

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO  
**THE GOVERNING COUNCIL**

**Thursday, October 23, 2008**

MINUTES OF THE GOVERNING COUNCIL meeting held on Thursday, October 23, 2008 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. David Asper  
Mr. Ryan Matthew Campbell  
Professor Brian Corman  
Dr. Claude S. Davis  
Mr. Ken Davy  
Ms Susan Eng  
Mr. David Ford  
Mr. Grant Gonzales  
Professor William Gough  
Dr. Gerald Halbert  
Professor Ellen Hodnett  
Professor Ronald H. Kluger  
Mr. Joseph Koo  
Professor Louise Lemieux-Charles  
Professor Michael R. Marrus  
Mr. Geoffrey Matus  
Professor Cheryl Misak  
Mr. Gary P. Mooney  
Ms Anna Okorokov  
Professor Ian Orchard  
Mr. Jeff Peters  
Mr. Timothy Reid  
Ms Melinda Rogers

Mr. Stephen C. Smith  
Professor Elizabeth M. Smyth  
Miss Maureen J. Somerville  
Mr. Oliver Sorin  
Mr. John David Stewart  
Dr. Sarita Verma  
Ms B. Elizabeth Vosburgh  
Mr. Larry Wasser  
Mr. W. David Wilson

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

**Secretariat:**

Ms Cristina Oke  
Ms Alison Webb

**Absent:**

Mr. P.C. Choo  
Ms Judith Goldring  
Dr. Joel A. Kirsh  
Dr. Stefan Mathias Larson  
Mr. Joseph Mapa  
Ms Florence Minz  
Mr. George E. Myhal  
Mr. Richard Nunn  
Professor Doug W. Reeve  
Professor Arthur S. Ripstein  
Ms Rita Tsang

**In Attendance:**

Mr. Garvin De Four, Office of the University Ombudsperson  
Mr. Jim Delaney, Office of the Vice-Provost, Students  
Ms Sheree Drummond, Assistant Provost  
Professor Emeritus Joan Foley, University Ombudsperson

## **In Attendance (cont'd)**

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  
Ms Joeita Gupta, Vice-President Internal, Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students  
Professor Edith Hillan, Vice-Provost, Academic  
Professor Angela Hildyard, Vice-President, Human Resources & Equity  
Ms Sandy Hudson, President, Students' Administrative Council (operating as the University of Toronto Students' Union)  
Ms Bryn McPherson-White, Director, Office of the President and Special Events  
Mr. Steve Moate, Senior Legal Counsel  
Mr. Henry Mulhall, Assistant Secretary of the Governing Council  
Mr. David Palmer, Vice-President, Advancement  
Ms Rose Patten, Past-Chair of the Governing Council and Chair of the Task Force on Governance  
Ms Christina Sass-Kortsak, Assistant Vice-President Human Resources & Equity  
Ms Nancy Smart, Judicial Affairs Officer  
Ms Laurie Stephens, Director Media Relations and Stakeholder Communications  
Ms Meredith Strong, Director, Office of the Vice-President, University Relations  
Ms Sara Suliman, Vice-President External, Graduate Students' Union  
Ms Linda Vranic, Director, Operations, Office of the Vice-President, Research  
Ms Judith Wolfson, Vice-President, University Relations  
Professor Safwat Zaky, Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget

IN ACCORDANCE WITH A DETERMINATION BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE PURSUANT TO SECTION 38 OF BY-LAW NUMBER 2, ITEM 13 WAS CONSIDERED BY THE GOVERNING COUNCIL *IN CAMERA*

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

#### **a) Welcome**

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

#### **b) Appointment of Lieutenant-Governor-In-Council Members to Governing Council**

The Chair announced that the Lieutenant Governor had issued the order that the following be appointed to the University of Toronto Governing Council:

- Mr. David Asper, for a period of three years, effective the 9<sup>th</sup> day of July 2008;
- Ms Rita Tsang, for a period of three years, effective the 9<sup>th</sup> day of July 2008; and,
- Ms Melinda Rogers, for a period of three years, effective the 3<sup>rd</sup> day of September, 2008.

## **1. Chair's Remarks (cont'd)**

### **b) Appointment of Lieutenant-Governor-In-Council Members to Governing Council (cont'd)**

The Chair also announced the reappointment of the following:

- Dr. Claude Davis for a two-year term effective July 1, 2008;
- Dr. Gerald Halbert, for a three-year term effective July 1, 2008;
- Mr. Geoff Matus, for a three-year term effective July 1, 2008;
- Ms Florence Minz, for a three-year term effective July 1, 2008;
- Mr. George Myhal, for a three-year term effective July 1, 2008; and
- Mr. John (Jack) Petch, for a three-year term effective July 1, 2008.

### **c) Appointment to the Committee for Honorary Degrees**

The Chair advised members that, following a mail ballot early in September Mr. Thomas Rahilly had been appointed to the Committee for Honorary Degrees for 2008-09.

### **d) Item placed on Table**

The Chair noted that a document pertaining to the impact of the economic decline on the University of Toronto prepared by the Vice-President Business Affairs, and the Interim Vice-President and Provost, had been placed on the table.<sup>1</sup> It would be addressed under Item #4, the Report of the President.

### **e) Speaking Requests from Non-Members**

The Chair informed members that six speaking requests had been received from non-members for the meeting. Four of the requests had been granted and the speakers would be called upon at the appropriate time in the meeting.

