

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL
Thursday, November 2, 2006

MINUTES OF THE GOVERNING COUNCIL meeting held on Thursday, November 2, 2006 at 4:30 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, University of Toronto.

Present:

Ms Rose M. Patten (In the Chair)
Mr. John F. (Jack) Petch, Vice-Chair
Professor C. David Naylor, President
Professor Varouj Aivazian
Ms Diana Alli
Mr. Terry Buckland
Professor Philip H. Byer
Professor Brian Corman
Mr. Kristofer T. Coward
Miss Coralie D'Souza
Dr. Claude S. Davis
The Honourable William G. Davis
Dr. Alice Dong
Ms Susan Eng
Professor Jonathan Freedman
Professor Vivek Goel
Mr. Robin Goodfellow
Professor William Gough
Dr. Gerald Halbert
Professor Ellen Hodnett
Professor Glen A. Jones
Professor Joel A. Kirsh
Professor Louise Lemieux-Charles

Mr. Joseph Mapa
Mr. Geoffrey Matus
Mr. Richard Nunn
Ms Jacqueline C. Orange
Ms Marvi H. Ricker
Professor Arthur S. Ripstein
Professor Barbara Sherwood Lollar
Mr. Stephen C. Smith
Miss Maureen J. Somerville
Ms Estefania Toledo
Ms B. Elizabeth Vosburgh
Professor John Wedge
Mr. W. David Wilson

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

Secretariat:

Mr. Henry T. Mulhall¹
Ms Cristina Oke

Absent:

Mr. John M. Badowski
Mr. P.C. Choo
Miss Saswati Deb
Dr. Shari Graham Fell
Professor Michael R. Marrus
Ms Florence Minz

Mr. George E. Myhal
The Honourable David R. Peterson
Mr. Timothy Reid
Mr. Robert S. Weiss
Ms Johanna L. Westar
Mr. Patrick Wong

In Attendance:

Dr. John R. G. Challis, Vice-President, Research and Associate Provost
Professor Angela Hildyard, Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity
Ms Cathy Riggall, Vice-President, Business Affairs

¹ Absent for Agenda Item 1.

In Attendance: (cont'd)

Ms Judith Wolfson, Vice-President, University Relations
Dr. Chris Cunningham, Special Advisor to the President
Mr. Neil Dobbs, Deputy Secretary of the Governing Council
Professor David Farrar, Deputy Provost and Vice-Provost, Students
Professor Edith Hillan, Vice-Provost, Academic
Professor David Klausner, Vice-Dean, Interdisciplinary Affairs, Faculty of Arts and Science
Ms Helen Lasthiotakis, Acting Assistant Provost
Dr. Jeanne Li, Special Assistant to the Vice-President, Business Affairs
Ms Bryn MacPherson-White, Director, Office of the President and University Events
Mr. Steve Moate, Senior Legal Counsel
Professor Peter Pauly, Vice-Dean, Joseph L. Rotman School of Management
Ms Elizabeth Sisam, Assistant Vice-President, Campus and Facilities Planning
Professor Mark Stabile, Interim Director, School of Public Policy and Governance
Ms Meredith Strong, Interim Special Assistant to the Vice-President, University Relations
Professor Caroline Tuohy, Provostial Advisor on Public Policy
Professor Safwat Zaky, Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget

THE MEETING BEGAN *IN CAMERA*.

1. Senior Appointments

(a) Vice-Provost, First-Entry Programs

On motion duly moved and seconded

It was RESOLVED

THAT the position of Vice-Provost, First-Entry Programs be established; and

THAT Professor Pekka Sinervo be appointed to the position of Vice-Provost, First-Entry Programs, effective November 3, 2006 for a term concurrent with his term as Dean, Faculty of Arts and Science (ending June 30, 2009).

(b) Interim University Ombudsperson

On motion duly moved and seconded

It was RESOLVED

THAT Professor Ian McDonald be appointed Interim University Ombudsperson, effective immediately and continuing until a University Ombudsperson is appointed and has taken office.

(c) Assistant Secretary of the Governing Council

On motion duly moved and seconded

It was RESOLVED

THAT pursuant to section 8 of *By-Law Number 2*, Mr. Henry T. Mulhall be appointed as an Assistant Secretary of the Governing Council, effective November 3, 2006.

