

**UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO**

**THE GOVERNING COUNCIL**

**OCTOBER 27, 2011**

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE GOVERNING COUNCIL held on October 27, 2011 at 4:00 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, University of Toronto.

**Present:**

Mr. Richard B. Nunn ( In the Chair)  
Professor C. David Naylor, President  
Mr. Donald Andrew  
Ms Diana A.R. Alli  
Professor Robert Baker  
Professor Philip H. Byer  
Ms Celina Rayonne Ceasar-Chavaness  
Mr. P. C. Choo  
Professor Elizabeth Cowper  
Mr. Ken Davy  
Mr. Cary Ferguson  
Miss Maria Pilar Galvez  
Professor William Gough  
Professor Hugh Gunz  
Professor Ellen Hodnett  
Ms Shirley Hoy  
Professor Edward Iacobucci  
Professor Louise Lemieux-Charles  
Mr. Aly-Khan Madhavji  
Professor Michael Marrus  
Professor Cheryl Misak  
Mr. Gary P. Mooney  
Ms N. Jane Pepino  
Professor Andrea Sass-Kortsak  
Mr. Howard Shearer  
Professor Elizabeth M. Smyth  
Miss Maureen J. Somerville  
Professor Janice Gross Stein  
Mr. W. John Switzer  
Mr. W. Keith Thomas  
Ms Morgan Vanek  
Mr. Chirag Variawa  
Ms B. Elizabeth Vosburgh  
Mr. W. David Wilson

**Secretariat:**

Mr. Louis R. Charpentier  
Mr. Anwar Kazimi

**Absent:**

The Honourable David R. Peterson, Chancellor  
Mr. Brent Belzberg  
Ms Judy Goldring  
Mr. Steve (Suresh) Gupta  
Mr. Nykolaj Kuryluk  
Mr. Jorge Prieto  
Mr. Manveen Puri  
Ms Melinda Rogers  
Ms Rita Tsang  
Professor Franco J. Vaccarino  
Dr. Sarita Verma

**In Attendance:**

Professor Angela Hildyard, Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity  
Mr. David Palmer, Vice-President, Advancement  
Ms Catherine Riggall, Vice-President, Business Affairs  
Professor Paul Young, Vice-President, Research  
Professor Edith Hillan, Vice-Provost, Faculty and Academic Life  
Professor Scott Mabury, Vice-Provost, Academic Operations  
Professor Jill Matus, Vice-Provost, Students  
Professor Cheryl Regehr, Vice-Provost, Academic Programs  
Ms Barbara Dick, Assistant Vice-President, Alumni Relations  
Ms Lucy Fromowitz, Assistant Vice-President, Student  
Ms Gail Milgrom, Assistant Vice-President, Campus and Facilities Planning  
Ms Gillian Morrison, Assistant Vice-President, Divisional Relations and Campaigns  
Ms Marny Scully, Assistant Vice-President, Government, Institutional and Community Relations  
Mr. Bill Simmons, Assistant Vice-President, Advancement  
Mr. Townsend Benard, Faculty of Physical Education and Health  
Mr. Garvin De Four, Assistant Ombudsperson  
Ms Sheree Drummond, Assistant Provost  
Mr. Trefor Evans, Human Powered Vehicle Design Team  
Professor Emeritus Joan Foley, University Ombudsperson  
Ms Nora Gillispie, Legal Counsel, Office of the Vice-President and Provost  
Dr. Anthony Gray, Special Advisor to the President  
Dr. Jane Harrison, Director, Academic Programs and Policy, Office of the Vice-President and Provost  
Ms Clara Ho, Vice-President, University Affairs, Students' Administrative Council (SAC) which  
operates as the University of Toronto Students' Union (UTSU)  
Professor Ira Jacobs, Dean, Faculty of Physical Education and Health  
Mr. Christopher Lang, Director, Office of Appeals, Discipline, and Faculty Grievances  
Ms Rosannagh MacLennan, Faculty of Physical Education and Health  
Mr. Steve Moate, Senior Legal Counsel, Office of the President  
Mr. Aidan Muller, Human Powered Vehicle Design Team  
Mr. Todd Reichert, Human Powered Vehicle Design Team  
Mr. Victor Ragusila, Human Powered Vehicle Design Team  
Ms Laurie Stephens, Director, Media Relations and Stakeholder Communications

**1. Chair's Remarks**

The Chair welcomed members and outlined the agenda for the meeting. He said that two speaking requests from UTSU had been received after the October 19, 2011 meeting of the Executive Committee. As an exception, the requests had been granted. UTSU had been reminded about the process for making requests, and the on-line request form available on the Governing Council website.