The requests from speakers representing the Canadian Union of Public Employees (CUPE), local 3902, and the Transitional Year Preservation Alliance had not been granted, but they had been asked to provide written submissions.

The Chair reiterated that it was expected that normally non-members would ask to speak on any matter at an early stage of discussion, in the appropriate Committee or Board where a matter is first introduced.

If non-members still wished to make speaking requests for meetings of the Governing Council, they would be expected to do so before the relevant meeting of the Executive Committee preceding the Governing Council meeting. The Executive Committee agenda made it clear what items would go forward to the Governing Council and was normally posted on the Governing

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.news.utoronto.ca/campus-news/the-impact-of-the-economic-decline-on-the-university-of-toronto.html>.

## **1. Chair's Remarks (cont'd)**

### **e) Speaking Requests from Non-Members (cont'd)**

Council website a week in advance of the Executive Meeting. That Committee could then make a reasoned decision on the speaking request – balancing the desirability of non-members' speaking against the need for members to have the sufficient time possible to debate and decide a matter.

In future, if speaking requests were not received by the date of the Executive Meeting, they would not be considered.

### **f) Items #8 – Task Force on Governance Mandate**

The Chair explained that Ms Rose Patten would arrive at approximately 5:30 for Item 8, the Mandate for the second phase of the work of the Task Force on Governance. With Council's permission, the agenda would be varied to move to Item 8 as soon as the item under discussion when Ms Patten arrived had been completed.

### **g) Audio Web-Cast**

The Chair reminded members that, following its usual practice, the meeting was being broadcast on the web. He asked senior administrators and other non-members who were invited to speak during the meeting to use a standing microphone so that their comments could be heard by those listening to the audio web-cast.

## **2. Minutes of the Previous Meeting of June 23, 2008**

The minutes of the meeting of June 23, 2008 were approved.

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

There was no business arising from the meeting.

## **4. Report of the President**

President Naylor welcomed members and thanked them for their service to the University. He noted that the University had a long tradition of excellent governance and it was a privilege for senior administrators to serve alongside the group of volunteer governors. He also expressed his disappointment at the unfair portrayal of ten members of the Governing Council that had appeared recently in a student newspaper.

#### 4. Report of the President (cont'd)

##### a) Awards and Honours

The President drew the attention of members to the extraordinary list of faculty, student and staff awards and honours accompanying the agenda packages for the meeting, and highlighted three:

- Six faculty members had been named to the Order of Canada:
  - Professors George Elliot Clarke of English and John Speakman of Ophthalmology;
  - Professors Emeriti Raymond Breton of Sociology and Norman Levine and George Zarb of Dentistry; and
  - Professor Michael Marrus of History who also served as a member of the Governing Council and as Chair of the Academic Board.

Members acknowledged Professor Marrus' Order of Canada with applause.

- University Professor Anthony Pawson from molecular genetics was the first Canadian scientist to be named a Kyoto Prize laureate in basic sciences by Japan's Inamori Foundation. This was an international prize of huge significance, awarded annually to honour the scientific, spiritual and cultural betterment of humankind.
- Mr. David Godri, a second-year civil engineering student, had been named to Canada's prestigious Top 20 Under 20 list.

##### b) Student Presentation

The President explained that the recent tradition of beginning Council meetings with presentations from innovative and interesting student groups would resume at the next meeting.

##### c) Four Bellwethers of Performance

The President commented that the rankings and report cards season had begun, and that analyses would be generated and posted on the relevant sections of the University's website.<sup>2</sup> He provided members with a few early observations on four such reports that, in his view, included results that were more interesting and informative than usual.

- i) *Shanghai Jiao Tong* was a research-heavy rating that was credible because of its use of objective measures, but was not really a rating of the university's overall mission and its educational performance. This year, the University of Toronto stood 24<sup>th</sup> world-wide. The other three Canadian universities in the top 100 were the University of British Columbia (UBC) - 35<sup>th</sup>, McGill University - 60<sup>th</sup>, and McMaster University - 89<sup>th</sup>. No subjective reputation rankings were reflected in these ratings.

---

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.utoronto.ca/aboutuoft/accountabilityreports.htm>

#### 4. Report of the President (cont'd)

##### c) Four Bellwethers of Performance (cont'd)

- ii) *Times Higher Education Supplement - Quacarelli-Symonds (THES-QS)*. The University of Toronto had improved four places to 41st (45th last year) overall. McGill had fallen from 12<sup>th</sup> last year to 20<sup>th</sup> this year, while UBC had stayed level – 33 last year and 34 this year. The University of Alberta had moved from 97<sup>th</sup> to 74<sup>th</sup>.

The methodology used in determining the rankings was consistent with that used last year. In 2007, however, the methodology used had been different from that used previously which had led to some changes in ranks.

These rankings included the use of student-faculty ratio to measure quality. However, the definition of the student-faculty ratio allowed for inconsistent calculations of this ratio by different universities. Some universities adjusted for full-time equivalents (FTEs), while others used a head count that included sessional teachers among others who are not full-time. As an example, McGill submitted over 5,000 faculty for a student-faculty ratio of 6:1 in the THES ranking, against its widely published ratio of 16:1. The faculty count reported on the UBC website was used for these rankings by QS analysts, which resulted in a ratio of 9:1 against a published ratio of 16:1. The University of Alberta increased its faculty count from 1,554 FTE to 3,270 FTEs by including clinical faculty among others. This improved their student-faculty ratio score from 23 out of 100 to 56 out of 100 and drove their shift in standings.

