

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

Monday, June 23, 2008

MINUTES OF THE GOVERNING COUNCIL meeting held on Monday, June 23, 2008 at 4:00 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, University of Toronto.

Present:

Mr. John F. (Jack) Petch (In the Chair)	Mr. Joseph Mapa
Dr. Alice Dong, Vice-Chair	Professor Michael R. Marrus
The Honourable David R. Peterson, Chancellor	Mr. Geoffrey Matus
Professor C. David Naylor, President	Ms Florence Minz
Professor Varouj Aivazian	Mr. Gary P. Mooney
Ms Diana Alli	Mr. George E. Myhal
Mr. P.C. Choo	Ms Jacqueline C. Orange
Professor Brian Corman	Professor Ian Orchard
Dr. Claude S. Davis	Mr. Alexandru Rascanu
The Honourable William G. Davis	Professor Doug W. Reeve
Mr. Ken Davy	Mr. Timothy Reid
Miss Saswati Deb	Professor Arthur S. Ripstein
Ms Susan Eng	Mr. Stephen C. Smith
Dr. Shari Graham Fell	Miss Maureen J. Somerville
Professor Vivek Goel	Dr. Sarita Verma
Ms Judith Goldring	Ms B. Elizabeth Vosburgh
Professor Ellen Hodnett	Mr. Larry Wasser
Professor Glen A. Jones	Mr. Robert S. Weiss
Mr. Alex Kenjeev	Mr. W. David Wilson
Dr. Joel A. Kirsh	
Professor Ronald H. Kluger	Mr. Louis R. Charpentier, Secretary of the
Professor Louise Lemieux-Charles	Governing Council

Absent:

Mr. Arya Ghadimi
Professor William Gough
Dr. Gerald Halbert
Dr. Stefan Mathias Larson
Mr. Richard Nunn
Ms Lorenza Sisca
Ms Estefania Toledo
Mr. Yang Weng

Secretariat:

Mr. Matthew Lafond

In Attendance:

Ms Wendy Talfourd-Jones, Past-Member of the Governing Council
Professor Angela Hildyard, Vice-President, Human Resources & Equity
Mr. David Palmer, Vice-President, Advancement
Professor R. Paul Young, Vice-President, Research
Ms Cathy Riggall, Vice-President, Business Affairs
Ms Binish Ahmed, Vice-President University Affairs, Students' Administrative Council
(operating as the University of Toronto Students' Union)
Ms Koat Aler, Vice-President Equity, Students' Administrative Council (operating as the
University of Toronto Students' Union)
Ms Sheila Brown, Chief Financial Officer
Ms Rose Da Costa, Resource Coordinator, Graduate Students' Union
Mr. Neil Dobbs, Deputy Secretary of the Governing Council
Mr. Bruce Dodds, Director of Utilities, Facilities and Services Department
Ms Sheree Drummond, Assistant Provost
Professor Emeritus Jonathan Freedman, Vice-Provost, Student Life
Ms. Nora Gillespie, Legal Counsel, Office of the Vice-President and Provost
Dr. Anthony Gray, Special Advisor to the President
Professor Edith Hillan, Vice-Provost, Academic
Ms Sandy Hudson, President, Students' Administrative Council (operating as the University
of Toronto Students' Union)
Ms Helen Lasthiotakis, Director, Policy and Planning, Office of the Vice-President and
Provost
Mr. Wasah Malik, President, University of Toronto at Mississauga Students' Union
Professor Cheryl Misak, Deputy Provost
Mr. Steve Moate, Senior Legal Counsel
Mr. Henry Mulhall, Assistant Secretary of the Governing Council
Mr. Pierre G. Piché, Controller and Director of Financial Services
Mr. Robert Ramsay, Chair, CUPE 3902
Ms Angela Regnier, Executive Director, Students' Administrative Council (operating as the
University of Toronto Students' Union)
Mr. Dave Scrivener, Vice-President External, Students' Administrative Council (operating
as the University of Toronto Students' Union)
Ms Elizabeth Sisam, Assistant Vice-President, Campus and Facilities Planning
Ms Nancy Smart, Judicial Affairs Officer
Ms Meredith Strong, Director, Office of the Vice-President, University Relations
Ms Chantal Sundaram, Communications Staff Representative, CUPE 3902
Ms Mae-Yu Tan, Assistant Secretary of the Governing Council
Ms Linda Vranic, Director, Operations, Office of the Vice-President, Research
Professor Safwat Zaky, Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget

IN ACCORDANCE WITH A DETERMINATION BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
PURSUANT TO SECTION 38 OF BY-LAW NUMBER 2, ITEMS 13, 14, 15 AND 16
WERE CONSIDERED BY THE GOVERNING COUNCIL *IN CAMERA*.

1. Chair's Remarks

The Chair welcomed members and guests to the final meeting of the current governance year.

2. Minutes of the Previous Meetings

(a) Minutes of the Meeting of April 10, 2008

The Chair reminded members that at the Governing Council meeting of May 21, 2008, a member had raised issues about certain aspects of the minutes of the April 10, 2008 meeting. The Chair advised that he had met with the member recently, and consulted with the Executive Committee. The revised draft of the minutes of April 10, which members had received in their agenda package, proposed minor amendments to the original draft provided in advance of the May 21 meeting, including the following:

- In the last paragraph on page 9, a further sentence regarding disadvantaged students had been added.
- On page 11, in paragraph 1, there had been a change in the language used when referring to a comment made by a member.
- In the Secretary's note on page 12, the phrase "pursuant to his duties under section 47" was replaced with "consistent with his authority under section 47." This better reflected the Chair's discretion and authority under *By-law Number 2* to maintain order and decorum in the meeting.

