

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO  
**THE GOVERNING COUNCIL**

**Thursday September 19, 2002**

MINUTES OF THE GOVERNING COUNCIL meeting held on Thursday,  
September 19, 2002 at 4:30 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall.

Present:

Dr. Thomas H. Simpson (In the Chair)  
Ms Rose M. Patten , Vice-Chair  
Professor Robert J. Birgeneau, President  
Professor Mary Beattie  
Dr. Robert Bennett  
Mr. Mark Braun  
Professor Philip Byer  
Professor Brian Corman  
Professor W. Raymond Cummins  
Mr. Brian Davis  
Dr. Claude Davis  
Professor Sherwin Desser  
Dr. Alice Dong  
Dr. Inez Elliston  
Ms Susan Eng  
Professor Luigi Girolametto  
Mr. Gerald Halbert  
Ms Durré Hanif  
Professor Ellen Hodnett  
Ms Shirley Hoy  
Professor David Jenkins  
Professor Brian Langille  
Ms Karen Lewis  
Professor Ian R. McDonald  
Professor Michael Marrus  
Mr. David Melville  
Mr. Sean Mullin  
Mr. Colm Murphy  
Mr. George Myhal

Dr. John P. Nestor  
Professor Shirley Neuman  
Mr. Elan Ohayon  
Ms Jacqueline C. Orange  
Mr. John F. (Jack) Petch  
The Honourable David R. Peterson  
Mr. Chris Ramsaroop  
Mr. Timothy Reid  
Mrs. Susan M. Scace  
Mr. Amir Shalaby  
Ms Carol Stephenson  
Professor Carolyn Tuohy  
Professor John Wedge  
Mr. Robert S. Weiss

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

Secretariat:

Mr. Neil Dobbs  
Ms Cristina Oke

Absent:

The Honourable William G. Davis  
Dr. Shari Graham Fell  
Mr. Paul V. Godfrey  
The Honourable Henry N. R. Jackman  
Dr. Joseph L. Rotman  
Mr. John H. Tory

In Attendance:

Mr. Felix Chee, Vice-President, Business Affairs  
Professor Angela Hildyard, Vice-President, Human Resources  
Dr. Sheldon Levy, Vice-President, Government and Institutional Relations and Interim Vice-Provost, Students  
Professor Ian Orchard, Vice-President and Principal, University of Toronto at Mississauga  
Professor Paul Thompson, Vice-President and Principal, University of Toronto at Scarborough  
Professor Vivek Goel, Vice-Provost, Faculty  
Professor Ronald Venter, Vice-Provost, Space and Facilities Planning  
Professor Rona Abramovitch, Director, Transitional Year Program  
Mr. Dan Bandurka, President, Scarborough Campus Students' Union  
Ms Karim Bhanji, Vice-President Academics, Scarborough Campus Students' Union  
Mr. John Bisanti, Chief Capital Projects Officer  
Ms Michelle Broderick, Research and Planning Officer  
Mr. Martin England, Assistant Vice-Provost, Strategic Planning  
Dr. Beata FitzPatrick, Director of the Office of the President and Assistant Vice-President  
Ms Rivi Frankle, Assistant Vice-President, Alumni and Development  
Ms Susan Girard, Assistant Secretary of the Governing Council  
Ms Georgina Gray, Director, University Events and Presidential Liaison, Advancement  
Dr. Connie Guberman, Status of Women Officer  
Mr. Mohammed Hashim, University Affairs Commissioner, Students' Administrative Council  
Mr. Rocco Kusi-Achampong, President, Students' Administrative Union  
Mr. John Lea, Vice-President, Operations, Students' Administration Union  
Professor George Luste, President, University of Toronto Faculty Association  
Professor Derek McCammond, Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget  
Ms Mary McGee, Assistant Provost  
Ms Erin McGinn, Director, Operations and Government Relations  
Ms Margaret McKone, Administrative Manager, Officer of the Governing Council  
Ms Ruth Perkins, Executive Assistant, Graduate Students' Union  
Ms Catherine Riggall, Assistant Vice-President, Facilities and Services  
Ms Emily Sadowski, President, Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students  
Ms Maureen Somerville, Chair, College of Electors  
Mr. Preet Viridi, Management Representative, Scarborough Campus Students' Union

**1. Chair's Remarks****(a) Welcome**

The Chair welcomed members to the first regular meeting of the academic year. He offered a special word of welcome to Vice-President and Provost Shirley Neuman, the newest member of the President's team, and reminded members that Professor Neuman played an extremely important role in governance as senior assessor to Academic Board and to the Planning and Budget Committee as well as a member of the Governing Council.