The University of Toronto had done a more inclusive faculty count that resulted in a number just under 10,000, which aligned proportionately with the McGill count of 5,000. However, as a matter of integrity, the University had also adjusted the count for all FTE's, which resulted in a 40% decrease to about 5,900. This aligned very well with the FTE count of 3,270 at Alberta. However, for reasons unknown, the QS analysts rejected our count and put back a number based on full-time instructional faculty only, as per the method used in other years. Discussions were ongoing about these issues.

The peer-review assessments that are part of the THES-QS ranking system have stabilized somewhat as the numbers of respondents have climbed higher among faculty worldwide. Nonetheless, there were some shifts on the peer review rankings of disciplines for Toronto this year:

Natural Sciences – 9th (from 16th)  
Life Sciences – 13th (from 14th)  
Engineering and Technology – 10th (from 11th)  
Social Sciences – 16th (from 13th)  
Arts and Humanities – 11th (from 8th)

The University's aggregate peer-review position was 9<sup>th</sup> in the world.

#### 4. Report of the President (cont'd)

##### c) Four Bellwethers of Performance (cont'd)

###### ii) *Times Higher Education Supplement - Quacarelli-Symonds (THES-QS)* (cont'd)

In this context, the President drew members' attention to the University of Toronto advertisement from the Globe and Mail that had been placed on the table that listed the University of Toronto, the University of California at Berkeley, Cambridge, Oxford and Stanford as the only institutions worldwide to place in the top 16 across all five major fields of study. While it was encouraging to be in such good company, he advised members that with Berkeley's funding per student estimated to be 60% higher than ours, the University would face ongoing financial challenges maintaining this academic standing, and would also continue to confront ongoing challenges in improving the student experience.

###### iii) *The National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)*<sup>3</sup>

The President informed members that the University had expanded its sample size in Arts and Science across the three campuses and had increased its efforts in promoting the survey (including prizes) in an effort to improve the response rate. The resulting response rate of 48.4% was one of the highest in the country.

There are improvements in the University's NSSE results, particularly on questions within the domains of Student-Faculty Interaction and Engaging/Enriching Experiences:

- All five benchmark scores improved over the 2006 survey results, and three showed improvement over the 2004 results as well.
- The benchmark areas where the University has had the lowest scores showed the greatest improvement since 2004 ("Active and Collaborative Learning"; "Student-Faculty Interaction"; "Enriching Educational Experiences").
- The University was moving into closer alignment with the large research universities nationally, which is encouraging.

###### iv) *Globe and Mail University Report Card*

The President reported that the Globe and Mail University Report Card was less encouraging, however. There had been only a 17% uptake from undergraduates on the survey run by the Strategic Counsel for the Globe and Mail. A number of our marks had in fact gone down because the Globe analysis focused on the distribution, and not the absolute score. Scores for all universities were improving, including ours, but a number of other institutions were making faster progress in enhancing a range of student services and amenities, evidence of another area where chronic and massive under-funding was hurting students. He noted that the funding system contained perverse incentives that gave greater financial latitude to those universities that were not as competitive in hiring

---

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.provost.utoronto.ca/public/reports/NSSE.htm>

#### 4. Report of the President (cont'd)

##### c) Four Bellwethers of Performance (cont'd)

###### iv) Glove and Mail University Report Card (cont'd)

top-flight faculty and staff, that did less research, that operated fewer professional faculties, or that had fewer research-stream graduate students.

##### d) Election Update

The President commented that the recent federal election had resulted in a government that was similar to its predecessor, with no major policy shifts promised or planned. The Government's manoeuvring room would be minimal in financial terms.

##### e) Economic Situation

The President referred to the statement on the impact of the economic decline on the University of Toronto from the Interim Vice-President and Provost and the Vice-President (Business Affairs) that had been placed on the table. The statement emphasized that the University could weather the storm in the financial markets in the immediate term on two fronts, in the funding of the pension plan, and in the payouts that were made on endowments.

He noted that endowments were very important, especially to student aid where over \$700M in endowed funds was aimed at supporting students. The *2030 Framework* acknowledged the generosity and importance of benefactors, many of whom have supported capital projects or given expendable gifts, rather than permanent endowments. However, it is important to understand that less than 5% of the University's annual budget was drawn from this source. The University was dependent on public grants and tuition revenues for its core operations.

Based on the October 22<sup>nd</sup> statement from the Ontario Minister of Finance, universities were cautiously optimistic that the Government would meet its commitment to increase total spending on universities from \$4.38B to \$4.83B this year. However, much of that growth in spending was tied to enrolment-related expenses, including enrolment-related increase in costs for student aid programs, and would not change the financial position of universities or students. The quality enhancement agenda remained largely unfunded. The Minister had warned that funding would likely not be increasing in fiscal 2009–10 according to the 2008 projections, and therefore the University anticipated problems starting next fiscal year. Also, last year Ontario universities had received a one-time investment of \$699 Million for unfunded enrolment growth. No such funding was projected as yet for 2008-09.

In 2007-08 there had been an infrastructure investment for universities of \$678M. The President noted that, while the capital budget for 2008-09 was a tiny proportion of that amount, he was encouraged that all Premiers were prioritizing infrastructure investment as a sound form of economic stimulus.

