

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL
Thursday, December 6, 2007

MINUTES OF THE GOVERNING COUNCIL meeting held on Thursday, December 6, 2007 at 4:30 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, University of Toronto.

Present:

Mr. John F. (Jack) Petch (In the Chair)
Dr. Alice Dong, Vice-Chair
The Honourable David R. Peterson, Chancellor
Professor C. David Naylor, President
Professor Varouj Aivazian
Ms Diana Alli
Mr. P.C. Choo
Professor Brian Corman
The Honourable William G. Davis
Mr. Ken Davy
Ms Susan Eng
Professor Vivek Goel
Dr. Gerald Halbert
Mr. Alex Kenjeev
Professor Ronald H. Kluger
Dr. Stefan Mathias Larson
Mr. Joseph Mapa
Professor Michael R. Marrus
Mr. Geoffrey Matus
Ms Florence Minz

Mr. Richard Nunn
Ms Jacqueline C. Orange
Professor Ian Orchard
Mr. Alexandru Rascanu
Professor Doug W. Reeve
Mr. Timothy Reid
Professor Arthur S. Ripstein
Mr. Stephen C. Smith
Miss Maureen J. Somerville
Dr. Sarita Verma
Ms B. Elizabeth Vosburgh
Mr. W. David Wilson

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

Secretariat:

Mr. Matthew Lafond

Absent:

Dr. Claude S. Davis
Miss Saswati Deb
Dr. Shari Graham Fell
Mr. Arya Ghadimi
Ms Judith Goldring
Professor William Gough
Professor Ellen Hodnett
Professor Glen A. Jones
Dr. Joel A. Kirsh
Professor Louise Lemieux-Charles

Mr. Gary P. Mooney
Mr. George E. Myhal
Ms Lorenza Sisca
Ms Estefania Toledo
Mr. Larry Wasser
Mr. Robert S. Weiss
Mr. Yang Weng

In Attendance:

Professor Angela Hildyard, Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity
Mr. David Palmer, Vice-President, Advancement
Ms Cathy Riggall, Vice-President, Business Affairs
Ms Judith Wolfson, Vice-President, University Relations
Professor Paul Young, Vice-President, Research

Mr. Andrew Brett, University of Toronto at Mississauga Advocacy and Outreach Coordinator, University of Toronto Students' Union
Ms Sheree Drummond, Assistant Provost
Ms Rivi Frankle, Chief Operating Officer, University Advancement and Assistant Vice-President, Alumni Relations
Professor Emeritus Jonathan Freedman, Vice-Provost, Student Life
Ms Nora Gillespie, Legal Counsel, Office of the Vice-President and Provost
Dr. Anthony Gray, Special Advisor to the President
Mr. Ahmad Khan, Vice-President, University of Toronto at Mississauga, University of Toronto Students' Union
Ms Bryn MacPherson-White, Director, Office of the President and University Events
Wasah Malik, Vice-President, Campaigns, University of Toronto at Mississauga Students' Union
Professor Cheryl Misak, Deputy Provost
Mr. Nadeem Shabbar, Chief Real Estate Officer
Ms Elizabeth Sisam, Assistant Vice-President, Campus and Facilities Planning
Dr. Tim McTiernan, Assistant Vice-President, Research
Ms Manisha Pawha, Editor-in-Chief, Editorial Division, Juxtaposition Magazine
Professor Richard Peltier, University Professor, Department of Physics
Professor Jay Rosenfield, Vice-Dean, Undergraduate Medical Education
Ms Christina Sass-Kortsak, Assistant Vice-President, Human Resources
Faraz Siddiqui, Sponsorship Director, Juxtaposition Magazine
Ms Nancy Smart, Judicial Affairs Officer
Mr. Henry Mulhall, Assistant Secretary of the Governing Council
Ms Mae-Yu Tan, Assistant Secretary of the Governing Council
Ms Linda Vranic, Director, Operations, Office of the Vice-President, Research and Associate Provost

IN ACCORDANCE WITH A DETERMINATION BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE PURSUANT TO SECTION 38 OF BY-LAW NUMBER 2, ITEMS 10, 11 AND 12 WERE CONSIDERED BY THE GOVERNING COUNCIL IN CAMERA.

1. Chair's Remarks

(a) Welcome

The Chair welcomed members and guests to the last meeting of the Governing Council in 2007.

(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. He 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.

