

**UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO**

**THE GOVERNING COUNCIL**

**APRIL 8, 2010**

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE GOVERNING COUNCIL held on April 8, 2010 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)  
Professor C. David Naylor, President  
Mr. Andrew Agnew-Iler  
Mr. Ryan Matthew Campbell  
Mr. P. C. Choo  
Mr. William Crothers  
Mr. Ken Davy  
Ms Judith Goldring  
Professor William Gough  
Ms Joeita Gupta  
Mr. Adam Heller  
Professor Ellen Hodnett  
Ms Min Hee (Margaret) Kim  
Dr. Joel A. Kirsh  
Professor Ronald H. Kluger  
Professor Christina E. Kramer  
Professor Louise Lemieux-Charles  
Mr. Joseph Mapa  
Mr. Geoffrey Matus  
Professor Cheryl Misak  
Mr. Gary P. Mooney  
Mr. Richard Nunn  
Professor Ian Orchard  
Mr. Tim Reid  
Professor Arthur S. Ripstein  
Professor Elizabeth M. Smyth  
Miss Maureen J. Somerville

Mr. Olivier Sorin  
Mr. John David Stewart  
Ms Rita Tsang  
Dr. Sarita Verma  
Ms B. Elizabeth Vosburgh  
Mr. Greg West

**Secretariat:**

Mr. Louis R. Charpentier  
Mr. Anwar Kazimi  
Mr. Henry Mulhall

**Regrets:**

The Honourable David R. Peterson, Chancellor  
Ms Diana A.R. Alli  
Professor Varouj Aivazian  
Dr. Claude S. Davis  
Dr. Gerald Halbert  
Ms Shirley Hoy  
Dr. Stefan Mathias Larson  
Ms Florence Minz  
Mr. George E. Myhal  
Professor Doug W. Reeve  
Ms Melinda Rogers  
Mr. Stephen C. Smith  
Professor Janice Gross Stein  
Mr. W. John Switzer  
Mr. W. David Wilson

**In Attendance:**

Professor Phil Byer, Member-Elect of the Governing Council  
Mr. Ken Kuran, Member-Elect of the Governing Council  
Mr. Nick Kuryluk, Member-Elect of the Governing Council  
Professor Emeritus Michael Marrus, Member-Elect of the Governing Council  
Ms Natalie Melton, Member-Elect of the Governing Council  
Mr. James Park, Member-Elect of the Governing Council  
Mr. Jeff Peters, Member-Elect of the Governing Council and President, Association of Part-Time Undergraduate Students (APUS)  
Dr. Robert Bennett, Former Member of the Governing Council

Professor Angela Hildyard, Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity  
Mr. David Palmer, Vice-President, Advancement and Chief Development Officer  
Ms Catherine Riggall, Vice-President, Business Affairs  
Ms Judith Wolfson, Vice-President, University Relations  
Professor R. Paul Young, Vice-President, Research  
Professor Peter Lewis, Associate Vice-President Research  
Ms Christina Sass-Kortsak, Assistant Vice-President, Human Resources  
Mr. Robert Steiner, Assistant Vice-President, Strategic Communications  
Professor Franco Vaccarino, Vice-President and Principal, University of Toronto at Scarborough  
(UTSC)  
Professor Edith Hillan, Vice-Provost, Faculty and Academic Life  
Professor Scott Mabury, Vice-Provost, Academic Operations  
Professor Jill Matus, Vice-Provost, Students  
Professor Cheryl Reghr, Vice-Provost, Academic Programs  
Mr. Amir Allana, Engineers Without Borders  
Professor Gage Averill, Vice-Principal Academic and Dean, University of Toronto at  
Mississauga (UTM)  
Mr. Adam Awad, Vice-President, University Affairs, Students' Administrative Council (SAC)  
which operates as the University of Toronto Student Union (UTSU)  
Ms Melissa Berger, Program and Planning Officer/ROP Coordinator, UTM  
Ms Sheila Brown, Chief Financial Officer  
Professor Donald Cormack, Chair – Department of Physical and Environmental Sciences, UTSC  
Mr. Jim Delaney, Director, Office of the Vice-Provost, Students  
Mr. Stephane De Vuyst, Engineers Without Borders  
Ms Sally Garner, Executive Director, Planning and Budget  
Ms Nora Gillespie, Legal Counsel, Office of the Vice-President and Provost  
Dr. Anthony Gray, Special Advisor to the President  
Professor Rick Halpern, Vice-Principal Academic and Dean, UTSC  
Ms Alina Husain, Engineers Without Borders  
Dr. Leslie Jermyn, Chair-Elect, CUPE 3902  
Professor Louis Kaplan, Director of the Institute of Communications and Culture, UTM  
Mr. Christopher Lang, Director, Appeals, Discipline and Faculty Grievances  
Ms Lesley Lewis, Assistant Dean, UTSC  
Mr. David Luu, Engineers Without Borders  
Mr. Steve Moate, Senior Legal Counsel, Office of the President  
Mr. Robert Ramsay, Chair, CUPE 3902  
Professor John Scherk, Vice-Dean Undergraduate, UTSC  
Ms Laurie Stephens, Director of Media Relations and Stakeholder Communications  
Ms Meredith Strong, Director of the Office of the Vice-President, University Relations  
Ms Karel Swift, University Registrar  
Professor Anthony Wensley, Director, Communication, Culture and Information Technology,  
UTM

IN ACCORDANCE WITH A DETERMINATION BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE PURSUANT TO SECTIONS 38 AND 44 OF BY-LAW NUMBER 2 OF THE GOVERNING COUNCIL, ITEM 10 ON THE AGENDA WAS CONSIDERED BY THE GOVERNING COUNCIL *IN CAMERA*.