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

##### **e) Economic Situation (cont'd)**

The President concluded his report by commenting that the operating implications for the University were serious. Members of the administration would work hard to avoid hiring freezes or lay-offs, and would work within the usual flow of relocations and retirements. Divisions would be given maximum flexibility to determine their future. However, the University could not ignore its budgetary realities or the signals coming from government.

#### **5. Items for Governing Council Approval**

##### **a) Faculty of Medicine and the Michener Institute for Applied Health Sciences: Memorandum of Understanding**

Professor Marrus explained that the Faculty of Medicine and the Michener Institute for Applied Health Sciences were proposing to enter into a formal agreement to develop further joint programs. To date, they had been offering one joint program - a Bachelor of Science degree (Medical Radiation Sciences) from the University and a Diploma in Radiation Sciences from the Michener Institute. Building on the existing 1998 agreement, the proposed Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) outlined the academic relationship and principles for offering such programs. New program proposals would be brought forward for Governing Council approval as appropriate.

There were no resource implications for the University's operating budget. There had been no discussion by the Board on this proposal.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

THAT the Memorandum of Understanding between the University of Toronto and The Michener Institute for Applied Health Sciences be approved, effective November 1, 2008.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 158 of the Academic Board as Appendix "A".

##### **b) Towards 2030: A Long-term Planning Framework for the University of Toronto**

###### **Introduction**

Professor Marrus advised that the President had given an extensive presentation to the Academic Board, highlighting the broad strategic directions outlined in the *Towards 2030 Framework* document. Members of the Board had congratulated the President and all those who had worked on the initiative.

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

### b) Towards 2030: A Long-term Planning Framework for the University of Toronto (cont'd)

A proposed editorial alteration to the *Framework* document was accepted by the Board: on page 2, Tri-Campus Issues, second paragraph, second sentence, the phrase 'under the Governing Council' was added to read:

*The University will support the development of three differentiated campuses **under the Governing Council** and a single University-wide administration with a strong overall identity and overarching academic standards.*

During the discussion at the Academic Board, a number of points had been raised.

- Members of various estates had inquired about funding models and enrolment plans, and about the impact on student funding provided by the University. The response underscored the importance of the continued use of a mixed revenue model, in which all sources of revenue were increased.
- The University wanted to ensure that access was maintained while recruiting the best and brightest students.
- Two members had stated their view that insufficient consultation had taken place within constituencies such as part-time students and graduate students. The President had disagreed. In this regard Professor Marrus drew members' attention to the summary, entitled *Opportunities for Student Consultation, 2030*, that had been placed on the table. The President had also noted that students would be fully engaged per usual at the divisional level in planning arising from the 2030 Framework.
- Some members asked about very specific directions for divisions and units. In general, the Framework and Synthesis documents were oriented to longer-term and general planning issues. Members were reminded that the *Framework* document dealt with the big picture rather than specific details.

Professor Marrus commented that members of the Academic Board had strongly supported the *2030 Framework* document.

It was duly moved and seconded

THAT “*Towards 2030: A Long-term Planning Framework for the University of Toronto*”, be approved in principle.

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

### b) Towards 2030: A Long-term Planning Framework for the University of Toronto (cont'd)

#### President's Remarks

President Naylor emphasized that *Towards 2030* was, as its title indicated, a long-term strategic planning exercise. The *Framework* document was intended to help shape, but in no way replace, University-wide academic planning at the divisional and departmental level. Neither the *2030 Framework* nor the *Synthesis Report*, entitled *Toward 2030: A Third Century of Excellence at the University of Toronto*, both of which were focused on academic and related financial issues, was intended to replace the University's *Statement of Institutional Purpose*. The members of the Governing Council were being asked to approve in principle a long-term planning framework.

#### Summary of the 2030 Process

The President summarized the *2030* process, which, in his view, had been one of the most intensively consultative in the history of the University.

- In June 2007, the *Towards 2030* background and discussion document had been distributed to the University community, with a request for comments and responses.
- In September 2007, five Task Forces had been created to consider issues and questions arising out of the University community's responses to the discussion paper. The Task Forces, chaired by current governors, were composed of past and present governors representing the key estates of the University – i.e. governors elected from the alumni, faculty, staff and student constituencies, as well as those appointed by the provincial government, along with senior administrators and staff in supporting roles. .
- The various Task Forces had hosted a series of consultations through the fall and winter and had considered dozens of written submissions.
- After consulting extensively, the Task Forces had produced their final reports, which were now publicly available on the *Towards 2030* website.<sup>4</sup>
- The *Framework* document distilled long-term strategic directions from the *Synthesis Report* and the Task Force final reports. It drew on common themes aired over many years throughout the University Community.

#### Tuition and Fees

President Naylor expressed his frustration at the mis-information that had been circulating concerning the topic of tuition in the *Towards 2030 Synthesis Report* and *Framework* documents. This week, several student groups in partnership with one of the University's unions had hosted a plebiscite that asked respondents to consider the question "Are you in favour of fully

---

<sup>4</sup> <http://www.towards2030.utoronto.ca/>

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

### b) Towards 2030: A Long-term Planning Framework for the University of Toronto (cont'd)

#### President's Remarks (cont'd)

deregulating tuition fees?" The implication had been that deregulating tuition fees was a goal of the *Towards 2030* strategic initiative, which it was not.