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL MOVED INTO OPEN SESSION.

2. Chair's Remarks

The Chair welcomed new and returning members, and guests, to the first regular meeting of the Governing Council of the academic year.

(a) Resolutions Approved by Council During the *In Camera* Session

The Chair announced that, during the *in camera* session at the beginning of the meeting, the Council had approved three senior appointments. The position of Vice-Provost, First-Entry Programs had been created, and Professor Pekka Sinervo had been appointed to this new position concurrent with his term as Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Science. Professor Ian McDonald, who had just completed nine years service on the Governing Council, had been appointed Interim University Ombudsperson until a new Ombudsperson had been appointed and had taken office. Finally, Mr. Henry Mulhall had been appointed to the position of Assistant Secretary of the Governing Council.

3. Minutes of the Previous Meetings

The minutes of the meetings of June 29, 2006 and September 8, 2006 were approved.

4. Business Arising from the Minutes of the Previous Meetings

There was no business arising from the previous meetings.

5. President's Report

(a) Executive Searches

The President reported that four searches were underway, two of which were for positions reporting to the new Vice-President, University Relations. These were the positions of Assistant Vice-President, Government, Institutional and Community Relations; and Assistant Vice-President, International Relations. The President and Vice-President and Provost were co-chairing the search for the new Vice-President and Principal of the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC), and were pleased with the progress which had been made. Finally, a search was also about to begin for a Vice-President, Advancement.

(b) Provincial Government Update

The President wished to emphasize that the University was facing somewhat greater than anticipated budgetary pressure during the current year. This was in addition to the 5% cut to base budgets which was a part of the current long-term budget plan. Much of the funding associated with the provincial government's Reaching Higher Plan was tied to enrolment growth, including for the planned graduate expansion. It also included coverage for unfunded Basic Income Units (BIUs) from previous undergraduate enrolment growth, as well as funds to cover shortfalls in student loans and bursaries. All of this was welcome, but did little to affect per student funding at the institutional level. In addition, there had been substantial unanticipated enrolment growth of some 30,000 students across the provincial post-secondary sector. This suggested that new funding would be required, but thus far it had not been forthcoming in discussions with the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities. It appeared, rather, that some of the funding previously anticipated for quality improvements would be redirected towards increased access and enrolment growth. The University, in collaboration with the Council of Ontario Universities (COU) was in active dialogue with the provincial government concerning the importance of sustaining the quality agenda.

5. President's Report (cont'd)**(c) Federal Government Update**

The University anticipated the release of the federal government's economic update within the next few weeks. Discussions were ongoing to promote the research university agenda in advance of the release of a full federal budget expected during the late winter or spring.

(d) Ratings, Rankings and Performance Measures

The President referred members to the full text of a statement which had been placed on the table entitled *University Report Cards, Ratings, Rankings and Performance Measures*², and indicated that he wished to speak to its highlights.

In the last few months, the President and Vice-President and Provost had briefed governance bodies on their view of some of the university rankings published by for-profit media outlets and non-profit agencies. The Vice-President and Provost had also kept governors apprised of the University's substantial array of institutional performance measures. More recently, a number of colleagues had asked about the President's views on the 2006 *Globe and Mail* University Report Card, released on October 31, 2006. His Statement accordingly was intended to offer some reflections on the Globe Report Card, and to recapitulate where the University stood more generally on university rankings and performance measures, including the *Maclean's* rankings.

First, the President stated that he welcomed the *Globe and Mail's* new magazine format. The stories in the 2006 University Report Card show that the *Globe and Mail* had assumed a leadership role in the Canadian debate about higher education. One striking example was an article entitled, 'Can our schools become world-class?', by Alex Usher, Vice President of the non-profit Educational Policy Institute (EPI). Usher had offered a trenchant summary of the challenges facing the University of Toronto and Canada's other research-intensive universities. The President believed that his analysis should be required reading for every Member of the Parliament of Canada and every Member of the Provincial Parliament of Ontario.