The revised minutes of the meeting of April 10, 2008 were approved.

(b) Confirmation of the Resolutions Adopted at the Meeting of April 10, 2008

On a related topic, the Chair noted that members had received a memorandum¹ regarding the disruption of the April 10 meeting. The Chair advised that the memorandum was self-explanatory, and reflected the advice of the Executive Committee. There were no questions.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

THAT the resolutions adopted by the Governing Council at its meeting on April 10, 2008 be confirmed as recorded in the minutes of the meeting.

(c) Minutes of the Meeting of May 21, 2008

The minutes of the meeting of May 21, 2008 were approved.

3. Business Arising from the Minutes of the Previous Meeting

There was no business arising from the previous meeting.

¹ <http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/AssetFactory.aspx?did=5390>

4. Report of the President

The President indicated that he wished to devote the bulk of his Report to an update on the *Towards 2030* Strategic Planning Initiative. However, he first drew Governor's attention to the many achievements outlined in the list of Faculty, Staff and Student awards included in the agenda package. The President also congratulated University Professor Anthony Pawson of Medical Genetics and Microbiology, on his being named a Kyoto Prize laureate in basic sciences by Japan's Inamori Foundation. Professor Pawson was the first Canadian scientist to be given the prestigious award.

Moving on to discussion of the *Towards 2030* initiative, the President gave a PowerPoint presentation, attached hereto as Appendix "A". The President reported that he was in the process of preparing a comprehensive Synthesis Report which would hopefully achieve three goals:

- First, it would summarize key arguments and recommendations advanced by the Task Forces, together with the President's own commentary and reflections;
- Second, it would highlight the connections and inter-dependencies among the various Task Forces' findings;
- Finally, it would draw on the Task Forces' deliberations and the entire *2030* process to propose and defend a number of long-term goals and strategic directions for the University.

The President's intention was to present, at a very high level of generality, some of the elements from the Synthesis Report, and in particular, to highlight several core findings and recommendations drawn from the Task Force reports. The President noted that he had deliberately set aside the work of the Task Force on Governance at this time, because their initial findings had been discussed at the previous meeting, and their continuing work would receive future consideration. Before moving ahead, the President wished to once again express his gratitude to the Task Force members and all those who contributed to the consultation process.

Highlights of the President's presentation included the following:

- **Process:**
 - This had been an intensively consultative process. The membership of Task Forces was fiduciary in nature, including membership drawn from the ranks of past and present governors covering the five traditional estates represented in governance.
- **Mission and Mandate:**
 - None of the Task Forces had called upon the University to abandon its current research-intensive mission. Instead, it was repeatedly emphasized that the University had a duty to advance its unique role within Canadian post-secondary education.

4. Report of the President (cont'd)

- Given its preeminent position in research and the unique attributes of its faculty, the University had a particularly strong set of graduate and professional offerings. It also had rigorous and well-established undergraduate programs that benefited from the University's research intensity, the caliber of the University's faculty and the quality of the University's facilities.
- While the University drew 16% of all undergraduates in Ontario, it drew 30% of all PhD students, and the University of Toronto had many graduate and professional programs that were not offered elsewhere in the province. Furthermore, many post-secondary institutions were contemplating undergraduate enrolment expansion in the Toronto region. As the first wave of undergraduates led to a secondary wave of applications to graduate and professional programs, the University would therefore have a unique role and responsibility..
- **A University on Three Campuses:**
 - It was universally acknowledged that there was already a *de facto* tri-campus system at the University of Toronto. The system was variously constrained – by collective agreements, the nature of the collegium, organizational structures, and the distribution of resources. Therefore, precipitous shifts in this system were neither desirable nor possible.
 - The President also stressed that it was not necessary to choose today between eventual independence of the three campuses or, for example, greater central authority and integration.
 - The University's long-term strategic direction was to develop a more explicit tri-campus regional system, with stronger identities for each campus. It was possible to pursue both diversification and synergy, without compromising quality or coordination.
- **St. George Organization:**
 - It was important to distinguish system functions from St. George functions, which had been strongly intermingled in the central administration. For example, it could be worthwhile to consider some delegation of provostial functions on each of the three campuses, while at the same time not compromising efficiency simply for the sake of parallelism. Similarly, in time, consideration might be given to delegation of some functions of the Academic Board to campus-level counterparts.
 - These matters were complicated, and there was no rush to implement changes, especially at a time when there were many other pressing matters requiring the attention of the administration. However, it was important to recognize that the University's size and configuration had changed in fundamental ways, and it was advantageous to be open-minded to alternative modes of organization.
- **Enrolment:**
 - The President expressed his support for the broad recommendation of the Task Force on Enrolment, which advised the University to intensify graduate education and end the hectic phase of undergraduate enrolment growth on the St. George campus.