The President made the following observations:

- "Tuition self-regulation" or "responsible tuition autonomy", both concepts contemplated in the *Synthesis Report*, were not synonyms or euphemisms for "tuition deregulation". The University of Toronto opposed a scheme in which Universities were free to set tuitions and fees without any accompanying accountability or mitigating commitments to governments or the public.
- The *Synthesis Report* raised the possibility of changing the nature of tuition regulation to better reflect the true costs of education in Ontario, and at the University of Toronto in particular. Accompanying this was an overriding acknowledgement of the University's accountability to the provincial legislature and to the people of Ontario to maintain and enhance access.
  - This was not a new idea. In its 1984 submission to the 'Commission on the Future Development of the Universities of Ontario', the University had articulated a similar plan. And, as today, they explicitly rejected the false regulation / deregulation dichotomy.
  - In the University's 2004 submission to the 'Rae Review',<sup>5</sup> the University proposed a system of "Institutional *self-regulation* of tuition fees within a framework that holds institutions accountable for ensuring access."
- The *Synthesis Report* proposed a combination of self-regulation and institutional accountability as part of a mixed revenue model to address our funding crisis. Progressive public jurisdictions across North America are arriving at, or have already implemented, similar strategies.
- The *Synthesis Report*, and most saliently for the present discussion, the *Framework* document both indicated that the most urgent step in addressing the funding crisis was "bringing the [provincial] grants per-student to levels equal with the average of the other nine Canadian provinces." Post-secondary education in Ontario remained an extraordinary asset for Ontario and for Canada available at a bargain rate. It was vital for the University of Toronto that the province invested responsibly and appropriately in its future.

---

<sup>5</sup> [http://www.raereview.utoronto.ca/UTresponse\\_1\\_exec\\_summ.html](http://www.raereview.utoronto.ca/UTresponse_1_exec_summ.html)

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

### b) Towards 2030: A Long-term Planning Framework for the University of Toronto (cont'd)

#### President's Remarks (cont'd)

- The *Framework* before Governing Council did not refer to self-regulation. It did not commit the University to any set of tuition policies or targets. The *Framework* was not a policy document and it was not a substitute for existing or future policies. The *Framework* affirmed that “tuition fees will remain an important source of revenue”, one component of a mixed revenue model.
- The Governing Council considered and set tuition fee schedules annually. In this process, as the *Framework* document says, the Council “will make reference to University policy, extant Government regulations, the revenues required to support the University’s educational offerings, and the level of resources that supports our institutional commitment to accessibility.”
- The University’s unwavering commitment to student aid must continue to take pride of place.
  - In 2006-07, the University of Toronto dedicated \$45.5m to need-based aid, up thirty-fold over 1992-93. During the same period the University’s enrolment grew by about 1.5 times. Most of that growth was derived from two sources: reallocation of revenues from tuition increases, and donations from benefactors, with or without provincial matching.
  - In 2006-07, graduate student funding totalled \$163.8m and an additional \$2.8m in need- and merit-based aid was set aside for international students.
- Compared to other Ontario Universities, the University of Toronto contributed about twice the proportion of its operating budget towards student financial aid. This commitment to student aid lay at the heart of the University’s student access guarantee: “No student offered admission to a program at the University of Toronto should be unable to enter or complete the program due to lack of financial means.”<sup>6</sup> Spending on scholarships, bursaries and other supports for students had risen faster than any other item in the University’s budget over the last decade.
- The impact of this commitment is clear. In 2006-07, 44% of University of Toronto undergraduate students had reported a combined annual parental income of less than \$50,000. 59% of first-entry undergraduate students had graduated with no OSAP debt and 89% of OSAP recipients had graduated with debt levels under \$25,000.

---

<sup>6</sup> <http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/policies/stufinan.htm>

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

### b) Towards 2030: A Long-term Planning Framework for the University of Toronto (cont'd)

#### President's Remarks (cont'd)

##### Advocacy

- Per-student funding of Ontario universities remains more than 25% below the average of the other nice provinces. Closing this gap remained the first and most important priority for the University in advocacy with the Government of Ontario.
- Advocating for further federal investments in research, as well as growth in federally-derived student aid and scholarships was also a priority for the University. A particular priority for federal advocacy would be the promotion of support for fundamental research and basic scholarship, along with the reduction of the ongoing shortfall in federal reimbursement for the institutional costs of research.

##### Scholarship and Research

- Fundamental research is paramount and the university would continue to maintain a breadth of disciplines and be distinguished by a research-intensive culture.

##### Conclusion

- The *Framework* document was *not* a policy document, a set of goals or milestones nor a prescriptive shell, but had to be seen as a living document, subject to intermittent review, with various of the strategic directions modified as circumstances required.

##### Discussion

A member commended the President, his administration, the Task Forces, and the Governing Council members for their work in the *Towards 2030* exercise. In his view, the *Framework* symbolized an effort to provide quality post-secondary education for students within the University of Toronto and to enhance the University's overall academic standing. Among the *Framework's* strengths was the University's advocacy position regarding per-student funding. This was an essential task that, if successful, would allow the University to achieve the many important goals within the *Framework*.

The member stated his support for industry-sponsored research, which, in his view, would benefit society. He noted, however, that all appropriate measures had to be taken to protect academic freedom and to ensure that partnerships reflected the University's social responsibility to the greater community.