Second, the *Globe and Mail* had added some new fields of analysis to its previous student survey data. It had done so in partnership with EPI, using publicly available data sources. This, too, was welcome. *Maclean's* had insisted for many years that institutions do extensive and customized data analysis on a *pro bono* basis for the magazine's university issues. In so doing, institutions had not only used public funds to subsidize a for-profit enterprise, but had tacitly legitimized one media source above others.

The University's approach to all these exercises was straightforward. It had been the national leader in institutional performance measurement. It intended to continue developing and posting on-line not only more information, but more partially-processed data for others to analyze as they saw fit.

In this respect, to facilitate inter-institutional comparisons, the University had been working closely with other Ontario universities to develop a Common University Dataset for Ontario (CUD-O). CUD-O would use standardized definitions for a substantial array of key variables, and promote consistent analysis of each university's operations. By defining these variables themselves, two goals would be achieved. It would show how different definitions affected the results and explain any interpretive pitfalls. It would also mitigate the 'gaming' that might become prevalent when data were processed for direct consumption by the media.

² See: <http://www.president.utoronto.ca/aboutthepresident/speeches/universityreportcards.htm>.

5. President's Report (cont'd)**(d) Ratings, Rankings and Performance Measures (cont'd)**

The first edition of CUD-O would be made public in a matter of days, and it was anticipated that more variables would be added to the dataset in the months ahead. This initiative would help to level the playing field among media outlets and agencies that wanted to publish competing assessments of universities.

More generally, the University did not intend to provide a blanket endorsement of any of those analyses by media outlets or other third-parties. The University reserved the right to work with any outlet or agency that was committed to the responsible generation and interpretation of information for its diverse stakeholders. It had a healthy degree of scepticism about the rhetoric of accountability and transparency from those who, quite reasonably, had a certain interest in headline font sizes, circulation numbers, or corporate balance-sheets. The University's professoriate had very substantial expertise in institutional performance analysis, and they, along with members of the administration, would remain free to comment on the reliability and validity of any of those efforts to grade or rank institutions.

Third, the main component of the *Globe and Mail* Report Card consisted of the results of a large-scale undergraduate survey, undertaken with the help of a market research firm, The Strategic Counsel. The *Globe and Mail* had acquired survey data reflecting the opinions of about 33,000 full- or part-time undergraduates registered as members of the studentawards.com database. Unfortunately, the University did not have an appropriately detailed description of the methodology. It would have been very useful to have seen full response rates by institution, to have known the potential impact of question-framing effects on responses, and to have understood the extent of potential sampling biases. However, on the positive side, starting in 2005 the *Globe and Mail* and Strategic Counsel had rejected numerical rankings as uninformative, and instead had adopted letter grades to reflect the mean scores that students gave their university for each question on the survey. A full summary of the University's grades had been reproduced in the President's written Statement, and was available on both the *Globe and Mail* and the University websites.

Some members of the University community had downplayed these results because they reflected student perceptions or opinions, rather than reasonably obvious facts about the operations of the University. Certainly there were some striking anomalies. For example, the University's library resources, both in physical and on-line holdings, were unmatched in Canada, and the latest ranking of the library put it 3rd in holdings in North America, bettered only by Harvard and Yale. Scores ranging from A- to B+ seemed hard to fathom for this dimension of the University's performance. Another anomaly was a score of B for "Number of courses to choose from". University of Toronto undergraduates had by far the widest selection of courses of any institution in Canada. "Diversity of extra-curricular activities" also drew a B, even as the University's students had access to over 300 registered clubs, with arguably the largest selection in the country.

While these and other grades might have seemed inconsistent with reality on the University's three campuses, any misperceptions of their environment by the University's students represented an opportunity for improvement simply through enhanced communication. To that end, these results had already been discussed at the executive table, and would inform ongoing investments in internal communications targeting a range of audiences, not least students.

On the other hand, the President emphasized that many of the grades were perfectly consistent with the results of the preceding year's *Globe and Mail* survey and the previous two years' results from the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). Other

5. President's Report (cont'd)**(d) Ratings, Rankings and Performance Measures (cont'd)**

Ontario institutions, most notably the University of Western Ontario, had achieved higher grades from their undergraduate students with per-student funding no different than the University of Toronto's. There were lessons to be learned from these and other survey results, and from the University's peers.