**1. Chair's Remarks**

(a) Welcome

The Chair welcomed the members and guests to the meeting. He indicated that there were a number of items on the agenda and that the Council would consider two items of significance – tuition fees and the annual operating budget. The Chair stated that his intention was to ensure that a robust discussion took place within a reasonable time. With this goal in mind, he requested members to be succinct and focussed in their remarks so that all those who had relevant points to make could do so.

(b) Announcement of Chair and Vice-Chair

The Chair offered his congratulations on behalf of the Council to Mr. Richard Nunn on his acclamation as Vice-Chair for the period July 1, 2010 to June 30, 2011.

(c) Governing Council Election Results

The Chair also offered his congratulations to the following current members who had been re-elected or acclaimed to the Governing Council: Mr. P.C. Choo, Ms Joeita Gupta, Ms Maureen Somerville, Mr. Olivier Sorin, Dr. Sarita Verma, and Mr. Greg West. In addition, he congratulated and welcomed the following individuals who had been newly elected as members of the Council and would begin their terms on July 1, 2010: Professor Robert Baker (Teaching Staff), Professor Philip Byer (Teaching Staff), Mr. Ken Kuran (Undergraduate Student), Mr. Nick Kuryluk (Alumni), Professor Emeritus Michael Marrus (Alumni), Ms Natalie Melton (Undergraduate Student), Mr. James Park (Undergraduate Student); Mr. Jeff Peters (Part-time Undergraduate Student Professor Andrea Sass-Kortsak (Teaching Staff), and Ms Tharsini Sivananthajothy (Undergraduate Student).

(d) Report on Consultations

At the last Council's meeting, the Chair had indicated that he had begun to meet with groups of governors to hear their observations and advice on ways to ensure that deliberations in Committees, Boards, and the Governing Council were positive and constructive. The Chair reported that he had met with members of each of the Council's estates. Thanking those who had participated in these discussions, the Chair said that the conversations had been frank, constructive and informative. The feedback had been consistently well-considered and had focussed on a few themes. They were:

- Members had emphasized that ensuring civil engagement – maintaining order and encouraging respectful debate – was a responsibility shared by all governors.
- Members had repeatedly noted that accommodation for persons with disabilities was an important and appropriate goal for the Governing Council – consistent with the University's values and policies. The governors had emphasized that that the Governing Council rely on the expert advice of the University's

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

(d) Report on Consultations (cont'd)

Accessibility Services and the Ontarians with Disabilities Advisor in the Office of the Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity in arranging appropriate accommodations.

- Members had expressed their concern about the disruption caused by non-members (and in some cases, governors themselves) distributing documentation during Council and Board or Committee meetings. Members had stressed that any such documentation should be provided to the Secretariat in advance of the meeting and the Chair and Secretary would decide on its distribution. The Chair said that the members had noted that unsigned letters had little or no standing.
- Several members had raised the matter of the presence of University of Toronto Campus Community Police at Council meetings. Governors had acknowledged that for some members of the culturally diverse University community, the presence of police could be uncomfortable. It was suggested that, while it was reasonable to have security available for the safety and well-being of governors, Campus Community Police staff should not be inside the Council Chamber – unless otherwise determined by the Chair.
- The Chair said that members had expressed their concern about the “three-minute rule” – the practice of asking all speakers to limit their interventions to a maximum of three minutes. Governors had suggested that Chairs be flexible up to the maximum of five minutes, as outlined in By-law 2 of the Governing Council. For individuals requesting additional time as an accommodation, Chairs would rely on the advice of the University's Accessibility Services and the Ontarians with Disabilities Advisor in the Office of the Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity.
- On the matter of external speakers, governors generally agreed that Chairs should demonstrate flexibility – taking into account the competing demands of the meetings. Governors also agreed that the expected notice of one week to submit speaking requests to the Executive Committee in advance of the Governing Council meeting was reasonable in the context of agenda planning. Governors also indicated that advance notice to the Chairs of Boards and Committees was reasonable.

Thanking the members, the Chair noted that their collective input, advice, and support would lead to a more productive output at the Governing Council, as well as Board and Committee meetings.

A member suggested that input be sought from students and individuals requiring accommodation for disabilities, in addition to the advice of the University's Accessibility Services and the Ontarians with Disabilities Advisor in the Office of the Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity.

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

(e) 2010-11 Governing Council Online Information Form

The Chair reminded members and members-elect to complete the 2010-11 Governing Council Online Information Form. He thanked those who had already done so.