4. Report of the President (cont'd)

- At the same time, modest increases in undergraduate enrolment on the Mississauga and Scarborough campuses, in conjunction with selective growth at the graduate level, would accelerate the maturation of the east and west campuses into comprehensive institutions.
- While the model contemplated either no or limited net growth in undergraduate enrolment at the system-level in the long run, the University was working closely with other institutions and the government to address enrolment pressures in the Toronto region. Furthermore, it was anticipated that any reduction in undergraduate enrolment on the St. George campus would be gradual and contingent on finances. Thus, reduction on the central campus would occur more slowly than undergraduate growth at UTM and UTSC. This meant that in the short run, system-level undergraduate enrolment would still rise during the peak period of regional demand.
- In recommending reduction of undergraduate enrolment on the St. George campus, the Task Force foresaw not only making room for graduate growth, but restoring to the undergraduate mission some of the grace, space, and pace that had been lost in the recent years of unfettered growth. Again, however, this shift would depend on finances.
- There should be no assumption that undergraduates were merely being shifted to the east and west campuses. Both the University of Toronto at Mississauga and the University of Toronto at Scarborough had indicated an interest in modest growth to achieve their campus-specific aspirations; however, this must be accompanied by vital investments in infrastructure, faculty, staff, and local and targeted graduate participation.
- Graduate enrolment depended upon specialized facilities, research funding, and enhanced student support, which must be closely monitored. Additional staffing would be needed as well.
- It must be emphasized that this was a long-term exercise. Changing enrolment patterns at a large public research university such as the University of Toronto took time, and was contingent on the appropriate resources.
- **Resources:**
 - Further to the topic of resources, the President noted that the basic conclusion of the relevant Task Force was simple: The University's expenses had consistently outpaced its revenues.
 - There had been a major shift in the last 15 years in sources of revenue: Government grants had fallen as a relative proportion of core operating support, and other sources, including tuition, had risen to help offset (but never fully mitigate) the loss.
 - The Task Force considered the consequences to the University if government grants rose with inflation, tuition and endowments grew at about 2% above inflation, and salaries and benefits continued to increase around 2.5% above inflation. The effect, unless the University developed other sources of revenue, would be an inability to balance the budget in 2030 without reducing faculty and staff complements by as much as a third and significantly raising the student-faculty ratio.
 - The Task Force concluded that only a multifaceted approach to securing sufficient revenue would permit the University to reach its goals and to compete internationally in the years ahead.

4. Report of the President (cont'd)

- **Student Experience and Recruitment:**

- The quality of student experience at the University of Toronto was directly connected to the excellence of the University's educational programs, which in turn was tied to its commitment to pedagogy and the caliber of its scholarship and research. Students came here in the first instance because they sought educational opportunities, and because at the University of Toronto, they had the opportunity to learn from many of the leading scholars and professors in the world. The University could not lower its scholarly standards, even if it meant competing in difficult markets and facing additional pressures on operating budgets from salary growth.
- The University of Toronto offered unparalleled breadth and diversity, and students who took the most advantage of these characteristics seemed to be among the happiest and most engaged.
- There was consensus that the University should focus attention and resources on student recruitment, particularly on a province-wide and national level.
- Student-faculty and student-staff ratios were high. The President noted that traditional measures of the student-faculty ratio could be misleading, and the institution's faculty complement was much larger than usual ratios suggested.
- There was a strong affirmation of the role of constituent colleges and Federated Universities in creating learning communities and innovative student-centred programs.
- Educational programs at the University should continue to foster the development of "soft skills" – teamwork, communication abilities, problem-solving, and constructive critical thinking.

- **Next Steps:**

- In the near future, the President would circulate a draft Synthesis document for critical feedback from Governors. Furthermore, the President noted that he had taken advice regarding the best way to seek governance approval of the final document. That issue would be dealt with as the next item of business.

There were no questions from members arising out of the President's report.

5. ***Towards 2030* Long-Term Planning Framework: Special Meeting of the Governing Council**

The President reiterated that he had sought input on the best way to present the final *Towards 2030* report for feedback and approval in principle of the Long-Term Planning Framework. On the advice of the Executive Committee, it was proposed that a special meeting of the Governing Council be convened, immediately following the orientation session for the upcoming governance year on September 9, 2008. The purpose of this special meeting would be to allow Governors to review, and if appropriate, approve in principle, the *Towards 2030* Long-Term Planning Framework. The Framework document would be substantially briefer than any Task Force report or the *Synthesis* report, and focus on general principles and strategic directions.

5. Towards 2030 Long-Term Planning Framework: Special Meeting of the Governing Council (cont'd)

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

THAT a special meeting of the Governing Council be convened for September 9th, 2008 following the orientation session, for the purposes of reviewing and, as appropriate, approving in principle the Long-Term Planning Framework for the University of Toronto arising from the *Towards 2030* exercise.

Further details regarding this meeting and the concurrent orientation session would follow closer to the relevant date.

6. Items for Governing Council Approval

(a) Federation Framework Agreement with the Federated Universities

Professor Marrus reported that for over a century, a federation had existed among the University of Toronto, Victoria University, the University of Trinity College, and the University of St. Michael's College. The proposed Federation Framework Agreement represented a separation of the existing *Memorandum of Agreement (MOA)* into three documents: an affiliation agreement with each Federated University; a statement on the role, rights, responsibilities and accountabilities of the Colleges; and operating agreements with each Federated University with regard to services, accountability reporting, and funding. The proposed funding model would provide a more meaningful link to the services provided and was more consistent with the University's new budget model. Although there would be an increase of approximately \$1.45 million to the total funding to the Federated Universities over a three-year period, funded by the Faculty of Arts and Science as well as University-wide cost bins, there would be greater transparency and accountability going forward.