(c) Holiday Reception

The Chair invited members and guests to attend the Holiday Reception following the meeting in the Debates Room at Hart House.

2. Minutes of the Previous Meetings

The minutes of the meeting of October 30, 2007, were approved.

3. Business Arising from the Minutes of the Previous Meeting

There was no business arising from the previous meeting.

4. Report of the President

(a) *Juxtaposition* Global Health Magazine

The President introduced Ms Manisha Pahwa and Mr. Faraz Siddiqui, Editor-in-Chief and Sponsorship Director, respectively, of *Juxtaposition* Global Health Magazine, an innovative student-led publication. The President noted that *Juxtaposition* was conceived, edited, and largely written by University of Toronto students.

Ms Pahwa and Mr. Siddiqui explained that the magazine provided a platform for students to share ideas and discuss issues in Global Health, and provided a means to expand upon topics discussed in the classroom. Through participating in the creation of the publication, students learned communication and organizational skills. Currently, the executive team consisted of approximately 25 students.

Juxtaposition had already received several honours, including the Arts and Science Dean's Initiative Award, recognition by the Hart House Good Ideas Fund, and support from the Centre for International Health and the University of Toronto Students' Union. The online version of the magazine¹ had received hits from a variety of international locations. The presenters explained that the most significant long-term challenge of the publication was ensuring sustainable financial support. They asked Governors to consider ways they could partner with *Juxtaposition* to ensure its continued success, and to create awareness for the magazine.

The Chair and the President thanked the students for their comments and emphasized the continued importance of increasing the Governing Council's interaction with student groups.

(b) Awards and Honours

The President drew Governors' attention to the list of Faculty and Staff Awards and Honours that had been included in the agenda package, commenting on the extraordinary achievements that were celebrated by the University.

The President reported that Mr. Wojciech Gryc, a recent graduate of the International Development Studies program and the Department of Mathematics at the University of Toronto at Scarborough, had been named a Rhodes Scholar. Mr. Gryc planned to pursue a Master's degree in Mathematical Modeling and Computational Sciences at Oxford University, and would continue his work in promoting human rights and international development issues.

Continuing on the theme of excellence, the President highlighted the recent results of the Canadian Graduate and Professional Student Survey (CGPSS). The response rate of the survey at the University of Toronto was over 43%. Overall, the results of the survey were 80% positive on all 11 questions. Specifically:

¹ <http://www.juxtapose.ca/>
43234

4. Report of the President (cont'd)

(b) Awards and Honours (cont'd)

- 91% of University of Toronto graduate students rated their academic experience as good to excellent;
- 88% of University of Toronto graduate students rated their overall experience as good to excellent;
- 82% of University of Toronto graduate students rated their faculty-student relationship as good to excellent.

The President pointed out that these figures had consistently risen over the past five years. Furthermore, over 50% of research-stream and professional Master's students reported no graduate education-related debt. The President extended his congratulations to Dean Susan Pfeiffer of the School of Graduate Studies and other staff and colleagues involved in graduate studies at the University.

On the topic of undergraduate education, the President reported that of the 38 semifinalists for TV Ontario's "Best Lecturer" prize, 16 were from the University of Toronto. With approximately 17% of the faculty complement in Ontario, the University accounted for over 40% of the semifinalists. In fact, the University of Toronto at Mississauga and the University of Toronto at Scarborough, each with fewer than 2% of the province's faculty complement, accounted for approximately 11% and 16%, respectively, of the TVO semifinalists.

(c) University Rankings

The President began by reiterating two points on the topic of university ranking systems that attempted to reduce an institution's general performance to a single number in an aggregated table. First, he indicated that the construct itself was dubious, given the widely varied mix of institutions and their programs. The University of Toronto, for example, could be seen as a combination of a "medical-doctoral" campus and two "primarily undergraduate" campuses, unified by a variety of shared graduate programs. Second, all aggregation formulae and the weights assigned to the individual components therein were inherently subjective, reflecting the preferences and beliefs of analysts and editors.

Turning to an examination of the specific ranking systems, the President reported that the University of Toronto had placed 23rd in the world, and 1st in Canada, on the *Academic Rankings of World Universities* (ARWU), released in August, 2007. Within Canada, the University of British Columbia (UBC) had placed 2nd, and McGill University had been ranked 3rd. This had been a consistent pattern for several years. The ARWU had been generated by education professors at Shanghai Jiao Tong University, and had the advantage of relying largely on publicly-available data sources rather than self-reported data. Thus, it was viewed by some experts as the only reliable ranking system in the world, but had also been criticized for its narrow focus on research measures.