**2. Report of the President**

*(a) Student Presentation*

The President began his report by introducing four members of the Human Powered Vehicle Design Team (HPVDT) consisting of undergraduate and graduate students from the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering – Mr. Aidan Muller (Materials Science & Engineering), Mr. Trefor Evans (Engineering Science), Mr. Todd Reichert (Aerospace Science & Engineering), and Mr. Victor Ragusila (Aerospace Science & Engineering).

The [PowerPoint presentations](#) made by the HPVDT are appended to these minutes. The presenters said that HPVDT had been established in 2006 with a goal to achieve flying by flapping wings. That project had spanned a period of four years and had involved research in structural dynamics and aerodynamics in the creation of the human-powered ornithopter. An aviation “first” had been achieved with a successful flight in 2010. The aerodynamic bicycle project presented at the meeting was an example of the practical application of knowledge coupled with the control and power of the human body. Advanced computer modeling and a special composite material had allowed the team to create a design that provided speed and stability. The HPVDT had competed successfully against several universities and in other races across North America. A maximum speed of 116.9 km/h was achieved by the HPVDT-designed “Vortex” at the 2011 World Human Powered Speed Challenge in Nevada, placing the team third.

The Council greeted the HPVDT presentation with applause, and on behalf of the Council the Chair congratulated the team on its achievements.

*(b) Awards and Honours*

The President drew members' attention to the Awards and Honours list and noted that 18 Fellows and a medalist from the University had been appointed to the Royal Society of Canada. [The list of the appointees is appended to these minutes.](#) The President informed members that the Chair had recently been elected a Fellow of the Institute of Chartered Accountants of Ontario, the highest designation conferred by that Institute.

*(c) Research and Development Report*

The President had served on the expert panel leading the Review of Federal Support to Research and Development Panel. The final Report of that panel had been well received. *The Bulletin* had featured an interview with the President after the publication of the Report. A copy of that article was provided to the members and is appended to these minutes.

**2. Report of the President (Cont'd)**

*(d) Provincial Election*

A Liberal government had been re-elected in Ontario on October 6, 2011. The President said that the Liberal party had campaigned on a 30% tuition grant to families across a wide income range. In addition, a pledge had been made to modernize the funding formula for universities as a means of addressing differentiation. The Manitoba government had announced that, starting in April 2012, all international students attending high school and post-secondary institutions in that province would receive free Manitoba Health coverage, as would their spouses and dependents. That would provide Manitoba with a competitive edge in recruiting international students. The President noted that several of the University of Toronto's student unions, led by the Graduate Students' Union, had long been advocating for similar coverage for international students in Ontario. The President reiterated his strong support for this position and he hoped that the recent measures in Manitoba would prompt corresponding action by the Ontario government.

*(e) Labour Relations*

[The President's remarks on labour relations](#) are appended to these minutes.

*(f) Rankings*

The President reported that four of the influential ranking systems had released results for 2011: *Times Higher Education World University Rankings*; *QS World University Rankings*; *Shanghai Jiao Tong Academic Ranking of World Universities*, and *SCImago Institution Rankings*. He noted that in all but one the University of Toronto ranked first in Canada. Furthermore, the University's excellence was even more pronounced in the finer grained disciplinary rankings. The University was one of only a handful of universities ranked world-wide among the top 25 in every broad subject area considered and was the top Canadian institution in each of these areas.

Members applauded as the Chair commended the high rankings received by the University.

*(g) Campus Events and Achievements*

In closing, the President highlighted the following:

- Student societies had hosted lively orientation-related activities across all three campuses.
- New instructional buildings had been opened at UTSC and UTM.
- Ms Rosannagh MacLennan (Faculty of Physical Education and Health) had won a gold medal in the trampoline event at the Pan American Games held in Guadalajara, Mexico.
- The Varsity Blues baseball team had won the Ontario University Athletics (OUA) championship.
- The Varsity Blues football team had a strong season, along the way winning both their season opener and finale.
- The Chancellor had served as Honorary Chair of the Toronto chapter of the *CIBC Run for the Cure* for the second year in a row and had led the University community's fund raising efforts. The St. George and Mississauga campuses once again hosted the event.