For example, many of those who were most knowledgeable about universities viewed the University of Toronto as the best research-intensive university in Canada. Usher, for one, described it as the only Canadian institution that was "genuinely world-class across a wide range of fields". And yet, the University had not received an A+ even for areas of obvious excellence, such as "Overall academic reputation of your university" or "Reputation for conducting leading-edge research". It seemed that the institution's academic strengths were currently lost on meaningful numbers of undergraduates. Why? Perhaps it was again a matter of internal communication. Perhaps the University's rigorous grading practices and high academic standards created some friction, and students were responding with some 'grade deflation' of their own. Perhaps too few undergraduates had an opportunity to interact personally with some of the renowned scholars who exemplified the international standing of the collegium. Understanding these perceptions might require internal 'market research' with the University's undergraduates.

Other lessons were more concrete. It appeared that the University needed to bolster front-line library services and hours of operation, rather than investing solely to defend its acquisitions budget against the ongoing erosion of library purchasing power. More quiet study space, and better classrooms and lecture halls were needed. The range of food services was limited on all three campuses, and more choices and better facilities were required in order to migrate from the current D to a more reasonable grade. The concept of expanding merit-based scholarships was now widely accepted, but to the President's frustration, it had taken months for a consensus to emerge on implementation of these important recruitment tools. The University had received a D for "Availability of Merit-Based Scholarships", and it had been deserved.

In short, many of these findings simply reinforced what was known, and offered a useful reminder that, as funding permitted, new investments had to be made urgently in facilities and services that students valued and needed.

As governors were aware, the University of Toronto had been among the 26 institutions that had not generated customized data for *Maclean's* in 2006. In past years, meeting the magazine's data needs had been very time-consuming, and had essentially given one media outlet a monopoly in the field. The University's preferred strategy was therefore to make data available using standardized definitions for a variety of media outlets and other agencies to use. A letter had been sent to *Maclean's* by eleven university presidents in August, outlining their reasons for declining to submit customized data to the magazine³. Their collective position reflected growing scepticism, worldwide, about reductionist rankings of universities by commercial enterprises.

For a decade now, there had been growing scepticism about such rankings in the American post-secondary education system. In the late 1990s, for example, the majority of American law school deans had signed a declaration warning prospective students against commercial ranking systems, which, they stated "purport to reduce a wide array of information about law schools to one simple number that compares all 192 ABA-approved law schools with each other. These ranking systems are inherently flawed because none of them can take your special needs and circumstances into account when

³ See: <http://www.news.utoronto.ca/bin6/060814-2502.asp>.

5. President's Report (cont'd)**(d) Ratings, Rankings and Performance Measures (cont'd)**

comparing law schools.” These criticisms were essentially identical to those that had more recently been raised about *Maclean's* in Canada.

In the last two years a handful of American universities had declined altogether to participate in ranking exercises. Others had objected publicly to the perverse effects of rankings on institutional decision-making. A number of highly selective liberal arts colleges, including Amherst, Swarthmore, and Williams, had agreed during the summer of 2006 to reduce their early admissions offers and associated merit-based scholarships, and to expand needs-based support with a view to enhanced opportunities for lower-income applicants. The presidents of these institutions had publicly acknowledged ‘gaming’, whereby they had sought to increase the total number of applications, thereby accepting a lower proportion and appearing more selective in the *US News and World Report* rankings.

Inside Canada, there had been similar controversy. Both President Birgeneau and Interim President Iacobucci had discussed withdrawal from the *Maclean's* rankings with their executive teams. President Birgeneau had been particularly concerned that *Maclean's* would not modify its global scoring system in a way that better reflected international research excellence. As one example, *Maclean's* did not capture international prizes for scholarly excellence where the University took dramatically more than its per-capita share. In 2002 President Birgeneau had written formally to request changes in the scoring system, but no changes had been made. Upon assuming office, the President had been surprised both by the methodological weaknesses of all these ranking systems, and by the depth of antipathy to them among other university presidents.

It was clear that rankings were not going to disappear. The appeal of any ranking exercise rested on basic human psychology. Humans clearly had an instinct to orchestrate competitions with first-past-the-post results. Humans also liked heuristics, that is convenient interpretive frameworks to manage complexity. They spoke of the “Top 10” as if the number eleven did not exist, and invented categories such as the “Top 25” or “Top 100”.