A member inquired how the Agreement would change the process used to determine funding to the Federated Universities. Professor Goel explained that the combination of agreements would take into account everything covered by the existing *MOA*; however, the funding model would be substantially different, and was more in line with the new budget model. It would also separate out items relating specifically to the Federated Universities from those relating to all seven colleges, four of which were constituent colleges of the University of Toronto. Therefore, the new Agreement clarified respective responsibilities, but the relationships remained substantially the same. In follow-up, the member directed Council's attention to Appendix 3 of the documentation, and asked if the blank spaces indicating dollar amounts under each of the headings had already been determined. Professor Goel responded that those amounts had been decided upon, but they were blank because there would be a separate agreement for each Federated University. Appendix 3 defined the drivers – for example, the number of faculty or students, and the Agreement set out the way in which these calculations would be performed. Ultimately, the change in the funding model would increase the amount of funding provided to the three Federated Universities.

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

(a) Federation Framework Agreement with the Federated Universities (cont'd)

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

1. THAT the template for the Federation Framework Agreement between the University of Toronto and the Federated Universities be approved, effective July 1, 2008; and
2. THAT the agreements signed under the provisions of this resolution be filed with the Secretary of the Governing Council.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 157 of the Academic Board as Appendix "A".

(b) Toronto School of Theology: Master of Sacred Music (M.S.M.) Conjoint Degree

Professor Marrus explained that the proposal was for a Master of Sacred Music (M.S.M.) degree that would be conferred conjointly by Emmanuel College of Victoria University, the Toronto School of Theology, and the University of Toronto. Admission to the proposed second-entry undergraduate program would require both a previous undergraduate degree and music experience, and would be open to students regardless of religious affiliation, if any. Students would be required to complete 20 half-courses taken over two years of full-time study, or up to five years of part-time study; the courses were currently offered by Emmanuel College and the Faculty of Music. The Academic Board was assured that the course load of 10.0 full credits was manageable, and in fact, was typical of many two-year professional programs.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

THAT the Master of Sacred Music (M.S.M.) degree offered by Victoria University have conjoint status with the University of Toronto, as of September 1, 2008.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 157 of the Academic Board as Appendix "B".

(c) Capital Project: Project Planning Report– Interdisciplinary Design Studios within the Department of Civil Engineering and the Lassonde Institute

Professor Marrus noted that the attic of the Mining Building had been identified as a potential location for the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering's Interdisciplinary Design Studios and the Lassonde Institute. The proposed capital project would address the urgent need for facilities in support of undergraduate and graduate expansion and enhancement of research and the student experience. The project would also complete some high-priority maintenance of the Mining Building and increase its accessibility by creating an interior elevator shaft. The total estimated project cost was \$12.150 million; of that amount, a commitment of \$4 million in external funding had been secured, and additional

6. Items for Governing Council Approval (cont'd)**(c) Capital Project: Project Planning Report– Interdisciplinary Design Studios within the Department of Civil Engineering and the Lassonde Institute (cont'd)**

private funding was being sought. Comments had been raised at both the Planning and Budget Committee and the Academic Board regarding the seemingly high project cost. Professor Goel had explained that the cost per square foot was actually comparable with the cost of other projects on campus, if the restoration, maintenance, and related costs were taken into consideration.

A member inquired whether there were conditions attached to the \$4 million received in external funding. Professor Goel responded that the \$4 million had been raised from advancement, and that it was unrestricted. He advised that this would also be the case for the balance of the funding. Furthermore, the portion of costs related to deferred maintenance would be funded through provincial facilities renewal programs.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

1. THAT the Project Planning Report for the Civil Engineering Interdisciplinary Design Studios be approved in principle; and
2. THAT the project scope, comprising renovations to approximately 632 net assignable square metres and 1,129 gross square metres with a project cost of \$10,065,000, and high priority repairs to the exterior of the Mining Building, estimated to cost approximately \$2,085,000, for a total project cost of up to \$12,150,000, be approved.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 157 of the Academic Board as Appendix “F”.

(d) Capital Project: Project Planning Report - Northeast Sector of the St. George Campus

Professor Marrus reported that there was a need for the establishment of appropriate guidelines for balanced development of the Northeast Sector of the St. George campus. The remaining development sites in this sector were Sites 11, 12, and 24. Comprehensive development of the area as outlined in the Project Planning Report would incorporate enhanced pedestrian routes, consideration of heritage preservation, and universal design principles to maximize accessibility.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

THAT the Project Planning Report for the Northeast Sector of the St. George Campus be approved in principle.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 157 of the Academic Board as Appendix “G”.

6. Items for Governing Council Approval (cont'd)**(e) Capital Project: Project Planning Report – Southeast Campus Electrical Plan**

Professor Marrus advised that modifications to the electrical infrastructure in the southeast sector of the campus were required in order to avoid the need to schedule, curtail, or relocate research activities. The Wallberg Building was the first priority in this area as the loads on Loop #1, from which it was fed, had grown excessively; in fact, the load on the Loop had grown to the point that the ability to feed surrounding buildings had been compromised. The Project Planning Committee had recommended obtaining a total of 2,500 kVA to provide sufficient room for future growth in research activity. The total project cost estimate was \$3 million, and would be funded under the Capital Renewal Program. Points raised in discussion at the Academic Board included the following:

- A member suggested that the University explore the possibility of capping its energy consumption. Professor Goel noted that the Sustainability Office was developing a plan to help reduce the environmental impact of operations on all three campuses.
- Members and guests emphasized that the considerable growth on campus and technological developments had resulted in a pressing need to increase electrical capacity.
- Ms Riggall and Mr. Dodds, Director of Utilities and Buildings Operations, highlighted some of the University's energy reduction initiatives. They indicated that the University had thoroughly examined renewable energy options, including increased generation on campus.