### **3. Recruitment, Admissions, and First-Year Programs – Presentation and Discussion**

In her introductory remarks, Professor Misak said that the administration was currently engaged in an exercise to explore progress in the goals and directions set in the *Towards 2030* initiative. The administration would continue to seek substantive feedback from governance bodies and stakeholders in this regard. It was intended that segments of the update on the *Towards 2030* initiative would be presented to the Governing Council at upcoming meetings in advance of the final consolidated report. The presentation on Recruitment, Admissions and First-Year Programs was the first of these updates.

Professor Matus made a [PowerPoint presentation](#) to the Council which is appended to this report.

In a free ranging discussion the following matters were raised

- A member suggested that the Constituent Relationship Management (CRM) system, used for recruitment, could also be an effective tool for alumni engagement. Professor Matus said that the use of CRM was being considered for Student Life matters and its use for alumni-related activities would also be considered in the future.
- In response to a question, Professor Naylor emphasized that the University's commitment to accessibility remained strong and that financial aid in the form of need-based and merit-based scholarships and bursaries would remain a major priority. This would be reflected in the upcoming campaign. A coordinated effort was required to ensure that the apparent cost of tuition alone did not discourage prospective students from applying to the University. It was important to communicate to applicants and their families information on the available resources that made post-secondary education accessible.
- Members commended the efforts of the administration in revitalizing recruitment strategies. The efforts had resulted in a renewed interest from the brightest applicants to consider the University as their first choice for post-secondary studies. The President noted the positive results in the University's efforts in improving student experience, as was suggested by the data received from National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). He acknowledged the efforts of the administration and student societies in this regard.

### **4. Report of the University Ombudsperson for the Period of July 1, 2010 to June 30, 2011 and Administrative Response**

The Chair welcomed Professor Emeritus Joan Foley, University Ombudsperson, and Mr. Garvin De Four, Assistant 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 provided to the members.

**4 Report of the University Ombudsperson for the Period of July 1, 2010 to June 30, 2011 and Administrative Response (Cont'd)**

At the invitation of the Chair, Professor Foley thanked the Council and commented briefly on the Report:

- In addition to responding to complaints, the Office of the University Ombudsperson identified issues that arose from those complaints – systemic issues - that might potentially affect other members of the community. The Report included quantitative and qualitative information on the Office's case load for 2010-11 as well as a discussion of the systemic issues that had engaged the Office during that period
- Over her four years in office, the administration had responded positively to all of her recommendations on the issues that had arisen. In many instances, the administration had acted on the basis of discussions and in the absence of any formal recommendations. However, some matters that required the creation or review of policies and procedures warranted an extended process for their resolution. The Report aimed to keep governors informed about the status of those matters.
- As an example, *Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters* (1995) included both policy and detailed procedures. In 2008, the Report had recommended a review of the *Code*. The recommendation had been accepted by the administration and a final report arising from the review of the *Code* would be presented to the Provost. The nature of the recommendations and the Provost's response would determine what, if any, governance steps were necessary.
- A new matter concerning student health plans had been included in the Report. The terms of reference of the Ombudsperson's office limited jurisdiction to, among other things matters where "the resolution of the member's complaint is within the authority of the Governing Council." Student health plans did not fall within the purview of the Council's authority. Rather, these were programs of student organizations which were separately incorporated bodies. Council approved proposed fees for student health plans on the assurance that the relevant societies' approval processes had been followed. However, in light of the University's commitment to equity and its responsibilities under provincial legislation, it was important for governors to be aware of the issues that had arisen. The Report explained the complexity of the situation as three separate student plans existed for undergraduates. This caused a problem for students with disabilities who required accommodation in the form of a reduced course load. The Office of the Ombudsperson would continue to take an interest in the matter and to explore any ways in which the University would be able to ameliorate the negative impact of the current situation on the students affected.

In closing, Professor Foley thanked the administration for its response to the Report. A member commended the Report and, in particular, appreciated the acknowledgment of systemic issues, and matters related to student health plans and program fees. Another member stated that the University was privileged to have Professor Foley serve as the Ombudsperson.

The Chair thanked Professor Foley for her Report.

**5. Items for Governing Council Approval**

**(a) Campaign – Plans and Priorities**

Professor Misak said that the University had been able to retain its strength in spite of inadequate public funding because of the generosity of its friends and benefactors. The University was now poised to launch an unprecedented \$2-billion campaign. The priorities of the campaign had been identified by the academic divisions as part of their academic planning processes. These priorities included a strong focus on funding for student support, as well as a number of capital and infrastructure renewal projects.