The Dean of the Wharton Business School, Patrick Harker, had been a particularly outspoken critic of the way that institutions used rankings for marketing purposes. Both Harvard and Wharton had recently declined to facilitate surveys of their business school alumni for ranking purposes, and Dean Harker had written in May 2004: “Some people who agree [that the methodology is severely flawed] also ask, ‘But if the rankings help us, who cares if they are flawed or give only a limited view of the school?’ But we can't have it both ways. We either endorse a defective, inconsistent practice, or we speak out, offer better alternatives for information, and work with the media to enable them to report with more useful, objective data.” The President stated that he supported those sentiments unreservedly.

The President noted that he had publicly stated his views on a number of occasions about the methodology used by *Maclean's*, and that these were available in his written Statement. He did wish to commend *Maclean's* for the positive changes that had been introduced in the 2006 Report, including efforts to share more information rather than rankings.

In fairness to *Maclean's*, the President emphasized that each of the international rankings listed in his Statement shared the general weakness of arbitrarily combining data from variables that might be badly measured from the outset. Each of them had particular flaws. *The Times* created a composite score by combining reputation ratings, research

5. President's Report (cont'd)**(d) Ratings, Rankings and Performance Measures (cont'd)**

outputs, proportion of international students and faculty, student-faculty ratios and survey data from employers or recruiters. It relied far too heavily on reputational survey data, so that the results for some institutions varied from year to year in rather startling fashion, depending on geographic response biases. The Shanghai scoring system relied on objective research performance measures, but underestimated the role of the humanities and social sciences, and assessed the success of an institution's educational mission largely on the basis of a handful of graduates who happened to win very prestigious research awards. It said almost nothing about the educational strengths of an institution or the experience of the students who attended it. *Newsweek International* had tried to balance off the weaknesses of those two systems by simply combining them, and adding an additional 10% weight to reflect the comprehensiveness of research library holdings. Again, however, reasonable people could disagree radically about what weights should be given to any of those elements, as well as the utility of any simple numerical rankings of complex institutions.

The President concluded by adding a closing reflection and a commitment. As someone who had spent much of his academic career in the field of institutional performance measurement in health care, he could only say that the state of performance measurement in higher education was deplorable. Inputs were confused with process indicators, processes were confused with outputs, and outputs were confused with outcomes. The current obsession with rankings only added to the prevalence of misinformation, in part because institutions, not least the University of Toronto, had been too quick to advertise those rankings that put them in a favourable light, and to criticize or downplay those that were less advantageous. The University of Toronto had led Canadian institutions in the volume of data that it had made available on-line⁴, and in the way in which it had analyzed and interpreted its institutional performance measures. The President and Vice-President and Provost, together with the University's remarkably capable team of institutional analysts and academic executives, were committed to maintaining that leadership position in the years ahead.

(e) Discussion

A member congratulated the President on his statement and recommended that the University engage a professional survey firm to assess the attitudes of graduating students at both the undergraduate and graduate levels with respect to their perception of the student experience. More relevant questions and more sophisticated analysis could be attained than that provided in the *Globe and Mail* Report Card. Another member noted that the Report Card was problematic in that it lacked transparency with respect to its methodology, specifically the questions it had used and the manner in which the responses had been analyzed.

The President responded that, despite its methodological limitations, the *Globe and Mail* survey's results still had to be taken seriously. It would be unacceptable to maintain that the price of having internationally recognized research and scholarly performance, and outstanding professional and graduate programs was to compromise the undergraduate student experience. The University's fundamental challenge was to find ways, within tight resource constraints, to engage a very large number of undergraduates. This was a recognized challenge in many large research-intensive universities in North America. One of the tools being used by the University was the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), which employed methodology which was superior to that used by many professional survey firms. Its results were consistent with the basic message

⁴ See: <http://www.utoronto.ca/aboutuoft/accountabilityreports.htm>.

5. President's Report (cont'd)**(e) Discussion (cont'd)**

derived from the *Globe and Mail* Report Card. The University also made use of the Graduate and Professional Student Survey (GPSS) where its scores with respect to student perceptions were more favourable.