(f) Speaking Requests

The Chair noted that three speaking requests had been granted to the following individuals: Mr. Adam Awad, Vice-President University Affairs, Students' Administrative Council (SAC), which operates as the University of Toronto Student Union (UTSU); Mr. Jeff Peters, President, Association of Part-Time Students (APUS); and Mr. Robert Ramsay, Chair, CUPE 3902.

**2. Minutes of the Previous Meeting of February 25, 2010**

The minutes of the February 25, 2010 were approved.

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

There was no business arising from the minutes of the previous meeting.

**4. Report of the President**

(a) Student Presentation – Engineers Without Borders

The President began his report by introducing the members to a student group – Engineers Without Borders (EWB). The President introduced Ms. David Luu, a third year Engineering student and EWB's incoming co-president; Mr. Amir Allana, a second year Engineering Science student; Mr. Stephane De Vuyst, a second year Chemical Engineering student; and Ms Alina Husain, a third year Political Science and Anthropology student.

The students informed members that EWB was a Canada-wide student organization involved with sustainable development projects. The group's projects extended beyond Canada to Burkina Faso, Malawi, Ghana and Zambia and involved work in water sanitation and agricultural improvement. The group's activities in Canada included outreach and advocacy for its projects in Africa. EWB had chapters across Canadian universities, with its headquarters in Toronto. The University's EWB student chapter had won an award for being the best student chapter in the country. Every summer, two student volunteers were sent overseas to work in rural infrastructure projects. The group's focus was capacity building and the promotion of social leadership, working at the grassroots level to identify the basic needs of village communities.

Across Canadian university campuses, EWB was involved in leadership and curriculum development. An objective was to understand the political situation in the organization's countries of focus in order to foster social development. EWB aimed to build relationships between the Canadian government, the Canadian populace and the communities that it worked with in Africa. In this context, representatives had met with members of Parliament and other key actors in international development to facilitate the distribution of knowledge. Presenting to about 2,000 high school students across Canada, the group's global engineers' series of presentation had been a successful too in fostering student engagement. The student presenters concluded their presentation by leaving the Council members with a challenge to think about using the University's full capacity to tackle issues such as poverty and the energy crisis.

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

(b) Awards and Honours

The President drew the members' attention to the Awards and Honours list that was included in the agenda package. He began by congratulating Professor Natalie Zemon Davis, Adjunct Professor of History and Professor of Medieval Studies, on being named the 2010 winner of the prestigious Holberg International Memorial Prize. The Holberg Prize, established by the Norwegian parliament, was the most prestigious international prize celebrating outstanding scholarly work in the arts and humanities, social sciences, law or theology. The President reminded members that University Professor Emeritus Ian Hacking had been awarded the prize in 2009. In March 2010, Professor Nicholas Everett, a Medieval historian and Professor Walid Saleh, a scholar of religion in the Department of Near and Middle Eastern Civilizations, had been awarded the New Directions Fellowships from the Mellon Foundation – the first time that these fellowships had been awarded outside the United States. Professor Eugenia Kumacheva (Chemistry); Professor Frank Kschischang (Electrical and Computer Engineering); and Professor Andreas Mandelias (Mechanical and Industrial Engineering), had won three of the year's eight Killam Research Fellowships.

The President also congratulated Professor Scott Mabury for winning the Chemical Institute of Canada 2010 Environmental Division Research and Development Award. As well, he noted that Professor Kluger had been recognized for his longstanding service to the University.

Finally, the President offered his congratulations to Varsity Blues wrestler Mr. Shujon Majumdar who had become the second Varsity wrestler to win a gold medal at the Canadian university championships.

(c) The Ontario Budget

The President noted that education remained a high priority for the provincial government. Funding for education had been protected in the recently released provincial budget. The provincial government had allocated \$155 million to fully support enrolment growth at Ontario's post-secondary institutions through 2009-2010. This, the President said, would cover the cost of unfunded and pro-rated Basic Income Units (BIUs) in the system from 2004-2005 to 2009-2010. In addition, the government had announced that an additional \$310 million would be invested to create 20,000 new spaces in post-secondary institutions. The President cautioned, that there was no increase in the per-student grant allocation and, consequently, any increases in grant levels would have to come through an increase in enrolment. He contrasted this with other jurisdictions in Canada – for example, in Alberta the University would have received nearly twice the level of its current per-student grant (i.e., \$1.2 billion instead of \$600 million).

Absent increases in grant levels, the University would need to rely primarily on tuition increases and enrolment growth for sources of new revenue. Unless this trend could be reversed, the long-term consequences would be larger classes; pressure on student services; higher faculty and staff workloads; and possible layoffs that the University had thus far managed to minimize. New compensation legislation had also been tabled in the budget to create wage and salary restraints; its impact on the University's faculty and staff was yet to be determined.

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

(c.) The Ontario Budget (cont'd)

Two other unexpected items were introduced in the provincial budget. The first of these was a commitment to increase international post-secondary enrolment in the province by 50 per cent. Though few details were provided, the government had indicated that Ontario's institutions would be promoted abroad. The President said that he had advised the government to consider extending Ontario Health Insurance Plan (OHIP) coverage to international students instead of the University Health Insurance (UHIP), as one way of assisting international student recruitment. The second item of interest was the announcement of the proposed establishment of the Online Ontario Institute. However, the government had as yet made few details on this venture available. It was expected that the Online Institute would allow Ontarians (especially mature learners) to access post-secondary education online.