Mr. Palmer said that approval of the University's campaign priorities had followed a process similar to its last campaign which had begun in 1997. At \$3.2 billion the total funding priorities were deliberately in excess of the campaign target.

- Funding priorities associated with faculty positions totaled \$1.2 billion. The key driver for those priorities remained the University's teaching and research mission. Some academic divisions sought assistance in recruiting the next generation of faculty leadership through the "Rising Stars Fund."
- Divisions had identified substantial priorities for student financial support totaling over \$450 million to provide merit and need-based scholarships and bursaries.
- The costs identified for capital projects totaled over \$1 billion. Support for those projects would be sought from private benefactors and from all three levels of government.
- The quiet phase of the campaign began at the start of the 2005-2006 fiscal year, coincidental with the appointment of Professor Naylor as President. So far close to \$948 had been raised. The public phase of the campaign would be launched on November 20, 2011.
- Principals, Deans, Academic Directors & Chairs, and their advancement teams, would be on the frontlines of the campaign.

Mr. Wilson summarized the presentation and discussion at the Business Board meeting held on September 26, 2011. Professor Hodnett summarized the discussion at the Academic Board meeting held on October 6, 2011.

The Chair invited Ms Clara Ho, Vice-President, University Affairs, Students' Administrative Council (University of Toronto Students' Union), to address the Council. Ms Ho asked two questions:

- (a) Referring to the Campaign Priorities Summary document, what were the timelines set for divisions to submit their funding priorities for approval? Would divisions have multiple opportunities to submit these requests? Ms Ho said that some students had expressed concern about some figures identified in the summary document for some divisions in need of funds.

Professor Misak replied that the campaign plans and priorities would continue to evolve. The University would continue to be responsive to any opportunity that would arise as a result of the campaign as long as those opportunities fit with the division's priorities. Mr. Palmer added that new divisional heads would be given the opportunity to bring forth their funding priorities as they were identified.

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

**(a) Campaign – Plans and Priorities (Cont'd)**

- (b) What strategies did the University have in place to secure greater public funding from the federal and provincial governments? Would the University administration work jointly with students to lobby the two levels of government for an increase in funding?

Ms Wolfson responded that the administration was always in favour of working with students to impress upon the provincial and federal governments the importance of funding for students. The University continued to work actively with both levels of government. Discussions had taken place with student groups on the kinds of representations that could be made to the government in this regard. Professor Naylor added that the University continued to invest substantial time and effort to leverage more funding from the provincial and federal governments. These efforts included the procurement of additional funding to cover overhead costs associated with research. The Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC) had also identified specific areas for greater federal government support which the University endorsed. These included student loans, study abroad opportunities, and graduate scholarships.

On motion duly moved, seconded and carried

It was Resolved

THAT (i) the ‘Overview of Campaign Plans’ and (ii) the ‘Campaign Priorities Summary as of September 2, 2011’, copies of which are Appendices ‘A’ and ‘B’ to Professor Misak’s and Mr. Palmer’s memorandum dated September 19, 2011, be approved as the planning framework for the University’s fundraising campaign.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 191 of the Business Board as [Appendix “A”](#).

**(b) Project Planning Report: Varsity Centre - Goldring Centre for High Performance Sport**

Professor Hodnett described the project and provided key points of the discussion at the Academic Board. Ms Vosburgh summarized the discussion at the University Affairs Board.

In the discussion that followed members raised the following questions: asked whether the proposed facility include gender-neutral washrooms, Ms Milgrom replied that gender-neutral washrooms would be designated in the proposed facility.

- What was the status of the discussion with the Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students (APUS) on the relocation of its office, which was currently on the site of the proposed facility. Would the project be delayed as a result of the need to relocate the APUS office? Professor Misak responded that the University would continue its discussions with APUS and offer alternative sites for the relocation. APUS presented a list of specifications for their new location, including garden space. The University had offered APUS an alternative with garden space. However, it had been rejected by APUS as were a number of other alternate spaces. APUS would move into some quarters as construction would commence at the site. No delay was expected.



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

**(b) Project Planning Report: Varsity Centre - Goldring Centre for High Performance Sport (Cont'd)**

The Chair invited Ms Clara Ho to address the Council. Ms Ho asked two questions:

- (a) The Goldring Centre for High Performance Sport was being presented as a student-focused space. If the request for an increase in student fees was rejected by the Council of Student Services (COSS) and if the costs associated with the operation of the Centre had to be generated with a greater amount of rental revenue, would ability of students to access the Centre's space and services be affected?