A member urged the University not to assume that excellence in research and excellence in teaching were inversely related. Surveys might find that some of the best teachers were in fact also excellent researchers. The President expressed his agreement, and noted that excellent teachers were to be found in both the teaching stream and tenure stream faculty. Some of the latter were outstanding teachers of very large classes who effectively shared their excitement about the discovery of knowledge with their students. The University needed to have first-rate scholars teaching in its classrooms. The Vice-President and Provost added that NSSE scores indicated that undergraduate students were not always aware that they were receiving research experiences, and that this needed to be made more apparent.

A member asked how priorities should be set, given the resource restraints that existed, to address the challenges raised by the various student surveys. The President responded that much of the initiative would need to come from the divisions, given the size, complexity and decentralized nature of the University. The central administration needed to promote institutional concerns, support the work of divisional leaders, and where possible put funds into play. This included the Student Experience Fund, designed to support and catalyze divisional and departmental initiatives. There was a growing sense that the teaching and learning experience needed to be at the heart of the institution, and this would be promoted by the central administration. Much work was also being done to improve the student experience outside the classroom through such initiatives as the Varsity Centre, the UTM Wellness Centre, the improvement of food services, and the extension of library hours.

6. Items for Governing Council Approval**(a) *Ontarians with Disabilities Act: University of Toronto Accessibility Plan, 2006-07***

Professor Corman reported that each Ontario university was required to develop an annual accessibility plan and submit it to the government by September 30 of each year. Highlights of the University's 2006-07 plan had been presented to the Planning and Budget Committee and to the Academic Board, as well as to the Business Board and the University Affairs Board. At the Academic Board, points raised in discussion had included: the suggestion of compulsory training for faculty in ways to deal appropriately with accommodation issues; the lack of appropriate accommodation for certain conditions, as well as the long waiting lists for some conditions such as attention deficit disorder; the small size of the Accessibility Offices on the three campuses; and the difficulties in following best practice with respect to mental health issues given certain University policies. Members had been reminded that the Accessibility Offices were only one aspect of the services provided to students. Other sources of support included divisional registrarial and student services offices and individual faculty and staff members.

Dr. Claude Davis reported that the University Affairs Board had also reviewed the ODA Accessibility Plan because of its responsibility for "equity issues and initiatives". The Board had been satisfied with the report and plan, and there had been no discussion.

6. Items for Governing Council Approval (cont'd)**(a) *Ontarians with Disabilities Act: University of Toronto Accessibility Plan, 2006-07* (cont'd)**

Ms Jacqueline Orange commented that, because the Business Board was responsible for human-resources matters, it also had received a presentation on the plan from Professor Hildyard. The Business Board had been clearly satisfied with the report and the plan.

A member expressed his concern about the true commitment of the University given that a number of recent major building renovations had not fully addressed accessibility issues. The Vice-President and Provost noted that he had addressed this issue at the June 29, 2006 meeting of the Governing Council in the context of the capital project for the Centre for Criminology. The University had to make difficult choices about where to use its very limited resources in order to address accommodation issues. No special grant was received for capital improvements for accommodation, so that funds had to be reallocated from other purposes to this end. A significant way in which accessibility was improved was through the construction of new buildings which were designed to be as accessible as possible. However, the University had a large stock of old buildings, especially on the St. George campus, many of which would never be fully accessible. In the case of the Canadiana Gallery, the inclusion of an elevator in the project would have increased costs by nearly 50%. At present, there was no identified need for an elevator to make the upper floors of the building accessible. The location for the eventual construction of an elevator had been identified, and, should a need for accessibility be identified in the short term, the library and an accessible room on the ground floor would accommodate faculty-student meetings for those who could not access the second floor. With limited resources, priorities had to be established to make accessibility improvements where there was an identified need, and where space was used most heavily. Elevators were just one of many different types of accommodation. If funds were used for elevators where there was not an identified need, less funding would be available for these other types of accommodation. While advocates for accessibility usually focused on physical barriers and on elevators, there were many other forms of accommodation. Significantly, invisible disabilities were more common than visible disabilities among the University's student population.

Another member noted that the Accessibility Plan was a very educational document, in that it raised awareness of issues, but also identified areas of concern that could not currently be addressed for lack of resources. Such an approach might also be appropriate in addressing issues related to the student experience.