One thousand new Ontario Graduate Scholarships (OGS) had also been announced – the first increase since 2005. Perhaps the most positive news for students in the budget maybe the long-overdue review of the Ontario Student Assistance Plan (OSAP). Under new the guidelines, the OSAP cap was raised for the first time in twelve years; the income exemption was raised from \$50 per week to \$100 per week of each week of the study period; there was to be flexibility with the loan repayment; and a new \$500 grant for part-time students was introduced along with improved support for married students with children.

Members had received the revised Report on Student Financial Support with their agenda package. The revisions made to the report had resulted from recent governance discussions of Student Aid. The President said that there was a need for the University to gather new data on the efficacy of its student aid policies and practices. Statistics indicated that the University provided substantial funding for student aid in an equitable and inclusive manner. Nevertheless, the University needed to ensure that there were no unintended internal consequences as a result of its policies, particularly in light of the Province's changes to OSAP. An initiative was planned for the summer where data would be collected, literature on student aid reviewed. Consultations would also be initiated with the University's varied student constituencies to understand possible gaps. A goal would be to enhance the University's student aid policies and practices, in line with the new government funding policies.

(d) Federal Budget

The President said that there were a number of positive elements in the federal budget for 2010. He had highlighted these in a statement, co-authored with the Presidents of Canada's thirteen largest research-intensive universities. The statement had been widely distributed and had been well received in Ottawa.

The President drew the members' attention to three points within the federal budget. Firstly, the federal government had preserved transfers to the provinces. This was critical. The current framework of fiscal federalism had meant that Ontarians were subsidizing the education of students in several other provinces. However, cuts to core transfer payments could actually exacerbate this problem. In particular, cuts to transfer payments had been used as a means to eliminate debt in the 1990s. This had resulted in a cascade of cuts down to the level of municipalities and to provincial institutions such as colleges and universities. In this context, the federal government's commitment to preserve transfer payments was an important positive change.

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

(d.) The Federal Budget (cont'd)

Secondly, the federal budget had signalled the importance of fundamental research and scholarship to the country's future in the knowledge economy. The federal government had recognized that these were the engines of innovation by allocating new funds for basic research through its granting councils.

Thirdly, the budget had signalled the government's intention to conduct a national review of public research and development funding. The University and other institutions had been advocating for such a review for a number of years. It was hoped the review would result in more funds for basic research and scholarship, enhanced transparency, and clarified mandates across the system. The President cautioned that, in some instances, government reviews had resulted in unexpected outcomes. Nonetheless, he was pleased that the review was planned, and the University would provide input into the review process.

The President outlined a number of uncertainties that remained even as the University turned its attention to its own budgeting process. One uncertainty related to University's negotiations with the Faculty Association as talks entered the arbitration stage. Another uncertainty pertained to the pension solvency test that the provincial government was continuing to apply to universities despite the fact that it had been waived in five other provinces. Setting aside the funds needed for the pension solvency test would have profound consequences on the University's operating budget. In addition, it was imperative, in the constrained circumstances, for the University to continue with its capital projects as more space was needed on all three campuses.

In closing, the President congratulated those who had been elected and re-elected in the Governing Council elections.

**5. Items for Governing Council Approval**

**(a) University of Toronto at Scarborough and School of Graduate Studies: Ph.D. in Environmental Science**

*(Arising from Report Number 166 of the Academic Board [March 23, 2010] - Item 5)*

Professor Lemieux-Charles, the Chair of the Academic Board, said that the proposed program in environmental science represented the first tri-campus doctoral program that would be housed at the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC). The program would be located within the Department of Physical and Environmental Sciences and would align suitably with the current undergraduate and graduate programs offered at UTSC. The distinctive program was intended for students with a broad scientific background and interest, rather than one specialized in a particular discipline. UTSC had committed to providing all of the resources needed for the program. Therefore, there were no resource implications for the University operating budget that would result from the proposal.

Some questions related to the interdisciplinary component of the program had been raised by members at the Academic Board meeting. Professor Gough had informed the Board that that aspect of the proposal had been discussed extensively during his consultations with deans of the Faculty of Arts and Science and the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM), and with the chairs of the relevant departments and centres in UTM, the Faculty of Arts and Science, the Faculty of Forestry, and the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering. Professor Lemieux-Charles said that following its discussion, the Academic Board had recommended the approval of the proposal.



**5(a). University of Toronto at Scarborough and School of Graduate Studies: Ph.D. in Environmental Science (cont'd)**

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

THAT the proposed Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) Program in Environmental Science, as described in the proposal from the University of Toronto at Scarborough dated January 8, 2010, be approved, with enrolment commencing September 2010.

Professor Naylor described the approval as a historic moment for tri-campus development.

Invited to comment by the Chair, Professor Vaccarino expressed his delight at the approval of the proposal. He said that the approval spoke to the evolution of UTSC and thanked members for their support.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 166 of the Academic Board as [Appendix "A"](#).

