reaching Higher* plan. Over the last 15 years there had been special funding envelopes to promote differentiation among the province's universities, but it appeared that *Reaching Higher* funding would be used rather to equalize institutions, specifically to bring the less developed up to the standards of the more established. Discussions were continuing with elected officials in the hope of

¹ The membership of the Committee was: Professor David Naylor, President (Chair); Professor John Challis, Vice-President, Research and Associate Provost; Professor Brian Corman, Vice-Chair, Academic Board and Chair, Department of English, Faculty of Arts and Science; Professor Jane Gaskell, Dean, OISE / UT; Mr. Ran Goel, Governor, Undergraduate Student, Faculty of Law; Ms Katherine Hilton, Assistant Dean, Alumni and Development, Faculty of Law; Ms Kim McLean, Assistant Principal (Business and Administration) and Chief Administrative Officer, University of Toronto at Scarborough; Ms Jacqueline Orange, Governor and Chair, Business Board, Alumna; Professor Ian Orchard, Vice-President and Principal, University of Toronto at Mississauga; Ms Marvi Ricker, Governor, Alumna; Ms Estefania Toledo, Vice-President, University Affairs, Students' Administrative Council; Mr. Louis Charpentier (Secretary). As Chair of the Governing Council, Ms Rose M. Patten would participate *ex officio* in meetings at her discretion.

5. Report of the President (cont'd)

reshaping the implementation framework for the *Reaching Higher* plan to further quality, excellence and differentiation.

Two other funding challenges for the University were related to its three-campus structure. The new Ontario Trust for Student Support (OTSS) matching program had replaced the Ontario Student Opportunity Trust Fund (OSOTF), and the University had been left with many pledges from its donors which were now unmatched. Under the OTSS program, the University would not be in a position to raise any new money from donors for the next three years because new OTSS funds during that period would be completely consumed simply to cover the unmatched commitments from OSOTF. In addition, the University would be penalized for having been so successful in attracting donations under the OSOTF because extra funds would be allocated to less successful institutions in the interests of advancing the goal of equalization. However, these extra funds would not be allocated to UTM or UTSC, which in many ways resembled Ontario's newer and less-advantaged universities. Rather the three campuses of the University would be treated as an aggregate to their disadvantage, and UTM and UTSC would not benefit from the equalization initiatives. The same problem would occur with respect to graduate enrolment expansion, where the government intended to allocate graduate student places to assist smaller universities to expand their graduate programs. However, despite the fact that there was capacity for graduate expansion at UTSC and UTM, these campuses would not benefit from these 'set aside' graduate student places. The University needed to make the case to the Provincial Government that its equalization initiatives should apply to UTM and UTSC, otherwise its three-campus structure would work to its disadvantage.

The implications of these funding challenges did not bode well for the 2006-07 budget, and difficult decisions would have to be made.

(d) Holiday Message

The President concluded by stating that his first ten weeks in office had been exhilarating and enjoyable. He wished to express his deep appreciation for the welcome he had received and the generous support he had been shown. He particularly wished to thank members of the Governing Council for the time and efforts they volunteered in the service of the University. He extended his best wishes to all for the holidays and the New Year.

A member congratulated the President on the outstanding senior appointments that had been made in recent weeks. Another member thanked the President for his ongoing efforts to educate government officials regarding the importance of differentiation in the treatment the province's universities. A third member thanked the President for the excellent relationship that he had already established with members of the Governing Council, and for his efforts in keeping them informed and enabling them to carry out their governance responsibilities in an effective manner.

6. Report of the Ombudsperson and Administrative Response

The Chair reminded members that the University Ombudsperson was responsible to the Governing Council, through its Chair, and as part of this responsibility, was required to report annually on the activities of the office. The administration had prepared its response to the *Report* and both documents had been circulated to members. The Chair welcomed Ms Mary Ward, the University Ombudsperson, and asked her to speak briefly to her report, and to take members' questions.