On motion duly moved and seconded

It was RESOLVED

THAT the *Ontarians with Disabilities Act: University of Toronto Accessibility Plan, 2006-07*, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 145 of the Academic Board as Appendix 'A', be approved in principle.

(b) School of Graduate Studies: Proposal for a Master of Finance (M.F.)

Professor Corman reported that only one question had been raised at the Academic Board during the discussion of the item, namely whether courses included in the program would be available to students who were not enrolled in the program. Members had been informed that the courses would be open to other students, space permitting.

6. Items for Governing Council Approval (cont'd)**(b) School of Graduate Studies: Proposal for a Master of Finance (M.F.) (cont'd)**

On motion duly moved and seconded

It was RESOLVED

THAT the Master of Finance Program, leading to the degree of Master of Finance (M.F.) within the Rotman School of Management, commencing September, 2007, be approved.

(c) School of Graduate Studies: Proposal for a Master of Public Policy (M.P.P.)

Professor Corman reported that, during the discussion of the item at the Academic Board, the question of whether courses included in the program would be available to students who were not enrolled in the program had again been raised. Members had been informed that some courses were regarded as core courses that were critical to building the cohort of students in the program, whereas other courses would be open to students who were not registered in the program.

On motion duly moved and seconded

It was RESOLVED

THAT the Master of Public Policy program leading to the degree of Master of Public Policy (M.P.P.) be established within the Faculty of Arts and Science, commencing September 2007.

(d) *Statement Regarding Access to Information and Protection of Privacy at the University of Toronto*

The Secretary reported that the *Policy on Access to Information and Protection of Privacy* had been approved by the Governing Council on March 19, 1995. This *Policy* had been based on guidelines developed by the Council of Ontario Universities and adopted voluntarily in the absence of coverage by provincial legislation. With the application of the *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy (FIPP) Act* to universities as of June 10, 2006 the University's *Policy* was no longer required and was redundant. It was therefore appropriate that it be rescinded and replaced by the proposed *Statement* which confirmed the University's commitment to the principles of the legislation.

A member asked whether a more detailed policy was required to address issues of access to information and protection of privacy that were specific to a university environment. The Secretary responded that the legislation was extremely detailed and contained provisions that were specific to universities. The Vice-President and Provost noted that other relevant University policies such as the *Policy on Access to Student Academic Records* remained in effect. The member asked whether guidelines would be developed for the application of the new FIPP legislation at the University, and the Vice-President and Provost indicated that these were currently being developed by the University's FIPP Office.

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

(d) *Statement Regarding Access to Information and Protection of Privacy at the University of Toronto* (cont'd)

On motion duly moved and seconded

It was RESOLVED

That the proposed *Statement Regarding Access to Information and Protection of Privacy* at the University of Toronto, dated October 3, 2006, be approved effective November 2, 2006, replacing the *Policy on Access to Information and Protection of Privacy*, dated March 9, 1995.

7. Consolidated Calendar of Business 2006-2007

Members had received copies of the Calendar of Business for the Governing Council and all its Boards and Committees. The Chair noted that this document was posted on the Governing Council website and was regularly updated throughout the year. It was an important planning tool, and provided an overview of virtually all matters that would come before governance during the upcoming academic year.

8. Reports for Information

Members received the following reports for information:

- (a) Report Number 151 of the Business Board (June 22, 2006);
- (b) Report Number 397 of the Executive Committee (June 15, 2006);
- (c) Report Number 398 of the Executive Committee (June 29, 2006).

9. Date of the Next Meeting

The Chair informed members that the next regular meeting of the Governing Council was scheduled for Thursday, December 14, 2006 at 4:30 p.m., and would be held in the Council Chamber on the campus of the University of Toronto at Mississauga.

10. Question Period

A member asked what impact the recent announcement by the federal government concerning taxation changes for income trusts had had on the University's investment portfolio. Ms Riggall responded that she had been assured by the President and C.E.O of the University of Toronto Asset Management Corporation (UTAM) that the impact had been very small, as the University had not been heavily invested in income trusts.

11. Other Business

There were no items of Other Business.

The meeting adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

November 22, 2006