**1. Chair's Remarks (cont'd)****(b) Order in Council: Appointment of Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council Appointees**

The Chair introduced the three newest Lieutenant-Governor in Council appointees: Mr. Gerald Halbert, Mr. George Myhal and Mr. Jack Petch, all of whom had been appointed from July 1, 2002 to June 30, 2005. He noted the reappointment of Dr. Claude Davis, the Honorable William Davis, Dr. Shari Graham Fell, Dr. Paul Godfrey, the Honorable David Peterson, and Mr. Robert Weiss for a three year period ending on June 30, 2005.

**(c) Introductions**

The Chair invited members to introduce themselves, indicate their estate on the Council, and state the Boards and Committees on which they served. At the invitation of the Chair, the President introduced the members of his administrative team who were present.

**(d) Restoration and Refurbishment of Council Chamber**

At the invitation of the Chair, the Secretary of the Governing Council introduced the members of the Project Team who had been responsible for the restoration and refurbishment of the Council Chamber: Mr. Ash Arokiaswamy, Assistant LAN Administrator; Mr. Sam Davis, Site Supervisor, Steelcase; Professor Jack Gorrie, Provost's Advisor on Information Technology; Mr. David Harrison, President, First Vision; Mr. Peter Heyes, Marshall Cummings; Mr. Ernie Lopez, Manager, Classroom Technology Support Group, Office of Space Management; Mr. Chris McGowan, Duplicating Supervisor, Office of the Governing Council; Mr. Steve McKee, Marshall Cummings; Ms Margaret McKone, Administrative Manager, Office of the Governing Council; Mr. Scott Murley, First Vision; Mr. Randy Poland, Project Manager; Ms. Elizabeth Sisam, Director of Campus and Facilities Planning; Mr. Themis Tzovolos, President, Steelcase; and Professor Ronald Venter, Co-chair, Project Planning Committee.

The Secretary thanked the team who had worked so diligently and committedly to bring the project to a close on time and on budget, and noted his gratitude for being able to work with such an effective team.

Members and guests joined the Chair in applauding the work of the Project Team.

The Chair noted that, as a result of the technological enhancements in the Council Chamber, an audio broadcast of the meeting was being made available on the internet.

**(e) 2002 Arbour Award Winners**

The Chair congratulated current members Dr. Paul Godfrey, Ms Jacqueline Orange, and Mr. Amir Shalaby, as well as Mr. Gerald Lokash, past member of the Governing Council, on receiving 2002 Arbour Awards.

**1. Chair's Remarks (cont'd)****(f) Time of Adjournment**

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was APPROVED

THAT the meeting adjourn no later than 6:30 p.m.

**2. Minutes of the Previous Meetings, June 27, 2002 and September 4, 2002**

The meetings of the previous meetings held on June 27, 2002 and September 4, 2002 were approved.

**3. Business Arising from the Previous Meetings**

The Chair reported that the one item of business arising from the June 27, 2002 minutes had been addressed at the Executive Committee meeting held on September 11, 2002 – a question concerning the permissibility under By-law Number 2 of video feed of Governing Council meetings. The discussion was included in Report Number 352 of the Executive Committee.

The Chair noted that a member had called the Office of the Governing Council and raised a question concerning the discussion reported under Item 20 – Reports for Information in the June 27 minutes. The Chair indicated that the question had been addressed. There was no other business arising.

A member asked what mechanisms had been in place to ensure that health and safety standards had been upheld during the demolition of Varsity Stadium. The member also asked if a safety audit concerning the demolition of the stadium was available. The Chair responded that this was not properly a matter of business arising from the minutes<sup>1</sup>, he would therefore ask the administration to reply to these questions under 'Other Business'.