A member suggested that it would be beneficial for the University to continue its efforts to investigate the environmental impact, or "footprint," of major electrical projects presented for governance approval. Professor Marrus reiterated that environmental concerns were discussed at some length at the Academic Board. Professor Goel also commented that the proposal, in fact, addressed the power requirements of *past* projects, and reminded members that a detailed environmental assessment was part of the Report. Being sensitive to these concerns, the University had an *Environmental Protection Policy* and a Sustainability Office. He noted that it was not a simple task to reduce the University's "carbon footprint" while at the same time engaging in growth and expansion.

A member inquired whether there had been an evaluation of the power requirements of other areas on campus, aside from the southeast portion considered in the present proposal. Mr. Dodds replied that this was phase 1 of the plan for the southeast quadrant; other areas would be the focus of future proposals as appropriate. The member inquired about the implications on electrical capacity resulting from the development of Site 11. Mr. Dodds indicated that these future requirements had been discussed with Toronto Hydro and had been taken into account.

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

(e) Capital Project: Project Planning Report – Southeast Campus Electrical Plan (cont'd)

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

1. THAT the Project Planning Report for the Southeast Campus Electrical Plan be approved in principle; and
2. THAT the project scope as described, with a capital cost of \$3 million, be approved, with funding to be provided from the Capital Renewal Program 2007/08.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 157 of the Academic Board as Appendix “H”.

(f) Capital Project: Interim Project Planning Report – Institute of Child Study Expansion

Professor Marrus stated that the Institute of Child Study (ICS) was established in 1925, and moved to its current location on Walmer Road in 1953. Adjoining properties at 56 and 58 Spadina Road were purchased in 2000 and 2008 to facilitate the planned expansion of the ICS facilities which were necessary for teaching, research, and the operation of the Laboratory School. The proposed expansion was also needed in order to meet guidelines and provide an exemplary student experience. An interim space program of 3,177 net assignable square metres was proposed, but further site review would be necessary to determine the ability of the site to accommodate additional expansion. The total project cost was estimated to be approximately \$21-24 million; further refinement to the project cost would be completed prior to distribution of the final report, and all funds for new construction and renovation would be raised from external sources.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

1. THAT the Interim Project Planning Report for the Institute of Child Study Expansion be approved in principle.
2. THAT the project scope, totaling 3,177 net assignable square metres (nasm), including 1,800 nasm of new construction, at 45 Walmer Road and on the combined sites of 56-58 Spadina Road, be approved.
3. THAT consultants be hired to prepare schematic design drawings, to investigate and make recommendations regarding development of the site, and to investigate maximum development potential on the combined 56-58 Spadina Road site.

6. Items for Governing Council Approval (cont'd)**(f) Capital Project: Interim Project Planning Report – Institute of Child Study Expansion (cont'd)**

4. THAT approval to proceed with schematic drawings and detailed site investigations, at a maximum cost of \$225,000, be funded from the Institute for Child Studies capital fund.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 157 of the Academic Board as Appendix “I”.

(g) University of Toronto at Mississauga Students’ Union: Recognition as a Representative Student Committee

Dr. Davis reported that at its meeting of June 2, 2008, the University Affairs Board (UAB) approved a proposal to realign student society fees and the formal representation to the Governing Council of part-time students at the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM) campus. The UAB approved the fees component, and was now recommending approval of the proposal that would make the Erindale College Students’ Union, operating under the name UTM Students’ Union (UTMSU) the fifth Representative Student Committee recognized by the Governing Council (the others being the Students’ Administrative Council, the Graduate Students’ Union, the Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students, and the Scarborough Campus Students’ Union). The proposal arose from a request to the University’s administration by the Erindale Part-time Undergraduate Students (EPUS) and UTMSU, into which EPUS would be folded.

A referendum had been held last February, asking part-time students if they wished to join UTMSU, thereby eliminating their membership in, and fees to, EPUS and APUS. With a voter turnout of approximately 8% (which was within the normal range for such processes), 95% of students voting supported the proposal. As reported in the UAB Report which was circulated to members, APUS had undertaken legal action against EPUS and UTMSU, challenging the validity of the referendum process. APUS had also sought an injunction to prevent the UAB from considering the proposal at its June 2, 2008 meeting. However, their request had been withdrawn when the University provided assurances that it would reverse any fee changes, and reinstate APUS as the Representative Student Committee, should the court find that the referendum process was defective.

At the UAB meeting, the Board heard from speakers who both supported and opposed the recommendation. After debating the issue, the UAB approved both parts of the proposal overwhelmingly. The Council was now asked to approve the recommendation for the recognition of UTMSU as the Representative Student Committee of part-time undergraduate students at UTM.

A member asked how the UTMSU would proceed if the motion was approved – would APUS continue to collect fees from UTM students? Dr. Davis reminded members that the issue had been dealt with in two parts – the first issue related to fees. That issue had been dealt with at UAB. The second part, the matter currently before the Council, dealt with the issue of representation.

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

(g) University of Toronto at Mississauga Students' Union: Recognition as a Representative Student Committee (cont'd)

A member wondered what the motivation for the referendum had been. Professor Orchard indicated, although he was not speaking on behalf of the student groups, that he believed that the primary factors were local autonomy and decision-making authority, and well as administrative efficiency.

A member inquired whether APUS had been given notice of the referendum and had been given an opportunity to campaign. Professor Goel confirmed that APUS had been aware of the referendum. The Chair reminded the Council that the matter was currently before the court.