A member thanked the President and those who worked on *Towards 2030*, and stated that, in his view, it was a good start to the planning process. He informed members many students he had spoken to were uncomfortable with *Towards 2030*, and that 90% of those voting in the recent

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

### b) Towards 2030: A Long-term Planning Framework for the University of Toronto (cont'd)

plebiscite had responded `No` to the question ``Are you in favour of fully deregulating tuition fees?'' He suggested taking another year before approval to seek additional input and feedback.

It was duly moved and seconded

THAT "*Towards 2030: A Long-term Planning Framework for the University of Toronto*", be tabled for a year to allow for intensive feedback from all student constituencies.

Several members who had been involved with various Task Forces stated that the student members of the Task Forces had been active participants. Student groups had been invited to meet with the Task Forces and to send written submissions to the Task Forces, but not all groups had taken the opportunity to do so.

It was duly moved and seconded

THAT the question be called.

The motion was APPROVED by the necessary two-thirds majority

The vote on the motion was taken.

The motion to table the "*Towards 2030: A Long-term Planning Framework for the University of Toronto* was DEFEATED.

A member noted that the entire University community had been invited to respond to *Towards 2030*. He commended the Graduate Students` Union (GSU) for making written submissions to the Task Forces and noted that many of the issues raised by the GSU had been addressed. He suggested that the University consider students as allies in its lobbying efforts. The member indicated that he was aware of some cases in which doctoral students had been unable to publish their findings due to the opposition of corporate partners.

A member stated that he had recently invited students to send him their comments concerning *Towards 2030*. Concerns that had emerged from the comments received included:

- Corporate sponsorship would not support research in humanities or social sciences.
- Corporations would influence the research that was undertaken by the University.
- As tuition increased, the percentage of that increase set aside for needs based grants would also increase and potentially lead to diminished returns to the university. At some point there would be a breaking point of how much support was necessary to maintain accessibility for students.

The member noted that some students expressed concern with the transparency of the Governing Council, felt they were not sufficiently consulted during the writing of the report, and did not know whom to contact to discuss their concerns about *Towards 2030*.

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

### b) Towards 2030: A Long-term Planning Framework for the University of Toronto (cont'd)

Professor Misak commented that, speaking as a philosopher, she could assure members that scholars in the humanities and social sciences were, and would remain, research intensive regardless of the availability of corporate sponsorship.

Professor Orchard reminded members that each year the Vice-President, Research provided a report on research funding at the University of Toronto. The majority of funding came from peer-reviewed sources such as SSHERC, NSERC and CIHR, while only a small percentage came from industry. He also advised that changes in policy and practices for corporate sponsored research had resulted from the Olivieri case. He further reminded members that there was an annual Report on Student Financial Support provided by the Vice-Provost, Students. He agreed with the President that the University of Toronto had the best model for needs-based student funding in Ontario.

### Addresses by Non-members

The Chair welcomed Ms Sari Suliman, Vice-President, External of the Graduate Students' Union (GSU), to the meeting and invited her to speak. Ms Suliman commented that the GSU had identified procedural concerns about *Towards 2030*, including: little formal consultation with students; the participation of only a few hand-picked students in the process with no accountability to report back to the student body; and, a lack of student involvement in the preparation of the *Synthesis* document. Also, while the *Framework* document claimed enhanced access for students, it contained no information on retention rates. The model of 'earned-autonomy' recommended in the *Framework* alleviated what the GSU considered to be the moral responsibility of the provincial government to finance post-secondary education and allowed the institution to autonomously set tuition fee levels. It was also the view of the GSU that the *Framework* document recommended increased user fees, the corporatization of the University, and called for the transformation of St. George to a research campus which, in the view of the GSU, jeopardized teaching opportunities for graduate students.

The Chair welcomed Ms Sandra Hudson, President of the Students' Administrative Council (operating as University of Toronto Students' Union) (SAC) and invited her to speak. Ms Hudson urged members to vote against the motion. She explained that her organization had collaborated with other students' unions on all three campuses as well as labour unions and the Faculty Association to hold a plebiscite of the general university community. Ninety-three percent of those who voted in the plebiscite voted 'no' in response to the question "Are you in favour of fully deregulating tuition fees?"

Ms Hudson stated students are aware of the funding challenges of our institution. The problem, however, is not that students are not paying enough, but that the government is not granting Ontario institutions sufficient funding. It was the view of UTSU that every time tuition fees had increased, the government had taken a proportional amount of funding away from post-secondary education.

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

### b) Towards 2030: A Long-term Planning Framework for the University of Toronto (cont'd)

She expressed how concerned students were about the possible deregulation of tuition fees. It was the opinion of UTSU that the *Towards 2030* plan steered the University away from the vision of the University community as expressed in the statement of institutional purpose, “the University of Toronto is dedicated to fostering an academic community in which the learning and scholarship of every member may flourish, with vigilant protection for individual human rights, and a resolute commitment to the principles of equal opportunity, equity and justice”. She concluded by again urging members to vote against the motion.

The Chair welcomed Ms Joeita Gupta, Vice-President Internal of the Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students (APUS). Ms Gupta stated that it was the view of APUS that there had not been enough student consultation in the development of *Towards 2030*. She was pleased that the plan mentioned mature students but was concerned that it steered them towards continuing education through the School of Continuing Studies. She expressed the importance for increased investment by the University in part-time students. In her opinion, *Towards 2030* is a plan to privatize the university. She asserted that the long-reaching and long-term consequences of the plan demanded that the student voice be heard. Ms Gupta concluded by asking members to postpone the approval of *Towards 2030*.