6. Report of the Ombudsperson and Administrative Response (cont'd)

Ms Ward stated that her *Report* was intended both to review the activities of the office of the Ombudsperson for the twelve months from July 2004 to July 2005, and to prepare for the review of the office by the Governing Council that was scheduled to begin in the new year. In addition to the usual statistics included in past reports, this *Report* also included an appendix with descriptive summaries of examples of issues brought to the attention of the office during the past year. The *Report* also included an account of the administrative responses to the Ombudsperson's recommendations since her first report in 1999, as well as an analysis of the changing profile and role of the office in recent years. The *Report* also made comments for the Governing Council's consideration in determining the Terms of Reference of the upcoming review of the office.

Highlights of the *Report* included the following. Since her appointment in 1998, the Ombudsperson had worked on more than 2,200 files, and had tabled 25 recommendations through her annual reports. In response to these recommendations, 22 major policy administrative initiatives had been taken to improve academic and administrative procedures and to streamline processes. Recent initiatives included the establishment by the University of a broadly representative equity advisory board, and the creation on the UTSC campus of the Equity Matters Group. The new student portal project was intended to improve institutional communications, and was being implemented in a three-stage process. Overall, the Ombudsperson found members of the University very responsive in remedying defects in process that were discovered, and open to suggestions for the improvement of internal communications and for resolving conflicts in a respectful manner. This was the first report in the history of the office that did not contain any new recommendations.

The President thanked the Ombudsperson for her service to the University and for her excellent *Report*. A member asked about the degree of student satisfaction with the office, and the response was that the ongoing challenge of the office was to make its existence known to students. A member commented on the importance of disclosure in the effective resolution of complaints, and that this needed to be communicated to students and other members of the University community. Another member asked how the administration responded when possibly systemic issues were identified by the Ombudsperson's office. The Ombudsperson responded that about one third of these cases involved academic issues, and many would be addressed by the new academic appeals framework. Other issues would be monitored for frequency of occurrence, and if there was an inadequate administrative response, this would be reported at the divisional level, and if necessary, to the Governing Council. The Provost added that the new equity advisory group would also allow for a more effective response to many of these issues. A member asked if the courts could request access to case files which were currently retained for seven years by the Ombudsperson's office under its Terms of Reference. The Ombudsperson responded that this issue had not been tested during her tenure, and that the policy for the retention of records should be considered in the upcoming review of the office. The Provost added that the University could be compelled by law to release records, but, in such a case the individual involved would be notified.

7. Items for Governing Council Approval

(a) Policy on Academic Appeals within Divisions

Professor Cummins reported that members of the Academic Board were advised that the Policy had been thoroughly discussed at the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs. A member of the Board had requested clarification on four points: the difference between a petition and an appeal; examples of the need for accommodation for reasons of equity and diversity; the use of informal resolution in appeals, and a clear definition of who was allowed access to student records in the appeals process. The

7. Items for Governing Council Approval (cont'd)

(a) Policy on Academic Appeals within Divisions (cont'd)

Provost's response had been included in Report 138 of the Academic Board. Board members had agreed that the issues raised had pertained to implementation rather than policy, and had subsequently approved the Policy.

On motion duly moved and seconded

It was RESOLVED

THAT the Policy on Academic Appeals within Divisions be approved, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 138 of the Academic Board as Appendix 'A', effective September 1, 2006; and

THAT the Guidelines for Academic Appeals within Divisions be rescinded, effective September 1, 2006.

(b) Academic Appeals Committee: Terms of Reference

Professor Cummins reported that members of the Academic Board had been informed that the change in the terms of reference to allow at least five chairs would expedite the number of appeals heard and would provide better service to students. No questions had been raised.

On motion duly moved and seconded

It was RESOLVED

THAT the revised Terms of Reference of the Academic Appeals Committee, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 138 of the Academic Board as Appendix 'B', be approved.

(c) Elections Committee: Change to Terms of Reference

Dr. Bennett reported that the University Affairs Board had briefly considered a minor change to the terms of reference to the Elections Committee. The change would enable the Committee to consult broadly without holding its currently required annual open forum, at which diminishing numbers of intervenors had presented annually. The University Affairs Board had offered no comment on this item.

On motion duly moved and seconded

It was RESOLVED

THAT the proposed revised Terms of Reference for the Elections Committee, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 131 of the University Affairs Board as Appendix "A", be approved.