The *Times Higher Education Supplement* (THES) was compiled by Quacquarelli Symonds (QS), a private consulting firm specializing in post-secondary educational information. The THES had been criticized for relying on some self-reported data, and for its geographical bias and low response rate. Conversely, its strength was its attempt to integrate a reputational survey and measures of student-faculty ratio that are said to reflect "educational quality". This year, the University of Toronto's THES ranking dropped inexplicably from 27th to 45th. UBC's ranking rose sharply to 33rd, and McGill rose to 12th. Other notable institutions that dropped in the THES rankings this year included Stanford University, which fell to 19th, and the University of California at

4. Report of the President (cont'd)**(c) University Rankings (cont'd)**

Berkeley, which dropped to 22nd. These rapid shifts had led to skepticism about this year's THES results. However, the President noted some interesting outcomes in the disaggregated data:

- The University of Toronto had been in the very highest group of universities on reputation, tied with 8 other institutions world-wide. McGill was in the top 9-14, and UBC in the top 15-20. However, the scoring system had assigned all 20 top institutions the same score of 100/100 on reputation.
- The University of Toronto had been the top Canadian university in three of five disciplinary areas. Averaged across all disciplines, the University had ranked 12th worldwide and highest among Canadian universities.

The President pointed out the apparent inconsistency between the University's overall ranking of 45 and its high scores in reputation and disciplinary assessments. He indicated that the THES measured "Teaching Quality" as a function of student-faculty ratio, and this element counted for 20% of any institution's total score. However, there had been ambiguity in the definition of "faculty". The University's analysis had now shown that a key to achieving a high ranking this year was to maximize faculty counts. For example, one high-ranking Canadian institution had scored a near-perfect 99 on this measure, by submitting a very high faculty count leading to a student-faculty ratio of 6.05. That figure contrasted with the same institution's student-faculty ratio of 17 derived from public sources by *Maclean's* magazine. Another high-ranking institution did not submit data to THES at all, but the QS staff had taken a faculty count from its website that includes all individuals with any academic appointments. That count led to a student-faculty ratio of 9.1, and a score of 70, whereas the published ratio for that institution using standardized faculty definitions was about double the ratio reported by THES. The University of Toronto submitted counts very similar to those used in standardized reports, leading to a much higher ratio, and scored only 21/100. This difference was the primary factor in the University's overall ranking this year.

The President indicated a preference that all research-intensive Canadian universities agreed on standardized counts to ensure consistency. However, if such standardization did not materialize, he indicated that the University would govern itself accordingly, and might, in the future, submit counts more closely aligned with the definitions applied by some peer institutions.

Before leaving this topic, the President recommended that Governors maintain a healthy skepticism towards ranking systems generally.

(d) *Towards 2030*

The President reported that the *Towards 2030* strategic planning initiative was now well into its second phase. Each of the five Task Forces had begun meetings and discussions. The President noted that he had attended several of the sessions and intended to participate in at least one meeting of each Task Force.

Furthermore, the Chairs and Vice-Chairs of each Task Force had started an informal monthly meeting to compare notes and to ensure that issues spanning the focus of several Task Forces were properly considered.

Finally, the President noted that a general call for submissions to the Task Forces had been issued in the eBulletin and in the campus newspapers. A number of submissions had

4. Report of the President (cont'd)**(d) *Towards 2030* (cont'd)**

already been received. Since its launch, the *Towards 2030* website² had seen 19,000 visits from over 100 countries world-wide, including substantial traffic from South Korea, India, Singapore, Australia, and Pakistan.

5. Items for Governing Council Approval**(a) Capital Project: Project Planning Report – University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM) Medical Academy**

Professor Marrus reported that the Project Planning Report for the UTM Medical Academy, approved in 2006, had proposed that the Academy be accommodated within the South Building on the UTM campus. A deferral of the original project had given the Project Planning Committee an opportunity to reconsider possible building site options for the new Academy. The current Project Planning Report proposed to create a stand-alone building for the Medical Academy to address long-term space requirements. The intent was to eventually enrol 54 first-year students, however, the Academy would be able to accommodate further expansion. The Project would create approximately 3,000 net assignable square metres (nasm) of space, with a total cost of \$36.155 million. A member of the Academic Board had inquired whether the Medical Academy building would be available for use by other students at UTM. Mr. Ray deSouza, Chief Administrative Officer of UTM, confirmed that one-third of the building would be assigned for academic use by UTM, but that the space program had not yet been finalized. Professor Marrus noted that the Academic Board had unanimously supported the proposal.