Members were invited to continue their discussion of the motion.

A member thanked those who had worked on *Towards 2030*. With respect to corporate-sponsored research, it was his view that corporate research sponsors were looking to the University for advice and answers.

A member expressed that the long-term view of tuition contained in *Towards 2030* was important for the Governing Council. He recognized the issue of rising tuition and its concern for students. He felt tuition should be considered in context and described four major changes that had occurred since he had first come to the University as a student fifty years ago:

- the cost of tuition had not increased substantially, in relative terms, to the cost fifty years ago;
- student financial aid had increased dramatically;
- accessibility to higher education had improved radically; and,
- the education provided by the University had been transformed. The University of Toronto was no longer a provincial university, and now competed internationally.

The member encouraged students to continue to be involved with the issues that could make a difference to the future of the University.

A member provided assurance that Alumni Governors, who were elected by alumni - past University of Toronto students - considered both immediate and long-term issues of the University, from a student perspective. She emphasized that the Ontario Legislature is not nearly as diverse as the University and its various estates, and may not be easily engaged, or even interested, in the issues that are of utmost concern to us. In order to create change, she stressed

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

### b) Towards 2030: A Long-term Planning Framework for the University of Toronto (cont'd)

the importance of members of the University community speaking with one voice when pursuing opportunities to bring matters forward to the provincial legislature.

A member observed that students were not necessarily aware of funding opportunities available to them within the University. Although there were large posters encouraging students to rally against increased tuition, there were no similar posters explaining the availability of bursaries. She encouraged the administration to address the lack of communication to students.

A member again urged members to postpone approval of the motion, given the long term impact of *Towards 2030*.

President Naylor responded to the themes that had emerged in the discussion of *Towards 2030*. He assured members that the University had no intentions of reducing the diversity of disciplines that were available. He reaffirmed that most of the research conducted at the University was peer-reviewed and not corporate sponsored. He reminded members that the University had a body of policies that governed and protected independent research, and encouraged the member who had raised the issue of graduate students having trouble with research sponsors to bring the matter to the attention of the relevant administrator.

President Naylor noted the points of continued miscommunication about tuition and research priorities. He indicated his hope that repetition by student leaders of points already refuted was a reflection of the fact that their remarks were prepared in advance. He agreed that the University could do a much better job of communicating with students. He concluded that there were areas of common ground that could be built upon.

The vote on the main question was taken.

It was Resolved

THAT “*Towards 2030: A Long-term Planning Framework for the University of Toronto*”, be approved in principle.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 158 of the Academic Board as Appendix “B”.

## 8. *Towards 2030: Task Force on Governance Phase 2 – Mandate*

The Chair welcomed Ms Rose Patten, Past-Chair of the Governing Council and Chair of the Task Force on Governance, to the meeting. He reminded members that they had received in their agenda packages documentation outlining the revised phase 2 mandate of the *Towards 2030* Task Force on Governance.

At the invitation of the Chair, Ms Patten commented that, in her view, the documentation was self-explanatory. Over the summer she had consulted with the Vice-Chair of the Task-Force and the Secretary on what might be the most reasonable approach to take, given the potential scope of the work.

Ms Patten indicated that the Task Force would first set out principles of good governance that would guide its subsequent work in addressing three streams: refinements to practice, delegations of authority, and tri-campus governance. The Chair, the Executive Committee, and the Governing Council would be kept informed about the Task Force's progress.

A member sought assurance that the Governing Council was in compliance with the *University of Toronto Act, 1971*. The Chair replied that legal advice was sought as appropriate on governance matters, and there was no reason to believe that Governing Council was not acting in compliance with our Act. Through Governing Council's processes and the University's many annual accountability reports to government,<sup>7</sup> it was his belief that we are fulfilling our obligations conscientiously and appropriately. He indicated that he would follow up with the member outside of the meeting.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

THAT the proposed mandate of the *Towards 2030* Task Force on Governance Phase 2, as described in the document dated September 29, 2008, be approved.

Documentation is attached to Report 417 of the Executive Committee as Appendix "B".

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

### c) **University of Toronto at Mississauga Students' Union: Recognition as a Representative Student Committee – Rescission**

Dr. Dong reminded members that, at its June 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting, the Governing Council had approved a recommendation from the administration that the University of Toronto at Mississauga Students' Union (UTMSU) replace the Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students (APUS) as the formal representative student committee to the Governing Council for part-time undergraduate students at the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM). This

---

<sup>7</sup> [http://www.utoronto.ca/\\_shared/assets/MYAA\\_Report\\_Back\\_for\\_2006-071853.pdf?method=1](http://www.utoronto.ca/_shared/assets/MYAA_Report_Back_for_2006-071853.pdf?method=1)

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

**c) University of Toronto at Mississauga Students' Union: Recognition as a Representative Student Committee – Rescission (cont'd)**

recommendation had arisen from a request by UTM student leaders on the basis of a referendum carried out among part-time UTM students.

On August 27<sup>th</sup>, the Ontario Superior Court of Justice had ruled that the referendum process had been invalid. The administration had previously undertaken to APUS to reverse the formal representation to Governing Council should the Court make such a finding. Consequently, it was now recommending the rescission of the motions passed by the Council in June.