(d) Election Guidelines 2006

Dr. Bennett reported that this annual approval had come forward for Governing Council approval, rather than stopping at the University Affairs Board as in previous years, because of the major nature of the changes which had been proposed. First, the category of Sessional Lecturer had been added to teaching staff elections – this change followed upon the decision of the Governing Council at the

7. Items for Governing Council Approval (cont'd)**(d) Election Guidelines 2006 (cont'd)**

June 29, 2005 meeting to designate sessionals as teaching staff under the Act. Secondly, the entire system of demerit points had been substantially revised to give much greater flexibility to the Chief Returning Officer and the Elections Committee in determining how to address violations of the rules of 'fair play'. The University Affairs Board had approved the *Election Guidelines* unanimously.

A member expressed concern, as a member of the teaching staff, that sessional lecturers had been grouped together with tenure-stream faculty for the purposes of election to the Governing Council. He maintained that most teaching staff members of the Governing Council have an ongoing commitment to the University, whereas sessional lecturers might be part-time employees teaching a single course for a single term. He considered this a significant question of principle that ought to be discussed.

The Vice-President and Provost responded that this issue had arisen with the decision to create the ranks of Sessional Lecturers I and II as members of the teaching staff as defined under the *University of Toronto Act, 1971*. This had been an important issue for C.U.P.E. 3902, Unit 3, which represented Sessional Lecturers, when its first collective bargaining agreement had been negotiated in 2004 with the University. The *Act* only allowed two categories of staff, teaching and administrative staff, and the employee group and the University had agreed that it would be most appropriate to include these new ranks in the former category. The Governing Council had subsequently approved this recommendation. The Provost added that the ranks of Sessional Lecturer I and II were only granted after careful review to certain members of the non-faculty stream teaching staff, not, for example to every person teaching a single course for a single term. The teaching staff category also already included a number of types of teachers who were not tenure-stream, such as athletic instructors, so the inclusion of Session Lecturers I and II had added one more group to this category.

The member added that he was not questioning the inclusion of these ranks in the category of teaching staff, but was concerned that there was no limit on the number of the twelve teaching staff positions on the Governing Council that they could hold. He recommended that the Elections Committee review this issue in the coming year. The Secretary responded that every constituency represented on the Governing Council already had eligibility requirements in place. For instance, there existed a requirement that a member had to remain a part of their constituency for the duration of their term on Governing Council. This would prevent a teaching staff member from remaining on Council if they only taught for a single term.

On motion duly moved and seconded

It was RESOLVED

THAT the proposed *Election Guidelines 2006*, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 131 of the University Affairs Board as Appendix "B", be approved.

8. Performance Indicators

The Chair stated that the annual Performance Indicators Report was a key element of the Governing Council's responsibility with respect to accountability. It was being presented for information and discussion, and the Provost would present its highlights by means of a PowerPoint presentation.

8. Performance Indicators (cont'd)

The Provost indicated that the copies of the presentation which had been placed on the table for members included notes which referred to specific pages of the Report, and so constituted an executive summary of the Report as requested by a member at the most recent Executive Committee meeting.

This was the sixth year that the Performance Indicators Report had been presented to the Governing Council, and a major change had been made in its format from previous years, from a data-driven model to a mission-driven model. That is, this Report had been organized around the University's major objectives, rather than around available data as in past years. This allowed an assessment of how the University was performing in advancing the major objectives of the *Stepping Up* Plan, and of where further data was required for reports in future years. The Report represented a high level snapshot of many of the accountability reports that were presented to the Governing Council each year, and was intended to provide a balanced scorecard, presenting key measures with comparisons to external benchmarks.