A member stated that, in his view, the meaning of the comments of the representatives from the Graduate Students' Union was not accurately reflected in Item 20 of the minutes of June 27, 2002. The reference to the provision of an open meeting within the Terms of Reference of the Elections Committee raised questions about the nature of the changes that had been made to the Terms of Reference. He noted that a motion had been ruled out of order at a recent meeting of the Elections Committee based on the role of the Committee as outlined in the revised Terms of Reference. The member sought confirmation that no procedural changes had been included in the revisions to the Terms of Reference of the Boards and Committees of the Governing Council that had been approved at the June 27 meeting.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Chair had, at the Governing Council orientation, provided a definition of matters appropriately raised as "Business Arising from the Minutes". Only matters requiring action from the previous meeting should be considered under this agenda item. These could include undertakings to take particular steps in a specific matter or to provide additional information on a particular topic, or to report on the disposition of a notice of motion.

### 3. Business Arising from the Previous Meetings (cont'd)

The member also raised the matter of the video taping of Governing Council meetings. He indicated that a non-member had been asked to stop video recording when the meeting had begun. The member stated his opinion that it was critical that every effort be made to make the Governing Council meetings open and accessible to the public.

The Chair ruled that the member's first point was not properly a matter of business arising, and that the second matter would be dealt with when Report Number 352 of the Executive Committee was reviewed under Reports for Information.

The member raised a concern about the September 4 special meeting of the Governing Council which had begun *in camera*, then moved to open session. The member suggested that the first part of the meeting should have been designated as open, which would have allowed members of the community to be present.

The Chair encouraged the member to contact him directly to discuss procedural issues, and indicated that discussion at the Governing Council meeting would follow the rules of order of the Council.

On motion duly made and seconded,

The ruling of the Chair, that the items that had been raised were not properly business arising from the minutes of the previous meeting, was appealed.

The appeal was defeated.

### 4. Report of the President

The President made a presentation on the topic of "University Education that Canadians Deserve" in which he made the following points:

- Canada's public university system strived to provide the best in higher education to as large and diverse a segment of the population as possible, unlike many public universities in other parts of the world, and private US universities.
  - Canada's leading research universities provided exemplary undergraduate and graduate education, and educated professionals in virtually every field from health to architecture.
  - Canada's leading research universities, such as the University of Toronto, aspired to emulate the very best public research universities in the world, including the University of London, ETH Zurich, the University of Tokyo, the University of Michigan, and the University of California at Berkeley.
- Numerous studies had demonstrated the vital place of research universities in knowledge-based economies.
  - For this reason, in Ontario and Canada, government and industry were seeking to collaborate with universities in order to provide not only an improved social and cultural environment, but also the technology and talent needed to compete effectively in the global economy.
  - Proper support for Canada's leading research universities was the surest way to ensure future prosperity for Canadians.

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

- The special nature of research universities allowed them to combine research, scholarship and education in unique ways that shaped not only the graduate, but also the undergraduate experience.
  - At the University of Toronto, virtually all professors in the Faculty of Arts and Science, including its most eminent scholars, taught undergraduates.
- The best public research universities recruited and retained a diverse group of faculty, staff and students who met the highest standards nationally and internationally.
  - These top institutions also assumed responsibility for the graduate education of the next generation of teachers, researchers and leaders, with high levels of support for their libraries, laboratories and information technology.
- The University of Toronto had an obligation to be inclusive in educating everyone from Toronto's diverse community and beyond who was academically able to gain admission.
  - Faculty had to be both inclusive and representational while meeting the highest standards as teachers and scholars both nationally and internationally.
  - The University had to be accessible to all segments of society.
- The challenge that was faced by administrators and members of the Governing Council was to engage the public, government and industry in advancing the cause of public research universities in Canada, and above all, the University of Toronto as Canada's pre-eminent research university.
  - Their goal had to be to ensure that Ontario, and Canada had a number of research universities of true international stature to provide Canadians with the educational opportunities that they deserved.

A member asked what plans the administration had to implement the vision of the University of Toronto as a world-class public research university. The President replied that, in order to achieve its vision, the University needed to recruit and retain world-class faculty, staff and students. In addition, a goal of the next academic planning exercise would be to strengthen the University by providing the opportunity for each department, division and faculty to identify new directions on which to build. The President also noted that he and the Vice-Presidents were working with federal and provincial governments to ensure continued support. The President reminded members of the role that they could play in communicating the importance of public research universities to the external community.

A member asked what resources were necessary to move the University of Toronto to the next level of excellence. The President replied that the use of current resources must be optimized. He noted that there was no single solution for obtaining increased resources.