A student member offered to provide some background perspective on the issue. He explained that there had been discussion regarding student representation at UTM for some time. The EPUS executive decided to put the question formally to students: would they prefer to be represented by APUS or UTMSU? By the time of the referendum, many services were already being provided to part-time students by UTMSU, and it had been suggested that they did so more efficiently than APUS. The member noted that similar concerns regarding APUS' representation of part-time students had been raised on the Scarborough campus, as well. Another student member added that she agreed with the previous member's comments; the issue had not developed from the "top-down," rather, there had been a great deal of discussion among part-time students at UTM, some of whom did not even know what APUS was.

A member advised the Council that it was his belief that the information regarding the referendum had been in place for approximately one month in advance of the vote. Therefore, in the member's view, APUS had been given significant notice.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

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

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

Terms and conditions of the foregoing recommendation and approval:

6. Items for Governing Council Approval (cont'd)**(g) University of Toronto at Mississauga Students' Union: Recognition as a Representative Student Committee (cont'd)**

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

Documentation is attached to Report Number 148 of the University Affairs Board as Appendix "A".

(h) Audited Financial Statements

Mr. Matus, on behalf of the Business Board, reported that the Audit Committee had reviewed the financial statements over two meetings, with the external auditors in attendance. The audit report was unqualified. That Committee, and the Business Board, were satisfied that the financial statements presented a fair and full picture of the University's financial results. The University's financial position at the end of the year was largely unchanged, with net assets remaining at approximately \$2.17 billion.

The University had enjoyed a positive net income for the fifth year in a row, but it was down somewhat from \$134.5 million last year, to \$50.6 million for the current year. That result reflected two factors. First, investment returns were not as strong last year as in 2006-07, reflecting weaker capital markets. Second, the Government's year-end grants were not as large last year as in 2006-07.

In the operating fund, the budget had planned to reduce the accumulated deficit from \$66 million to \$55 million. In fact, that deficit had declined to \$46 million. In keeping with the new budget model, the divisions would retain the benefit of that reduction, and the University would proceed with its plan to reduce the deficit by a further \$11 million from the planned \$55 million level.

Once again, Chief Financial Officer Sheila Brown, Controller Pierre Piché and their colleagues had turned out clean, audited financial statements for an incredibly complex organization within six weeks of the end of the fiscal year. Mr. Matus expressed his thanks and congratulations for their superior work.

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

(h) Audited Financial Statements (cont'd)

The Chair also expressed his thanks on behalf of the Council to the Audit Committee for fulfilling their critical responsibility for this complex task.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

THAT the University of Toronto audited financial statements for the fiscal year ended April 30, 2008 be approved.

(i) External Auditors: Appointment for 2008-09

Mr. Matus advised that the Business Board recommended the re-appointment of Ernst & Young as the University's external auditors for 2008-09. The Audit Committee and the administration were satisfied that the external auditors had been doing their job well. While the same firm had been in place for many years, their independence was ensured by the firm's policy of rotating the partner in charge and by the oversight of the University's Audit Committee.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

THAT the recommendations of the Audit Committee for the appointment of external auditors be approved.

7. Summer Executive Authority

The Vice-Chair indicated that each June, the Governing Council was asked to delegate to the President the authority to take any actions necessary on its behalf during the summer months. Proposals for approval were normally discussed with, and had the support of, the relevant Board or Committee Chair, or, in the Chair's absence, the Vice-Chair. Supporting documentation was reviewed by the Chair of the Governing Council, who then countersigned the individual authorizations. In the fall, a report on approvals under Summer Executive Authority was made to each Board. Items which were not regarded as urgent were held for consideration in the usual manner in the fall.

7. Summer Executive Authority (cont'd)

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

1. THAT until the next regular meeting of the Governing Council or its appropriate committee or board, authority be granted to the President for:
 - (i) appointments to categories 2² 3³ and 5⁴ of the *Policy on Appointments and Remuneration* approved by the Governing Council of the University of Toronto, dated May 30, 2007;⁵
 - (ii) approval of such additional curriculum changes as may arise for the summer and September 2008; and
 - (iii) decisions on other matters the urgency of which does not permit their deferral until the next regular meeting of the Governing Council or its appropriate standing committee or board.
2. THAT all actions taken under this authority be approved by the Chair of the Governing Council prior to implementation and reported to the appropriate committee or board for information.

8. Reports for Information

Members received the following reports for information:

- (a) Report Number 157 of the Academic Board (June 3, 2008)
- (b) Report Number 166 of the Business Board (April 28, 2008)
- (c) Report Number 147 of the University Affairs Board (April 29, 2008)
- (d) Report Number 148 of the University Affairs Board (June 2, 2008)
- (e) Report Number 415 of the Executive Committee (June 16, 2008)

There were no questions arising from the Reports.

9. Date of the Next Meeting

The Chair advised members that the date of the next regular meeting of the Governing Council was scheduled for Thursday, October 23, 2008, at 4:30 p.m., in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall. The Orientation Session and the Special Meeting of the Governing Council, approved under item number 5, were scheduled for Tuesday, September 9, 2008. Further details about these sessions would follow closer to the date.

² Category 2 includes the positions of Vice-President, Secretary of the Governing Council, and University Ombudsperson, which are subject to the approval of the Governing Council.

³ Category 3 includes the positions of Deputy Provost, Associate and Vice-Provosts, Chief Financial Officer, Senior Legal Counsel and Deputy Secretary of the Governing Council, which are subject to the approval of the Executive Committee, and are reported for information to the Governing Council.