At the invitation of the Chair, Ms Joeita Gupta, Vice-President Internal of APUS, addressed Governing Council. She advised that the court had affirmed APUS as the legitimate governor of EPUS, and that APUS was happy with the court decision. She informed members that APUS looked forward to working with the administration to serve part-time students at UTM.

Professor Misak noted that the court had not in fact affirmed APUS as the legitimate governor of EPUS. She also informed members that she had established a Provost's Advisory Committee on Student Governments that would be chaired by Professor David R. Cameron, an expert on democratic processes. The committee would consist of both student government representatives and faculty members, and would consider best practices, and develop recommendations on guidelines for the fair and democratic operation of student governments.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

THAT the following resolutions approved by the Governing Council on June 23, 2008 be rescinded:

THAT the Governing Council cease its recognition of the Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students (APUS) as the Representative Student Committee of part-time undergraduate students registered at the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM); and

THAT the Erindale College Students' Union (currently operating as the University of Toronto at Mississauga Students' Union, UTMSU) be recognized as the Representative Student Committee and primary representative body of part-time undergraduate students registered at UTM.

Terms and conditions of the foregoing recommendation and approval:

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

### c) University of Toronto at Mississauga Students' Union: Recognition as a Representative Student Committee – Rescission (cont'd)

1. THAT for the purposes of the *Memorandum of Agreement between the University of Toronto, the Students' Administrative Council, the Graduate Students' Union and the Association of Part-Time Undergraduate Students for a Long-Term Protocol on the Increase or Introduction of Compulsory Non-Tuition Related Fees* (the "Protocol"), the Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students shall continue to represent part-time undergraduate students registered at UTM until such time as a new or revised Protocol is approved; and
2. THAT the Erindale College Students' Union (currently operating as the UTMSU) will:
  - (a) undertake, in consultation with the Students' Administrative Council (currently operating as the UTSU), to address the formal representation of full-time undergraduate UTM students; and (b) will report to the administration the society's progress on addressing this matter no later than the spring of 2010.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 417 of the Executive Committee as Appendix "A".

## 6. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units – Annual Report

The Chair informed members that the Guidelines for Review of Academic Programs and Units stated that the "Governing Council is responsible for ensuring that the University administration is monitoring the quality of academic programs and units and is taking the necessary steps to address problems and achieve improvements."

Members had received in their agenda package a two-part summary of the reviews completed in 2006-07 and the administrative responses to those reviews. Members had also received copies of Reports Number 135 and 136 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs (APP), the governance body that considered the reviews in detail at its meetings in April and May. The heads of the relevant academic divisions had been in attendance at those meetings to answer questions.

The documentation had then been reviewed by the Agenda Committee of the Academic Board and the Academic Board itself. There were no matters that required the attention of the Board.

A member observed that in her six years as a member of APP, the discussion had become increasingly comprehensive.

## **7. Report of the University Ombudsperson (June 1, 2007 – July 31, 2008), and Administrative Response**

The Chair welcomed Professor Emeritus Joan Foley, University Ombudsperson, to the meeting.

He reminded members that the University Ombudsperson was responsible to the Governing Council, through its Chair. Section 5.1 of the Terms of Reference of the Office stated that “the Ombudsperson shall make a written annual report to the Governing Council and through it to the University community . . . .”

The administration had prepared its response to the Report, and both documents had been included in the agenda package for the meeting.

At the invitation of the Chair, Professor Emeritus Foley commented that she was enjoying her service as University Ombudsperson. She was gratified at the quick response to requests to improve things that were not working, and also appreciated the administrative response to her Report.

## **9. Reports for Information**

Members received the following reports for information:

- (a) Calendar of Business 2008-09
- (b) Report Number 158 of the Academic Board (October 2, 2008)
- (c) Report Number 167 of the Business Board (June 19, 2008)
- (d) Report Number 168 of the Business Board (September 22, 2008)
- (e) Report Number 416 of the Executive Committee (June 23, 2008)
- (f) Report Number 417 of the Executive Committee (October 6, 2008)

The Chair noted that the consolidated Calendar of Business for 2008-2009 was posted on the Governing Council website<sup>8</sup> and was updated throughout the year.

## **10. Date of Next Meeting**

The Chair informed members that the next meeting of the Governing Council was scheduled for Wednesday, December 10, 2008 at 4:30 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall.

## **11. Question Period**

There were no questions for members of the senior administration.

---

<sup>8</sup> <http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/Assets/Calendars+of+Business/Consolidated+Calendar+of+Business.pdf>

**12. Other Business**

**a) Convocation**

The Chair encouraged members to attend the Convocation ceremonies taking place the week of November 10<sup>th</sup> and to participate in the academic procession. He noted that invitations and further information would be forthcoming.

**b) Discussion at Governing Council meetings**

A member suggested that Governing Council meetings for which there was not a lot of business would provide an opportunity for members to discuss matters that they might not otherwise have the opportunity to consider. The Chair invited members to contact him with suggestions for matters that might be discussed at the December meeting, which was anticipated to have a light agenda.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

IT WAS RESOLVED

THAT, pursuant to sections 28 (e) and 33 of *By-Law Number 2*, consideration of item 13 take place *in camera*.

*In Camera Session*

**12. Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters: Recommendation for Expulsion**

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

THAT the President's recommendation for an expulsion, as outlined in the memorandum and supporting documentation from the Secretary of the Governing Council, dated October 6, 2008, be confirmed.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Secretary

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chair

November 17, 2008