A member asked how teaching quality was measured in the University. The President noted that, in the promotion process, teaching was measured through evaluation by both students and peers. A member added that teaching in the University had improved as a result of regular evaluation by students.

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

A member asked whether the University had to choose between educating a large number of qualified students and being a world-class institution. The President replied that he believed it was possible to achieve both goals, although it was a special challenge.

A member asked whether the situation described in *Losing Ground*<sup>2</sup> with respect to affordability and accessibility to higher education in the United States applied to Canada as well. The President replied that, while student financial aid was decreasing in the U.S., that was not the case in Canada.

A member asked how much emphasis was placed on teaching quality in the hiring of new faculty. The President replied that teaching quality was always an important consideration in faculty hiring. A member noted that the Office of Teaching Advancement had been created to co-ordinate the support for teaching which already existed within the University, as well as to institute initiatives that both highlighted teaching excellence and ensured continuing professional development among the academic staff.

A member noted that research was often overlooked when teaching was emphasized, and suggested that emphasis on research was needed.

A member supported earlier comments about the effectiveness of teaching evaluations. He noted that, in the Faculty of Medicine, a course representative was designated for each course to serve as a liaison with the instructor and to deal with any teaching concerns.

A member urged that there be student input into the Office of Teaching Advancement. The President agreed with the suggestion.

The Chair noted that six additional items of the President's Report were included in Report Number 352 of the Executive Committee<sup>3</sup>, and asked members if there were any questions regarding these items. No questions were raised.

#### 5. Performance Indicators for Governance

Professor Tuohy introduced her presentation by emphasizing that the Performance Indicators in this Report were significantly different from those used in the Maclean's survey of universities. She noted that her presentation would not restate the highlights of the report,

---

<sup>2</sup> *Losing Ground: A National Status Report on the Affordability of American Higher Education* (The National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education, 2002).

<sup>3</sup> The President's report on the following matters is described in pages 3-5 of Report Number 352 of the Executive Committee which is available at <http://www.utoronto.ca/govcncl/bac/details/ex/2002-03/exr20020911.pdf>.

- Start of the new academic year
- September 11<sup>th</sup> Open Letter to the University Community
- Federal Government Relations
- Provincial Government Relations
- Review and Search for the Vice-President, Research and International Relations
- Status of UTFA Negotiations

## 5. Performance Indicators for Governance (cont'd)

but would review the performance of the University of Toronto in the context of its national and international peer institutions. A copy of the presentation is attached hereto as "Appendix A".

A member congratulated Professor Tuohy on the Report, and stated that she was particularly pleased to see a number of financial indicators included, given the importance of strong financial support to achieve academic excellence. The member asked how the data would be used in the planning process. Professor Neuman indicated, as examples, that the data on time to completion, attrition and supervisory support for doctoral students would be examined in the academic planning exercise. The President added that indicators on international recognition of faculty and the impact of research would be added in the future.

Another member added his congratulations, and said he was pleased that the University continued to pursue excellence rather than merely accepting the results. He welcomed the possible participation of the University in the U.S. Survey of Student Experience.

A member asked what was included in the U.S. Survey of Student Experience. Professor Neuman replied that the survey included questions on student satisfaction with teaching, class size, access to teachers, and student participation in undergraduate activities. A member asked about the implications on program design of the length of time that doctoral students pursued their studies, then withdrew or allowed their registration to lapse. She also asked what factors might contribute to the withdrawal or lapse of registration. Another member indicated that a report would be released within the next few weeks which would allow a division-by-division comparison of results with respect to time to completion and other indicators. The member noted that both the funding situation and the policy environment had changed since 1992, the year of the entering doctoral cohort that was the basis of the figures on time to completion included in the Performance Indicators report.

A member said that he was pleased that the report had recognized through the use of confidence interval bars that accessibility surveys had a wide margin of error. The member remarked that there had been previous requests from students to compare accessibility to universities in countries such as Ireland, France and the Netherlands, which had a history of free tuition. Referring to retention rates with respect to funding, the member said that, while funding for graduate students had been addressed, much work remained to be done on funding issues for undergraduate students and part-time students. The increase from 1% to 2% in the number of students who graduated with debt loads of more than \$30,000 represented an increase of 100 per cent. The member also commented that neither the effect of student debt nor the effect of tuition policies were being measured. In addition, the indicators did not measure the impact of the creativity, new ideas and social-justice initiatives that were lost as a result of students being discouraged by an environment in which they felt that their ideas were not welcomed. The member concluded by questioning the concept of excellence and asking what the University was really striving for.