Mr. Nunn reported that the Business Board had authorized the execution of the project, subject to Governing Council approval. A member of the Board had asked whether the amount of provincial funding would increase in light of the proposed expanded enrolment from 36 to 54 students. Professor Goel had replied that the University anticipated an increase in provincial funding accordingly.

A member commented that he initially had had reservations about supporting a project of this scope at UTM, given recent issues surrounding the University's provision of child care services on that campus. However, he noted that recent negotiations between the administration and student unions had been productive, and commended the University for its co-operation in addressing student concerns on that issue.

² <http://www.towards2030.utoronto.ca/>
43234

5. Items for Governing Council Approval (cont'd)**(a) Capital Project: Project Planning Report – University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM) Medical Academy (cont'd)**

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was Resolved

1. THAT the Project Planning Report for the Medical Academy Building at the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM) be approved in principle.
2. THAT the project scope of 2,980 net assignable square metres (5,960 gross square metres) for the Medical Academy Building having a total estimated project cost of \$36.155 million be approved.
3. THAT the \$36.155 million funding required for the UTM Medical Academy Building comprise the following:
 - i) For the Mississauga Academy portion (totalling \$25.476 million):
 - a. Provincial funding in the form of annualized payments having a present value of \$8.637 million, and
 - b. \$16.839 million in contingency financing carried by the Faculty of Medicine.
 - ii) For the University of Toronto at Mississauga portion:
Funding of \$10.679 million through borrowing, paid from the UTM operating budget.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 153 of the Academic Board as Appendix "A". ([Cover](#)) ([Item](#))

(b) Capital Project: Project Planning Report – University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM) Storm Water Management Pond

Professor Marrus reported that further expansion on the UTM campus would require the creation of a Storm Water Management (SWM) facility to satisfy water quality and erosion control concerns in the Credit Valley. The proposed Medical Academy had triggered this requirement. The total cost was estimated to be \$2.7 million, to be apportioned between the Medical Academy, UTM Parking Services, and borrowing, to be repaid from the UTM operating budget. A member of the Academic Board had asked whether the project had received government funding. Mr. deSouza explained that there had been no direct government funding, however, the Medical Academy, which had received some capital funding from the provincial government, would be sharing the cost of the project. A member had inquired about the potential consequences of not proceeding with the SWM project. Mr. deSouza replied that failing to complete the facility would result in the denial of building permits for new construction on the campus.

5. Items for Governing Council Approval (cont'd)**(b) Capital Project: Project Planning Report – University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM) Storm Water Management Pond (cont'd)**

Mr. Nunn advised that the Business Board had approved the execution of the project subject to Governing Council approval. Discussion at the Board had focused on sources of funding. It had been noted that \$650,000 of the cost of the project had been apportioned to the Medical Academy, and members were assured that this amount would not be double-counted in the Reports on Capital Projects that were provided to each meeting.

Members had no questions.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was Resolved

1. THAT the Project Planning Report for a Storm Water Management Pond at the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM) for \$2.7 million be approved in principle.
2. THAT a maximum of \$1.6 million be allocated from borrowing to be repaid from the UTM operating budget.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 153 of the Academic Board as Appendix “B”. ([Cover](#)) ([Item](#))

(c) Capital Project: Project Planning Report – SciNet High Performance Computing Facility

Professor Marrus reported that the SciNet project was the latest of several Canadian Foundation for Innovation (CFI) and provincial grants that would allow a significant increase in High Performance Computing (HPC) capabilities for both the University of Toronto and the wider research community. A five-year lease, matching the current funding term of the grant, had been executed for a facility located at 7700 Keele Street in the City of Toronto. It had been noted that the significant power demands of the HPC system made it impractical to locate the project on campus. If funding was renewed, the lease could be extended. Additional space on campus, at 256 McCaul Street, would be provided for associated technical support. A member of the Board had expressed concern about the waste heat that would be generated by the facility. Professor Goel confirmed the University’s commitment to the *University Environmental Protection Policy*, and noted that potential applications for the waste heat would be considered in the Request for Proposals.