The Report included three major categories of measures: institutional mission measures, Stepping Up priority objectives, and Stepping Up enabling actions. Institutional mission measures included student average entering grades, faculty honours, faculty teaching awards, research yields, and research publications and citations. Many of these had been reflected qualitatively in the President's report earlier in the meeting, whereas the Report presented them quantitatively. With respect to student entering grade averages, the University had taken in, during each of the last three years, approximately 18% of the first-year students entering the Ontario university system from high school, but it had taken a disproportionately higher percentage of students with the highest grades. For instance, approximately 7-8% of high school students with a 70% entering grade average had attended the University, whereas more than 33% of those with a 95% average or higher had attended the University. The University wished to continue to attract students with the highest entering grade averages, but did not want to focus exclusively on grades as a measure of merit, also taking into consideration such factors as artistic and athletic performance, as well as leadership qualities.

With respect to faculty honours, the University's faculty represented approximately 8% of Canadian university faculty members, but had received a disproportionately high percentage of faculty honours from Canadian sources (on average between 19.1% and 38.5%) and had received more than two-thirds of international honours awarded to Canadian faculty. In contrast, the University's faculty were under-represented in the receipt of 3M Teaching Awards, having received approximately 5% of those awarded to Canadian faculty members during the last 19 years. This was an indication that more needed to be done both to support and recognize teaching excellence at the University.

The Provost explained that research yield was a measure of faculty success in obtaining research grants from the federal granting councils, and that the University's performance in this regard, for instance ranking third in 2003-04, compared favourably with its G10 peer institutions.

With respect to total research publications in the sciences, the University had ranked first among all public universities in North America between 2000-2004, and had ranked second behind Harvard when private institutions were included. Measures of research quality and of publications per faculty member were also needed, but nonetheless this measure of the University's total publication volume was meaningful and impressive.

The five Stepping Up priority objectives were addressed in the Report: the enhancement of the student experience; the promotion of interdisciplinary, interdepartmental and interdivisional collaborations; the linking of teaching and research; outreach and

8. Performance Indicators (cont'd)

engagement in public policy; and equity and diversity. With respect to the enhancement of the student experience, student-faculty ratios were a significant measure of the process. Since 2001, these ratios had increased significantly at the University from 29.5 to 34.9, while they had remained constant at approximately 22 for the University's peer public universities in the Association of American Universities (AAU). This comparison was somewhat misleading, however, because of the need for comparison purposes to use the same definition of 'faculty' as was used by the AAU. Following this definition, the total number of faculty at the University used for the calculation had not included clinical, status only, or teaching stream faculty, and many of these did, in fact, teach large numbers of students. Nonetheless, the increase in this ratio over the last three years was a challenge that needed to be addressed in order to enhance the student experience. Class size data, another measure of performance with respect to the student experience, was presented in this report as a distribution rather than merely as an average. While it would not be possible to eliminate large classes altogether, there was a need to ensure that each student had the experience of small classes, and progress had been made in this regard. Creative strategies were needed, such as to set a target that all first-year students had at least one experience of small-class teaching.

The Report also addressed the five Stepping Up enabling actions: the recruitment, retention and recognition of excellent faculty, staff, and students; the improvement of the employee experience; the creation of a world-class infrastructure; the development of an institutional information management strategy; and the generation and allocation of the resources needed to achieve priorities. Due to time constraints, the Provost very briefly summarized a few of the more significant slides related to this section of the Report. Efforts were being made to introduce research experiences for undergraduate students. Accessibility was being enhanced, as measured by the increasing percentage of students who reported annual parental household income levels below \$50,000. The yield rate, that is the proportion of students who accepted the University's offers of admission, had increased slightly during the last six years through the period of the 'Double Cohort'. Retention and graduation rates had been maintained, and compared favourably to those at peer institutions. The proportion of the University's operating budget devoted to student financial aid had increased dramatically from 4.6% to 12.3% during the last eight years, and was significantly higher than the average at other Ontario universities. Finally, the Provost stated that the ability to achieve the institution's mission ultimately depended on the resources available, and, measured in terms of total revenue per full-time student, the University ranked poorly compared to peer public universities in the AAU. Currently, the total revenue per student was less than one-half the average of its AAU peers, and the recent Reaching Higher investments promised by the provincial government would not be sufficient to close this gap by the end of the decade.