A member quoted from an article concerning college and university rankings<sup>4</sup> and asked whether the points raised in the article were germane to the consideration of the

---

<sup>4</sup> Daniel J. Levin, "The Uses and Abuses of the *U.S. News* Rankings" in AGB (Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges) *Priorities*, Number 20, Fall 2002.

## 5. Performance Indicators for Governance (cont'd)

University of Toronto's Performance Indicators. The President replied that he did not believe that the points raised in the article were germane to the discussion.

A member suggested that additional appropriate performance indicators might include the impact of faculty work on external committees and councils and the research and expertise that was shared with media nationally and internationally. While these measures were nebulous, they reflected the high profile held by the University.

A member asked whether the University of Toronto could consider itself a leading public research institution when 80% of its incoming undergraduate students came from the greater Toronto area (GTA), and 90% of the incoming students in professional programs came from Canada. Only in the doctoral student stream was there a significant number of incoming international students. The President replied that the University was under-performing in attracting high-end graduate students. At the undergraduate level, the situation was more complex, because the operating grant was provided by the provincial government for the education of the population of southern Ontario. The President noted that, although a substantial majority of students resided in the GTA, a large percentage of those students were born in other countries, which resulted in a diverse student body.

A member noted that, although statistics on Ontario Student Assistance Program (OSAP) debt load were provided in the Performance Indicators report, the figures did not reflect the situation of students in the professional faculties. The member referred to a study of medical students<sup>5</sup> which showed that the proportion from families with an income of less than \$40,000 had declined from 22% in 1997 to 15% in 2000. The study also showed that first-year Ontario medical students reported higher levels of expected debt at graduation than graduating students (median \$80,000 vs. \$57,000). The member asked whether the Performance Indicators report could be expanded to include non-provincial financial aid and professional programs. Professor Tuohy replied that information about other forms of debt load was collected as part of the annual report on Student Financial Support made by the Vice-Provost, Students.

The Chair noted that a motion was required to extend the length of the meeting, and noted for the Governing Council the list of final speakers.

It was duly moved and seconded,

THAT the time of adjournment be extended to 6:35 p.m.

The motion was carried with the necessary two-thirds majority.

At the invitation of the Chair, Professor Ian Orchard, who had served as Vice-Provost, Students until March 31, 2002, confirmed that the annual report on Student Financial Support contained information about debt load of students within the professional

---

<sup>5</sup> J.C. Kwong, I. Dhalla, D. Streiner, R. Baddour, A. Waddell and I. Johnson, "Effects of rising tuition fees on medical school class composition and financial outlook", Canadian Medical Association Journal, April 16, 2002.

**5. Performance Indicators for Governance (cont'd)**

faculties, as well as OSAP debt load. This report came to governance through the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs.

A member raised questions about endowment, equity and accessibility. He asked whether there was any social responsibility associated with the University's investment policy, and how often the investments were reviewed. He asked whether the University would follow more aggressive policies, such as affirmative action, to increase the diversity of the faculty. The member noted the three percent decrease between 1999-00 and 2000-01 in the proportion of students in first entry programs who self-identified as belonging to a visible minority category, and the five percent decrease in the same time period in the proportion of students in first-entry programs who were born outside

Canada. The member asked why similar information was not provided for students in second-entry programs. The member commented positively on the graduation rate for first-entry students, but raised the question of what happened to the percentage who did not graduate [approximately 23%]. The member also inquired about the impact that the budget cuts to secondary and elementary education would have on the diversity of the student body in future years.

Professor Tuohy commended the member on the interesting questions that he had raised, but noted that many of them were beyond the scope of the Performance Indicators report. She stated that increasing faculty diversity continued to be a major theme of academic planning within the University, and would be a major focus of the next planning exercise. She informed members that the decrease in the student diversity indicators were so marginal within the sample size that no conclusions could be drawn from them.

In conclusion, Professor Tuohy thanked the staff from all of the Vice-Presidential portfolios who worked on the report, and acknowledged in particular the efforts of Mr. Martin England and Ms Michelle Broderick.

The meeting adjourned at 6:35 p.m.

October 4, 2002

Secretary

Chair