**(b) University of Toronto at Mississauga: Proposal to Disestablish the Institute of Communication and Culture and Establish an Institute of Communication, Culture and Information Technology (EDU:A) and a Development of Visual Studies**  
*(Arising from Report Number 166 of the Academic Board [March 23, 2010] - Item 6)*

Professor Lemieux-Charles said that the proposal was based on an external review of the Institute of Communication and Culture, and it provided a more appropriate structure that would meet the needs of UTM's teaching staff and students. Broad consultations had taken place within the UTM community and with the Sheridan Institute of Technology and Advanced Learning. The proposed Institute of Communication, Culture and Information Technology (CCIT) would bring together two units, Communication, Culture and Information Technology and Professional Writing and Communication. As a extra-department unit A (EDU:A), it would house a number of academic programs. The proposed Department of Visual Studies would house the Art and Art History, Visual Culture Communication, and Cinema Studies programs. As part of the restructuring, the Biomedical Communications program, which was currently located in the Institute of Communication and Culture (ICC), would be relocated to the UTM Department of Biology. At its meeting earlier in the month, the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs had approved the deletion of the Human Communication and Technology and the Health Science Communication programs, which were also offered through ICC. Professor Lemieux-Charles said that the existing operating resources would be realigned to support the two new units, and that there would be no changes in the ongoing funding resources at the University level. No questions had been raised by the members of the Academic Board.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

1. THAT the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM) Institute of Communication and Culture be disestablished, effective July 1, 2010;
2. THAT the UTM Institute of Communication, Culture and Information Technology be established as an Extra-Departmental Unit A (EDU:A), effective July 1, 2010;
3. THAT the UTM Department of Visual Studies be established, effective July 1, 2010.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 166 of the Academic Board as [Appendix "B"](#).

**5(c) Capital Project: Project Planning Report for the Biozone: Bioengineering Research Facility**  
(Arising from Report Number 166 of the Academic Board [March 23, 2010] - Item 7)

Professor Lemieux-Charles said that the proposal was to construct 350 gross square metres on the rooftop of the Wallberg Building and to renovate 420 gross square metres on the third floor of that building to accommodate new laboratory and research space. The Department of Chemical Engineering and Applied Chemistry’s Biozone Research had been awarded \$1.8 million from each of the Canada Foundation for Innovation (CFI) and the Ontario Research Fund (ORF) for an expansion its facilities. The Department and the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering would each contribute towards the total project cost of \$4.429 million. The Faculty would also assume the costs of some secondary effects of the project, which would include the displacement of a computer engineering facility. The project would begin in December 2010, with occupancy planned for January 2012. No questions about the proposal had been asked at the Academic Board meeting.

Mr. Nunn, the Chair of the Business Board, reported that the Business Board had reviewed a recommendation to permit the Vice-President, Business Affairs, to proceed with the project, subject to the approval of the Governing Council. The construction cost of \$234 per square foot, was considered acceptable, and the funding plan sound. The Board had, therefore given its approval for the executive of the proposal.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

1. THAT the Project Planning Report for the Biozone: Bioengineering Research Facility for Energy, Environmental, and Economic Sustainability be approved in principle.
2. THAT the project scope as identified in the Project Planning Report be approved in principle at a Total Project Cost of \$4,429,000 with funding as follows:

Canada Foundation for Innovation (CFI)	\$ 1,771,679
Ontario Research Fund (ORF)	\$ 1,771,679
Dept of Chemical Engineering and Applied Chemistry	\$ 485,642
<u>Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering</u>	<u>\$ 400,000</u>
Total	\$ 4,429,000

Documentation is attached to Report Number 166 of the Academic Board as [Appendix “C”](#).

**(d) Student Financial Support: Report of the Vice-Provost, Students – January, 2010**

The Chair drew members’ attention to the Report of the Vice-Provost, Students on Student Financial Support that had been provided for information as context for the consideration of the Tuition Fees Schedules and Budget Report. Governance responsibility resided with the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs, which had received the Report at its March 2, 2010 meeting, and had raised no concerns.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Secretary’s note: Members were provided additional information on Tuition and Student Aid ([PDF link](#))

**5(e) Tuition Fee Schedule for Publicly Funded Programs, 2010-11**

*(Arising from Report Number 180 of the Business Board [March 22, 2010] - Item 3(c))*

Professor Mabury and Ms Garner provided a presentation on both the Tuition Fee Schedules and the Budget Report (the PowerPoint Slides are attached hereto as [Appendix "A"](#)), noting that the University's overall budget situation as well as its policy framework provided the context for the proposed Tuition Fee Schedules.<sup>2</sup>

Mr. Nunn reported that the Business Board had recommended approval of the Tuition Fee Schedule for Publicly Funded Programs at its meeting on March 22, 2010. The Board had also received the Enrolment Report, which had indicated continuing, strong enrolment. In addition, it had received the Report on Student Financial Support and had been assured that the University continued to adhere to its Policy that no student offered admission should be unable to enter or complete a program due the lack of financial means. The Board had engaged in a substantial debate. One important focus was the connection between student aid and tuition fees. A member of the Board had urged that the Vice-Provost, Students, in future studies on student financial support, give attention, first, to student debt other than OSAP debt and, second, to the students' need for part-time work and its effect on their course load and their student experience. The President had pointed out that there were many proxies for accessibility. Most importantly, the University's data showed clearly that its student support enabled a large proportion of students from families with lower incomes and lower level of parental education to attend university. However, the President had advised the Board that he would look into the possibility of resuming the surveys of such factors as part-time work. The Board was convinced that the proposed tuition fee were necessary to enable the University, particularly in the existing financial circumstances, to continue to offer students a high-quality educational experience.