⁴ Category 5 includes the head of Internal Audit (approved by the Business Board) and the Warden of Hart House (approved by the University Affairs Board).

⁵ Approval of Academic Administrative Appointments until the next regular meeting of the Agenda Committee of the Academic Board shall be approved by electronic ballot and shall require the response of at least five members of the Agenda Committee.

10. Question Period

There were no questions for members of the senior administration.

11. Other Business

There were no items of Other Business.

12. Closing Remarks

The Chair expressed his thanks to all members of the Governing Council, as well as its Boards and Committees, for their generous contribution of time and effort to the important work of governing the University over the past year. He also wished to acknowledge especially those members of the Council who were completing their terms on June 30:

The Honourable William Davis:

The Honourable William G. Davis had served as a member of the Governing Council for nine years. As Minister of Education and later as Premier, he was at the very centre of the development of the University, including perhaps most remarkably the establishment of its Scarborough and Mississauga campuses. His presence on the Council and on its Executive Committee had been an additional and exceptional gift. The University would forever be grateful to Bill Davis for so much he had done for it, and his contributions would always be remembered. The Council would perhaps always remember even more the humanity, the extraordinary warmth, and the wonderful good humour he so often provided in this room. The Chair again expressed his profound gratitude to Mr. Davis and wished him all the best in the future.

Dr. Shari Graham Fell:

Dr. Fell had served as a Government Appointee on Council for the last nine years. During that time, she had been a dedicated and active member of a long list of boards and committees including the Elections Committee, the Academic Appeals Committee, the Academic Board, and the University Affairs Board, also serving as Vice-Chair of UAB from 2001-02. The Chair commented that he would like to highlight, in particular, Dr. Fell's extensive service on the Executive Committee and the Committee for Honorary Degrees – on each of these important bodies she served for a total of 5 years. In her many contributions to governance, Dr. Fell had brought a broad perspective and good judgment.

12. Closing Remarks (cont'd)***Professor Vivek Goel:***

Professor Goel had served on Governing Council with great distinction for 7.5 years as a faculty Governor, as Acting President, and as a Presidential appointee. His exceptional commitment to – and profound respect for – the University’s governance had been apparent through his work on all three of the Boards and on a number of the Governing Council’s Committees. He had served as non-voting assessor on the Business Board and the University Affairs Board since 2001, as voting assessor to the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs and the Academic Board from 2001 to 2004, and since 2004 as senior assessor to the Academic Board and the Planning and Budget Committee and voting assessor to the Agenda Committee. Among other contributions, Professor Goel had played a key role in the University’s long term planning, most recently in his capacity as Vice-Chair of the *Towards 2030* Task Force on Governance.

His breadth of knowledge and wisdom had benefitted the University in countless ways. The University would miss his counsel and expertise and thanked him for his extraordinary and unique service to the Governing Council. Although he would be moving on from his current position at the University in order to lead the newly created Ontario Agency for Health Protection and Promotion, the Council looked forward to Professor Goel’s ongoing affiliation with the University. The Chair wished him all the best as he proceeded to his new role as the Agency’s Founding President and CEO.

Professor Glen Jones:

Glen Jones, Professor of Higher Education and Associate Dean, Academic at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education at the University of Toronto, was now completing his third year as a teaching staff member of the Governing Council. Professor Jones had had extensive involvement in governance at the University, including as a member of the Business Board from 2005-2007, and of the Planning and Budget Committee from 2005-2006 and 2007-2008. He had also been a member of the Committee to Review the Office of the Ombudsperson and the Academic Appeals Committee. As a scholar and expert in the areas of Higher Education and Governance, Professor Jones had always provided an important perspective in the Council’s deliberations, and his contributions to its work had been invaluable. The Chair thanked him for his dedicated service, and wished him the best for continued success in his teaching and research.

Ms Jacqueline Orange:

Jackie Orange had been an outstanding leader on the Council. She had served for nine years on the Council, including four years as Chair of the Business Board and one year as its Vice-Chair. She made a number of very valuable changes in the way the Board has conducted its business. She established regular Board orientations. She worked to ensure that the Business Board allocated its time carefully. It always completed its meetings on time or received advance notice when it was clear that the agenda would require more time. Most importantly, she ensured that the Board focused its time well – on strategic discussions and on the big issues that mattered most to the University. She brought to the Council many years of experience in the financial industry and excellent judgement in business matters. She brought also a warm and engaging personality, something that all members would long remember.

12. Closing Remarks (cont'd)***Mr. Bob Weiss:***

Bob Weiss had been an exceptional leader on the Governing Council. He had not only served on the Council for eight years, he had been a co-opted member of the Business Board since 1993 and a co-opted member of the Audit Committee since 1996. He initially served as Vice-Chair of the Audit Committee for two years, and as its Chair for five years. He had brought to the University his seasoned judgement and his extraordinary expertise in financial matters. He also gave the University the benefit of his real wisdom and his experience elsewhere as a director in the not-for-profit sector and more recently in the private sector. He was an exemplary Chair of the Audit Committee, which has served the University well as the Governing Council's financial conscience.

Student Members

Each year, the Governing Council was fortunate to have the invaluable service of its student members, who provided unique perspective to the governance process. The Council was grateful for their dedication to the University, and although many students served for short terms, it was hoped that their time here had been as rewarding for them as it had been for the Council.