A member congratulated the Provost on the improved format of this year's Report, and commented that the issue of class size also needed to be considered from the perspective of the faculty experience, in addition to that of the student experience. This was a significant factor that had an impact on faculty recruitment and retention. Another member asked how class sizes could be reduced given the constraints on space and numbers of faculty. The Provost responded that a reduction in the number of students was also not a viable solution under the current funding system, as it would negatively impact the operating grant. Further, it was unlikely that a significant increase in faculty numbers would be possible in the next five years. Rather, the University would have to address issues of how teaching was carried out, how faculty were supported in their teaching role, and how faculty and courses were distributed across the student body by making use of initiatives such as the first-year learning communities in the life sciences and the Vic One and Trin One programs. The Provost also noted that some of the largest classes received the best student evaluations. One member stated that he had had very positive experiences with large classes, while another added that this had not been her experience.

9. Graduate Enrolment Planning 2005-15: Discussion Paper

The Chair stated that the Graduate Enrolment Planning Discussion Paper was also being presented for information. The extensive discussion of the Paper which had occurred at the Academic Board meeting of November 24, 2005 was recorded in Report Number 138 which had been circulated to Members. There were no questions or comments about the paper.

10. Reviews of Academic Units and Programs – Annual Report

The Chair introduced this item which was also being presented to the Governing Council for information only. Members had no questions or comments about the *Reviews*.

11. Reports for Information

Members received the following reports for information:

- (a) Report Number 144 of the Business Board (October 11, 2005);
- (b) Report Number 131 of the University Affairs Board (November 15, 2005);
- (c) Report Number 138 of the Academic Board (November 24, 2005);
- (d) Draft Excerpt of Report Number 392 of the Executive Committee (December 1, 2005).

With respect to Report Number 131 of the University Affairs Board, a member thanked the Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity for the excellent presentation of the annual reports of the equity officers which had taken place. A member commented that Report Number 138 of the Academic Board summarized the excellent discussion which had occurred of the Graduate Enrolment Planning 2005-15: Discussion Paper, much of it building on the initial discussion which had occurred at the Planning and Budget Committee meeting of November 1, 2005. Regarding the Reviews of Academic Programs and Units, which were discussed at the Academic Board meeting, a member commented that it was unfortunate that many members of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs had been unable to attend the June 14, 2005 meeting of that Committee when these had been discussed. A member of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs responded that all members of the Committee, even those unable to attend the meeting, had contributed to their consideration by submitting written reports.

12. Date of the Next Meeting

The Chair reminded members that the next regular meeting of the Governing Council was scheduled for Thursday February 9, 2006 at 4:30 p.m.

13. Question Period

Members had no questions for members of the senior administration.

14. Other Business

There were no items of Other Business.

IN ACCORDANCE WITH A DETERMINATION BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE PURSUANT TO SECTIONS 38 AND 40 OF BY-LAW NUMBER 2, ITEMS 15 AND 16 WERE CONSIDERED BY THE GOVERNING COUNCIL *IN CAMERA*.

15. Senior Appointments

(a) Interim Assistant Vice-President, University Advancement

On motion duly moved and seconded

It was RESOLVED

THAT Ms Avon MacFarlane be appointed as Interim Assistant Vice-President, University Advancement, effective immediately and continuing to June 30, 2007, or until a Vice-President is appointed with responsibilities for the Division of University Advancement, at which time decisions regarding the long-term organizational structure of the Division will be made.

(b) Vice-Provost, Relations with Health Care Institutions

On motion duly moved and seconded

It was RESOLVED

THAT Professor Catharine Whiteside be appointed to the position of Vice-Provost, Relations with Health Care Institutions for a term commencing January 1, 2006 until June 30, 2011.

(c) Acting Vice-President and Principal, University of Toronto at Mississauga

On motion duly moved and seconded

It was RESOLVED

THAT Professor Cheryl Misak be appointed to the position of Vice-President of the University of Toronto at Mississauga for a term commencing July 1, 2006 until June 30, 2007.

16. Report Number 48 of the Committee for Honorary Degrees

On motion duly moved and seconded

It was RESOLVED

THAT the recommendations contained in Report Number 48 of the Committee for Honorary Degrees be approved; and

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

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

The meeting adjourned at 6:35 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

December 21, 2005