Two matters that arose in questions and discussions were the following:

- (i) **Financial aid for part-time students.** A member suggested that even though part-time students contributed 30 cents to every dollar spent on student aid, they were not covered by the student guarantee or by the funds set aside for the University of Toronto Advanced Planning for Students (UTAPS). She claimed that this was a form of systemic discrimination and provided a significant barrier to part-time students. Although a review of the Noah Meltz Bursary program had been announced, the Association of Part-Time Undergraduate Students (APUS) had not been invited to the consultations. The Noah Meltz Bursary in itself was not a guarantee parallel to the one available to full-time students. In addition, part-time students did not have access to OSAP or UTAPS funding. Within the context of flat fees, part-time students had no protection from increases in fees as it took them more than five years to complete their program of study. In 2011, there would be an unprecedented increase in fees of up to 66 per cent for part-time students. A member enquired about the time frame for the review.

---

<sup>2</sup> The following Reports detail similar presentations provided on the Budget Report and Tuition Fees Schedule at Board and Committee meetings preceding the meeting of the Governing Council: Report 135 of the Planning and Budget Committee (March 3, 2010) (<http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/Assets/Governing+Council+Digital+Assets/Boards+and+Committees/Planning+and+Budget+Committee/2009-2010+Academic+Year/r0303.pdf>); Report Number 180 of the Business Board (March 22, 2010) (<http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/Assets/Governing+Council+Digital+Assets/Boards+and+Committees/Business+Board/2009-2010+Academic+Year/r0322.pdf>); Report Number 166 of the Academic Board (March 23, 2010) (<http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/Assets/Governing+Council+Digital+Assets/Boards+and+Committees/Academic+Board/2009-2010+Academic+Year/r0323.pdf>).

**5(e) Tuition Fee Schedule for Publicly Funded Programs, 2010-11 (cont'd)**

In response, Professor Misak said that needs-based assistance was available to all part-time students. The Noah Meltz Bursary program was under review, in part, because students had asked for a review. It was hoped that a broad spectrum of part-time students would be involved in the review process. The review process was to begin within the following months and would be a priority for the Vice-Provost, Students and the University Registrar. The President added that the presumption of a steep increase due to a change in the number courses was a conceptual issue. The Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities (MTCU) did not accept the argument of a 66 per cent increase, and it was reasonable to disagree with such an argument. He added that the 30 per cent rule, which applied to marginal fee increases, had been established in the province during the era of the Harris government. The current Student Access Guarantee was based on the actual student aid and was not an arbitrary number. The University's student aid program provided more funds than those required by the Student Access Guarantee.

- (ii) **Financial aid for international students.** Referring to the Report on Student Aid, a member stated that the number of international students who had received financial support in 2007-2008 was higher than those who had received support in 2008-2009. Another member compared the \$19.1 million in revenue that would be raised from domestic fee increases with the \$9.3 million that would be raised from international student fee increase, although international students made up only 11 per cent of the student population. The member suggested that such increases for international students were unsustainable and that the University needed to consider the financial pressure borne by international students.

Professor Misak responded by stating that the issue of financial assistance for international students needs to be situated within the broader context. Governments tend not to support international students and, hence, international students are expected to cover the full costs of their education abroad. It was important to recognize that there was an international market in Universities for international students. For example, international student fees were much higher at university in the United Kingdom compared with the fees at the University of Toronto. Notwithstanding the fact that the University was moving in a direction that was in line with the fees commonly charged by institutions elsewhere, steep increases were not sustainable indefinitely.

A member sought clarification that program fees at the St. George campus were conditional, as had been previously decided by a Governing Council resolution. Professor Misak said that the commitment to review program fees remained but noted that program fees were not unprecedented at the University or Ontario. The Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Science would strike a review committee would consider data on several factors including the average course load and retention rates.

The Chair invited Mr. Adam Awad to address the Council. Mr. Awad said that, in his opinion, the moderate fee increases outlined in the Budget Report earlier in the meeting would have a significant impact on the students' ability to meet expenses related to living costs. He urged members to vote against the budget in order to send out a message to the provincial government that the University would not acquiesce to the expectation that shortfalls in revenue would be made up through students. He urged the University to improve its advocacy efforts for more funding from the government. A member concurred with Mr. Awad and compared the fees increase to a flat tax. In the member's opinion, the government needed to be reminded of its commitment towards post-secondary education.