Professor Misak said that the operational costs for the new building could only be estimated. If a referendum was then deemed necessary to increase student fees to cover some of the Centre's operational costs, and if it was not successful, there would be far less student access to the facility. The Faculty would continue to build a compelling case to the student body for an increase in student fees, once the operational costs were more clearly known. The University's aim was to have the Centre for the use of its students and community.

- (b) The project planning report outlined the first phase of a Tower costing \$9.0 million. What would be the nature of the academic activities in the proposed Tower? Would the Munk School of Global Affairs have exclusive access to the Tower or would other academic departments be able to make use to the space?

Professor Misak clarified that plans for the use of space in the proposed Tower had not been finalized and the University aimed to use the space in the Tower for a variety of academic Divisions. There continued to be an acute need for space at the St. George campus.

On motion duly moved, seconded and carried

It was Resolved

- (i) THAT the Project Planning Report, dated September 14, 2011, for the Goldring Centre for High Performance Sport at the St. George campus be approved in principle to accommodate the activities and functions as described.
- (ii) THAT the project scope for the Goldring Centre for High Performance Sport, comprising approximately 6,700 net assignable square metres (nasm)( or 11,189 gross square metres (gsm)) plus a portion of shared site servicing provisions and a central elevator/stair core to be constructed concurrently with the Goldring Centre as the first phase of a future Tower, be approved at a provisional total project cost of \$60.8 million.
- (iii) THAT the project scope for the remaining work of the first phase of the future Tower to include foundation, and shared site servicing and central elevator/stair core be approved at a provisional total project cost of \$9.0 million.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 175 of the Academic Board as [Appendix "D"](#).

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

**(c) Terms of Reference of Boards and Committees**

The Chair said that the *Report of the Task Force on Governance* had been approved by the Governing Council on October 28, 2011. The proposed revisions to the Terms of Reference for the Board and Committees had resulted from the work of the Implementation Committee that had been mandated by the Council to oversee the adoption of the recommendations. The Executive Committee and the Council had received regular updates on the work of Implementation Committee at meetings since the approval of the *Report*. The Committee would continue its work related to the *Report's* recommendation on Tri-Campus matters and would continue to provide updates to the Council. All proposed revisions to the Terms of Reference had been presented to the various governance bodies for information and for their input in the current governance cycle.

On motion duly moved, seconded and carried

It was Resolved

THAT the revised Terms of Reference for Governing Council Boards and Committees, contained in the Office Consolidation dated October 14, 2011 be approved.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 441 of the Executive Committee as [Appendix "A"](#).

Items 6 to 10 were on the consent agenda.

**6. Faculty of Medicine: Proposal to Establish the Institute of Health Policy, Management and Evaluation as an Extra-Departmental Unit: A**

On motion duly moved, seconded and carried

It was Resolved

THAT the status of the existing Department of Health Policy, Management and Evaluation in the Faculty of Medicine be changed to an Extra-Departmental Unit: A (EDU: A) effective immediately.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 175 of the Academic Board as [Appendix "E"](#).

**7. Notice of Motion: Revisions to By-Law Number 2**

Pursuant to section 76(a) of By-Law Number 2, the Executive Committee gave notice of motion for the proposed revisions to By-Law Number 2, as described in the memorandum dated October 13, 2011.

The memorandum is [appended](#) to these minutes.

**8. Minutes of the Previous Meeting of September 7, 2011**

The minutes of the September 7, 2011 meeting were approved.

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

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

**10. Reports for Information**

The Council received the following reports for information:

- a. [Report Number 175 of the Academic Board \(October 6, 2011\)](#)
- b. [Report Number 191 of the Business Board \(September 26, 2011\)](#)
- c. [Report Number 165 of the University Affairs Board \(September 27, 2011\)](#)
- d. [Report Number 441 of the Executive Committee \(October 19, 2011\)](#)

**11. Date of the Next Meeting**

The Chair reminded the members that the next meeting of the Governing Council was scheduled for Thursday, December 15, 2011 at 4:30 p.m.

**12. Question Period**

There were no questions for the members of the administration.

**13. Other Business**

There were no items of Other Business.

**14. Closing Remarks**

The Chair thanked members and guests for attending the meeting.

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

**15. 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 degree recall and expulsion, as outlined in the memoranda and supporting documentation from the Secretary of the Governing Council, dated October 20 for October 27, 2011, be confirmed.

The meeting adjourned at 6:03p.m.

---

Secretary

---

Chair

December 5, 2011