Ms Saswati Deb:

Ms Deb had served two one-year terms on the Governing Council as a full-time undergraduate representative, and had been an engaged member of the Academic Board from 2006-2007, and member of the University Affairs Board and the Executive Committee during the current governance year. She had also served on the Academic Appeals Committee, the Discipline Appeals Board, and the Committee for Honorary Degrees.

Mr. Arya Ghadimi:

Mr. Ghadimi had completed a one-year term as a graduate student representative on the Council. He also left the Council having been a member of the University Affairs Board, the Planning and Budget Committee, the Academic Appeals Committee, and the Elections Committee.

Mr. Alex Kenjeev:

Mr. Kenjeev had been a thoughtful member of the Governing Council for the past year, serving as a graduate student representative. He had also been an active member of the Business Board, Academic Board, and the Academic Appeals Committee. He would continue to contribute to governance at the University as a new member of the University Tribunal.

12. Closing Remarks (cont'd)

Mr. Alexandru Rascanu:

Mr. Rascanu had completed a one-year term as a full-time undergraduate representative on the Governing Council, and had been an outspoken and committed member, providing valuable perspective from the Scarborough campus. He also served this year on the University Affairs Board and had been a member of the Academic Appeals Committee.

Ms Lorenza Sisca:

Ms Sisca now completed her one-year term as a full-time undergraduate representative on the Council. During her term, she had also been a member of the Academic Board, the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs, and the Academic Appeals Committee.

Ms Estefania Toledo:

During her two terms as a part-time undergraduate student Governor, Ms Toledo had been extensively involved in numerous Boards and Committees, providing thoughtful feedback from the student perspective. She had been a member of the Executive Committee since 2006, and also served on the Business Board from 2006-2007, as well as completing a term on the University Affairs Board. Additionally, she had served on the Academic Appeals Committee and the Discipline Appeals Board. Finally, she had been a dedicated and considerate student member of the Task Force on Governance.

Mr. Yang Weng:

Mr. Weng had been a full-time undergraduate student member of the Governing Council for one term. He had also been a member of the Academic Board, the Business Board, and the Academic Appeals Committee, during this time.

The Chair again expressed his thanks to all departing Governors, and wished them continuing success.

A member took this opportunity to also congratulate the Chair for his re-election to his position on the Governing Council, and thanked him for his continued dedication and exemplary service to the University.

IN ACCORDANCE WITH A DETERMINATION BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE PURSUANT TO SECTION 38 OF BY-LAW NUMBER 2, ITEMS 13, 14, 15 AND 16 WERE CONSIDERED BY THE GOVERNING COUNCIL *IN CAMERA*.

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

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

THAT the President's recommendation for an expulsion, as outlined in the memorandum and supporting documentation from the Secretary of the Governing Council, dated June 16, 2008, be confirmed.

14. Committee for Honorary Degrees: Membership

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

THAT the proposal for membership on the Committee for Honorary Degrees, 2008-2009, as recommended by the Academic Board and outlined in the memorandum from the Secretary of the Executive Committee, dated June 16, 2008, be approved.

Administrative Staff

Mrs. Bonnie Horne, Librarian

Lay Members

Mr. Harvey Botting

Ms Shirley Hoy *

Students

Ms Krista Boa (graduate student, Faculty of Information Studies) *

Mr. Alex Kenjeev (graduate student, Joseph L. Rotman School of Management / Faculty of Law)

Teaching Staff

Professor Anne-Emanuelle Birn, UTSC (International Development Studies)

University Professor Brad Inwood, Faculty of Arts and Science (Department of Classics)

Professor Cynthia Goh, Faculty of Arts and Science (Department of Chemistry)*

Professor Elizabeth Smyth, OISE/UT (Curriculum, Teaching, and Learning)

* *indicates re-appointment*

15. Board Assignment 2008-2009

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

THAT the proposal from the Chair for a Board assignment for 2008-09 be approved.

16. Towards 2030: Task Force on Governance Phase 2 – Membership

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

THAT the proposed membership for Phase 2 of the Task Force on Governance, as described in the document dated June 16, 2008, be approved.

Ms. Rose M. Patten – Chair (Former Chair, Governing Council)
Professor Vivek Goel – Vice-Chair (Founding President and CEO, Ontario Agency for Health Protection and Promotion; Professor, Dalla Lana School of Public Health; Former Governor; Former Vice-President and Provost)

Mr. P.C. Choo (Administrative Staff Governor; Member, Business Board and Elections Committee, former Member, Executive Committee)
Professor Ray Cummins (Former Teaching Staff Governor and Chair, Academic Board)

Dr. Claude Davis (LGIC Governor; Chair, University Affairs Board)
Professor William Gough (Teaching Staff Governor; Member, University Affairs Board and Committee on Academic Policy and Programs; Associate Professor, Department of Physical and Environmental Sciences, University of Toronto at Scarborough, Graduate Department of Geography)

Mr. Alex Kenjeev (Graduate Student Member, University Tribunal; Former Graduate Student Governor; Former Member, Academic Board and Business Board)

Professor Michael Marrus (Teaching Staff Governor; Chair, Academic Board; Chancellor Rose and Ray Wolfe Professor Emeritus of Holocaust Studies)

Mr. Stephen Smith (Alumnus Governor; Chair, Elections Committee; Member, Business Board and Senior Appointments and Compensation Committee;)

Mr. W. David Wilson (LGIC Governor; Member, Business Board, Senior Appointments and Compensation Committee)

Mr. Louis R. Charpentier – Secretary

The meeting adjourned at 5:37 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

June 5, 2008