**5(e) Tuition Fee Schedule for Publicly Funded Programs, 2010-11 (cont'd)**

Invited to speak, Mr. Jeff Peters told members that fees had continued to rise annually at the University for several years. Though the University had a guarantee to assist students with demonstrated financial need, this guarantee was lost if the students had to drop courses and lost their full-time status. In Mr. Peters' opinion, students were discontinuing their studies for the wrong reasons. Part-time students did not have access to sufficient funds and were forced to go on welfare. Access to education needed to be based on intellectual ability and not on the ability to pay. The Noah Meltz bursary only covered the cost of tuition and books. Some part-time students were left in a position where they had to choose between paying for their daily expenses and paying tuition fees.

As the discussion drew to a close, a member thanked the student members of the Council and speakers for their comments. She said that the decisions before the members were admittedly not very easy to make.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

THAT the Tuition-Fee Schedule For Publicly Funded Programs in 2010-11 as described in Professor Misak's March 3, 2010 report to the Business Board, and the tuition fees in 2010-11 and 2011-12 for the special programs identified in Tables B2 and C2 of Appendices B and C of the report, be approved.

Documentation is attached hereto as [Appendix "B"](#).

**(f) Tuition Fee Schedule for Self-Funded Programs, 2010-11**

*Arising from Report Number 180 of the Business Board [March 22, 2010] - Item 3(d)*

Mr. Nunn reported that the Business Board has also recommended approval of the tuition fee schedule for self-funded programs. These programs received no government funding, and their fees were set to recover at least their direct costs.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

THAT the tuition-fee schedule for self-funded programs for 2010-11, a copy of which is attached to Professor Misak's February 5, 2010 memorandum to the Business Board as Table 1, be approved.

Documentation is attached hereto as [Appendix "C"](#).

**(g) Budget Report, 2010-11, and Long Range Budget Guidelines, 2010-11 to 2014-15**  
*(Arising from Report Number 166 of the Academic Board [March 23, 2010] - Item 8, and from Report Number 180 of the Business Board [March 22, 2010] – Item 4)*

Professor Lemieux-Charles reported that at the Academic Board meeting Professor Misak had provided some introductory remarks, that the University had not been immune to financial pressures faced by universities around the world over the previous year. Ms Garner and Professor Mabury had then provided an informative presentation of the proposed presentation of the proposed 2010-2011 Budget Report and Long Range Budget Guidelines. The Academic Board had held a full discussion on points related to revenue and expense items, student enrolment, and the University Fund. Some student members had expressed concern about the budget assumption of increased tuition fees, noting that increases for incoming and international students would be even greater than the average 4.31 per cent increase anticipated for continuing domestic students. A student had also stated that the program fee that had been introduced in 2009-10 in the Faculty of Arts and Science was perceived by many as a mechanism for increasing tuition fees. In response, Professor Misak had explained that the practice of charging a program fee was a common one, both in many programs at the University and elsewhere in Ontario. She had emphasized that it was another way of collecting tuition, and not a tuition fee increase.

Some Academic Board members had asked for an elaboration of the University's plan to spend a total of \$30 million to replace the existing repository of student information system (ROSI). Professor Mabury had emphasized the urgent need for a multi-functional system that would enable enhanced connectivity and that would have the necessary foundation to support future technologies. The University was in part responding to students' feedback for an improved system that could handle heavy usage during peak periods. In response to a member's query about the University-wide expense of shared-infrastructure investments, Professor Misak had explained that the \$18.9 million allocated for 2010-11 should be viewed as an increase over two years rather than one. As a result of the University's constrained financial situation in 2009-10, spending on such initiatives had been limited during that year. Professor Misak had noted that a large portion of the cost would be used to launch a major fundraising campaign – composed of human and advertising resources. It was expected that the campaign would be a prudent investment that would allow the University to make marked advances across all divisions.

Mr. Nunn said that the Business was responsible for advising the Governing Council on the financial prudence of the budget plan. The Board, like the Council, had also received a full and careful presentation from Professor Misak, Professor Mabury and Ms Garner. It had also received a detailed evaluation from the President. The President had advised the Board that there were many uncertainties in the budget assumptions. Some the assumptions had since been cleared – for example the tuition-fee framework and been extended as predicted. Others remained – for example, the application of the solvency test to the University's pension plan. In recognition of those uncertainties, however, the President had assured the Board that the budget was as prudent as possible. The Board was assured that, where necessary, the divisions had in hand the plans that were necessary to deal with their share of the University's deficit from before the current budget plan. Those divisions that had been forced to borrow the previous year to cope with the absence of an endowment payout had made plans to repay those funds. Finally, the University and its divisions were aware that there was a structural element to the deficit that would have to be dealt with – if possible through the successful advocacy for realistic funding or, if not, by further expense containment.

Members thanked the administration for presenting a balanced budget.