On behalf of the Business Board, Mr. Nunn reported that the execution of the project had been authorized, subject to Governing Council approval. Members had raised a number of questions regarding the cost of the project and its potential to generate income. Mr. Nunn advised that these issues had been dealt with appropriately, and that the Board had supported the approval of the project.

Members had no questions.

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

(c) Capital Project: Project Planning Report – SciNet High Performance Computing Facility (cont'd)

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was Resolved

1. THAT the Project Planning Report for the SciNet project be approved in principle.
2. THAT the project scope for leasehold improvements at 7700 Keele Street consisting of 1,100 square metres with a total project cost of \$4,771,970 be approved.
3. THAT the project scope for 256 McCaul Street of approximately of 320 net assignable square metres with a total project cost of \$1,110,620 be approved.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 153 of the Academic Board as Appendix “C”. ([Cover](#)) ([Item](#))

6. Reports for Information

Members received the following reports for information:

- (a) Report Number 153 of the Academic Board (November 8, 2007)
- (b) Report Number 160 of the Business Board (October 1, 2007)
- (c) Report Number 161 of the Business Board (October 30, 2007)
- (d) Report Number 162 of the Business Board (November 19, 2007)
- (e) Report Number 144 of the University Affairs Board (November 6, 2007)
- (f) Report Number 410 of the Executive Committee (November 26, 2007)

The Chair noted that Report 144 of the University Affairs Board had been distributed electronically and was available at the door.

Members had no questions arising from the Reports.

7. Date of the Next Meeting

The Chair informed members that the next regular meeting of the Governing Council was scheduled for Thursday, January 17, 2008, at 4:30 p.m., in the Council Chambers, Simcoe Hall.

8. Question Period

A member commented that he had been advised by the Association of Part-Time Undergraduate Students (APUS) that they had received an “eviction notice” from their current location, and had accordingly made a request to address the Governing Council on this issue.³ He inquired why this request had been denied.

The Chair responded that it was important that requests to address the Governing Council follow the appropriate procedure, as outlined in the *Procedures for Non-Members to Address Governing Council, Its Boards and Committees*.⁴ He indicated that the request had been made shortly before the meeting, and that APUS had failed to indicate what the topic of their request had been. It had become apparent that the issue was not related to an item on the agenda. The Chair reiterated the importance of appropriate dialogue at the Governing Council, and encouraged APUS to reissue their request in a timely manner, to be considered by the Executive Committee for the next meeting of the Governing Council.

9. Other Business

There were no items of Other Business.

IN ACCORDANCE WITH A DETERMINATION BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE PURSUANT TO SECTION 38 OF BY-LAW NUMBER 2, ITEMS 10, 11 AND 12 WERE CONSIDERED BY THE GOVERNING COUNCIL IN CAMERA.

10. Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters: Recommendation for Expulsion

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was Resolved

THAT the President’s recommendation for expulsion, as outlined in the memorandum and supporting documentation from the Secretary of the Governing Council, dated November 29, 2007, be confirmed.

11. Academic Integrity Matter: Laying of Charges and Establishment of a Judicial Board

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was Resolved

THAT the recommendations outlined in the memorandum and supporting documentation from the Secretary of the Governing Council, dated November 29, 2007, be approved.

³ Secretary’s Note: Attached as [Appendix “D”](#), for Governor’s information, is a letter from Professor Vivek Goel to the President of APUS, dated November 26, 2007, clarifying the circumstances surrounding the recurring issue with respect to the space currently occupied by APUS at 100 Devonshire Place.

⁴ <http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/AssetFactory.aspx?did=3824>
43234

12. Report Number 50 of the Committee for Honorary Degrees

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was Resolved

THAT the recommendations contained in Report Number 50 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 the list of recommended candidates, and any discussion that had occurred, was strictly confidential. Past practice had been that the entire list of candidates approved by Governing Council had remained confidential until the President had reported back to Governors at a subsequent meeting the names of all those candidates who had accepted offers of a degree. However, this had occasionally prevented the timely public announcement of individual honours, for example, to coincide with a division's centenary celebration. In this context, it was proposed that the process be refined slightly. If there was sufficient reason to make a public announcement prior to the next meeting of the Governing Council, Governors would be notified by email of the offer accepted so that they were no longer committed to confidentiality with respect to that individual (or group of individuals). The President would continue the practice of reading into the minutes of the Council the complete list of offers accepted as soon as it was appropriate.

Secretary

Chair

January 3, 2008