**5(g) Budget Report, 2010-11, and Long Range Budget Guidelines, 2010-11 to 2014-15 (cont'd)**

The President provided information on the projected pension deficit in response to members' questions. He said that the University's Defined Benefit pension plan was firm in its commitment towards retirees. The funding for the pension plan came from several sources – investment income; employee contributions; employer (University) contributions; and special payments. The ratio of the University's contribution towards the pension plan was 2:1 with respect to the contribution made by the employees. This was not sustainable and had been brought up in the ongoing discussions by the government. The University wanted the government to have the pension solvency test waived, had been done in five other provinces. The President said that there was no basis to subject an institution such as the University of Toronto, with, for example, billions in real estate assets, to the kind of solvency test presently in place. The University's assets would easily cover its pension obligations if, in the highly unlikely event, it were to close. In response to a question, the President said that the University was not planning to move towards a Defined Contribution pension plan.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

THAT the Budget Report 2010-11 be approved; and

THAT the Long Range Budget Guidelines, 2010-11 to 2014-15, be approved in principle.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 166 of the Academic Board as [Appendix "D"](#).

**6. Reviews of Academic Units and Programs, July 2008 – December 2009: Annual Report**

The Chair said that the Guidelines for the Review of Academic Units and Programs 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 improvement." Members had received in their agenda packages a summary of the reviews completed between July 2008 and December 2009 and the administrative responses to those reviews. Members had also received a copy of Report Number 144 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs. That Committee had considered the reviews in detail at its meeting on March 2, 2010. The heads of relevant academic divisions had been in attendance at that meeting to answer questions. The same documentation had been reviewed by the Agenda Committee of the Academic Board.

Professor Lemieux-Charles reported that at the decision of the Agenda Committee, a report on the "review of reviews" that had been carried out by the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs was provided to the Academic Board. Professor Andrea Sass-Kortsak, Chair of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs, had informed the Board that the University's programs continued to be regarded as outstanding ones, among the best in Canada, in North America, and internationally. The Committee on Academic Policy and Programs had been entirely satisfied with the review process, documentation, follow-up of fifteen of the nineteen reviews. In four cases – the Faculty of Forestry, the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, UTM's Institute of Communication and Culture, and UTSC's Department of Humanities – the Committee's awaited further information including additional updates and responses. Professor Lemieux-Charles concluded by acknowledging the stellar work for Professor Regehr and the staff in the Office of the Vice-President and Provost in guiding the review process and in the preparation of the comprehensive compendium of reviews.

**6. Reviews of Academic Units and Programs, July 2008 – December 2009: Annual Report (cont'd)**

The Chair invited any questions or comments on the process of monitoring the quality of academic programs and units, or about the Reviews themselves and the administrative responses. There was no discussion on the matter.

Documentation is attached hereto as [Appendix "D"](#).

**7. Reports for Information**

The Governing Council received items for information in the following four reports:

- (a) [Report Number 162 of the Academic Board \(March 23, 2010\)](#)
- (b) [Report Number 156 of the University Affairs Board \(March 16, 2010\)](#)
- (c) [Report Number 180 of the Business Board \(March 22, 2010\)](#)
- (d) [Report Number 429 of the Executive Committee \(March 25, 2010\)](#)

**8. Date of Next Meeting**

The Chair reminded members that the next meeting of the Governing Council was scheduled for Thursday, May 13, 2010 at the University of Toronto at Scarborough.

**Question Period**

There were no questions for members of the senior administration.

**9. Other Business**

At this point, the Chair invited Mr. Robert Ramsay to address the Council in relation to the cancellation of courses at UTSC. Mr. Ramsay requested that Dr. Leslie Jermyn, Chair-Elect, CUPE 3902, be recognized to address the Council.

Dr. Jermyn expressed her concern on the announcement that seven language courses at UTSC were to be cancelled. In her opinion, this decision was arbitrary as no consultations had taken place with students and teaching staff. Students were left with the option of either changing their academic plans or to take these courses at another campus, if they could find alternatives. For sessional instructors, the cancellation of courses amounted to layoffs with serious financial implications. The timing of the announcement meant that many sessional instructors would not be able to find summer term assignments. Dr. Jermyn said that, in her opinion, the University's rationale to cancel the language courses as they were not tied to programs did not hold any merit. She urged members to recognize the value of language courses as means of enriching the existing programs at UTSC. Dr. Jermyn wanted the University to reverse its decision.

Professor Misak responded by saying that the Dean at the UTSC planned to review its decision to cancel some of the courses. However, the courses under review had been put in place as pilot projects. The University did recognize the value of language courses for scholarship and was proud of the depth of its course offerings. Careful academic planning was needed in deciding the courses that were offered at each of the campuses.

Members were of the opinion that the University needed to ensure languages such as French were offered at all campuses given that Canada was a bilingual country.



IN ACCORDANCE WITH A DETERMINATION BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, PURSUANT TO SECTIONS 38 AND 40 OF BY LAW NUMBER 2, ITEM 10 WAS CONSIDERED BY THE GOVERNING COUNCIL *IN-CAMERA*.

**10. *Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters: Recommendations for Expulsion***

On individual motions duly moved, seconded and carried

It was Resolved

THAT the President's recommendations for expulsions, as outlined in the memoranda and supporting documentation from the Secretary of the Governing Council, dated April 1, 2010 for April 8, 2010, be confirmed.

The meeting adjourned at 7:20 p.m.

---

Secretary

---

Chair

April 23, 2010