

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL
REPORT NUMBER 403 OF
THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Thursday, March 8, 2007

To the Governing Council,
University of Toronto.

Your Committee reports that it held a meeting on Thursday, March 8, 2007 at 5:00 p.m. in the Boardroom, Simcoe Hall, with the following members present:

Ms Rose M. Patten (In the Chair)
Mr. John F. (Jack) Petch, Vice-Chair
Professor David Naylor, President
Mr. P.C. Choo
The Honourable William G. Davis
Ms Susan Eng
Professor Ellen Hodnett
Mr. Timothy Reid
Professor Arthur S. Ripstein
Professor Barbara Sherwood Lollar
Ms Estefania Toledo

Non-Voting Member:

Mr. Louis R. Charpentier

Secretariat:

Mr. Henry Mulhall, Secretary

Regrets:

Miss Coralie D'Souza
Dr. Shari Graham Fell
Mr. Robert S. Weiss

In Attendance:

Dr. Claude Davis, Chair, University Affairs Board and Member of the Governing Council
Professor Michael R. Marrus, Chair, Academic Board and Member of the Governing Council
Professor Vivek Goel, Vice-President and Provost and Member of the Governing Council
Ms Catherine Riggall, Vice-President, Business Affairs

Vary the Agenda

It was agreed to vary the agenda to consider the *in camera* items at the end of the meeting.

1. Report of the Previous Meeting

Report Number 402 of the Executive Committee meeting held on January 18, 2007 was approved.

2. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting

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

3. Minutes of the Governing Council Meeting of February 1, 2007

Members received for information the minutes of the Governing Council meeting held on February 1, 2007.

4. Business Arising from the Minutes of the Governing Council Meeting

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

5. Report of the President

(a) Vision 2030

The President reported that the University's long-term planning exercise, Vision 2030, was continuing on schedule. A preliminary framing document was being drafted and would be forwarded in coming weeks to the President, Vice-Presidents and Vice-Provosts (PVP) group for comment and revisions. This would be followed by a process of broad consultation and dialogue across the University community. Significant issues under consideration included the tri-campus configuration of the University, its business model, and its long-term strategy.

(b) Offline Session on the New Budget Model

The President reported that an offline information session on the implementation of the new budget model had been held on February 27, 2007 for members of the Planning and Budget Committee and the Business Board. The new budget model had also been discussed extensively at meetings of Principals and Deans, including its differential effect on the University's various divisions. Its implementation would be an evolutionary process. An ongoing issue would be to clarify the distinction between the budget model and the long-term budget framework. The former dealt with the process by which budget allocations were made. The latter was the long-term plan to maintain the University's cumulative operating deficit within the limits required by Governing Council policy, that is, to an amount no greater than 1.5% of operating revenue. To do so, ongoing expense containments would be required.

(c) Speaking Up Survey

The results of the Speaking Up Survey, completed by staff, faculty, and librarians between October 10 and November 10, 2006, would be communicated to members of the Governing Council in coming weeks. An offline information session would also be provided if needed. The preliminary data were encouraging, indicating that respondents were proud to be associated with the University and engaged with their work. The results compared favourably with appropriate benchmarks. The survey had, however, identified issues of concern that would require further analysis.

5. Report of the President (cont'd)

(d) Government Relations

Advocacy efforts were continuing with the Federal Government for the inclusion of measures in support of research-intensive universities in the upcoming Budget scheduled to be released on March 19, 2007. There continued to be uncertainty with respect to funding allocations from the Provincial Government, including the quality funds. Given that the Provincial Budget was slated for March 22, 2007, substantial advocacy had also been undertaken with the Provincial Government regarding year-end and base budget allocations.

(e) Faculty of Nursing Gift

The President was pleased to note that, at a ceremony that morning, the Faculty of Nursing had formally announced the receipt of a gift of \$10 million brought to the University by Mr. Lawrence Bloomberg. In recognition of the gift, the largest ever received by a faculty or school of nursing in Canada, the faculty would be named the Lawrence Bloomberg Faculty of Nursing. The gift would have an enormous impact on this small but elite faculty. A member noted that this gift would raise awareness of the important role played by the Faculty in responding to the critical need for leaders, teachers and researchers in the nursing profession.

6. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council

(a) Capital Plan, 2006-2011 ¹

(Arising from Report Number 148 of the Academic Board (February 15, 2007)- Item 6)

Professor Marrus reported that an integrated presentation on the Capital Plan, the Real Estate Strategy, and the Borrowing Strategy had been provided at the Academic Board meeting. Much of the discussion that followed had concerned the issue of the desirability of future enrolment growth. Professor Goel had noted that very few projects on the Capital Projects List were linked to enrolment growth, but rather dealt with the renewal of older buildings which would be required irrespective of growth.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation

THAT the updated Capital Projects List as described in Appendix 5 of the *Capital Plan, 2006-2011*, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 148 of the Academic Board as Appendix "A", be approved.

(b) Capital Project: Interim Project Planning Report: Faculty of Law

(Arising from Report Number 148 of the Academic Board (February 15, 2007)- Item 7)

Professor Marrus reported that the Faculty of Law, after considering other options, had decided to expand its facilities on its current site, 78 and 84 Queen's Park Crescent West. This expansion was required to provide the space needed to carry out its academic plans. The Faculty of Music had also identified space needs to support its academic plans, and the two faculties would cooperate in carrying out their respective expansions.

¹ The Real Estate Strategy, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 116 of the Planning and Budget Committee as Appendix "B", and the Borrowing Strategy, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 116 of the Planning and Budget Committee as Appendix "C", were attached for information to the documentation for this item.

6. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council (cont'd)

(b) Capital Project: Interim Project Planning Report: Faculty of Law (cont'd)

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation

THAT the Interim Project Planning Report for the Faculty of Law, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 148 of the Academic Board as Appendix “B”, be approved in principle to accommodate the activities and functions described for the expansion of the School's programs at its present location at 78 and 84 Queen's Park Crescent West.

(c) Capital Project: Project Planning Report: Department of Anthropology, Hughes Building Phased Master Plan

(Arising from Report Number 148 of the Academic Board (February 15, 2007)- Item 8)

Professor Marrus reported that the Norman Hughes Building, formerly occupied by the Faculty of Pharmacy, had been assigned in July 2006 to the Faculty of Arts and Science to accommodate the Department of Anthropology. The proposed phased approach to its renovation was less extensive than the original proposal, and could be carried out within budget. Discussion at the Board had focused on the decision to conduct limited renovations rather than full renovations. Professor Goel had explained that it had been decided that the proposed staged approach to the project would make the most efficient use of available resources.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation

1. THAT the Project Planning Report for the Relocation of the Department of Anthropology to the Norman Hughes Pharmacy Building, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 148 of the Academic Board as Appendix “C”, be approved in principle.
2. THAT the project scope having a total space allocation of 3660 nasm/6100 gsm space program at a cost of \$9.76 million in 2006 dollars, be approved with funding to be provided as follows:

Faculty of Arts & Science	\$7.59 million
Facilities and Services (FRP)	\$2.00 million
Office of Space Management	\$0.17 million

3. THAT all space currently occupied by the Department of Anthropology be released and made available for reallocation to other units.

6. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council (cont'd)**(d) Capital Project: Project Planning Report: Lash Miller Chemical Laboratories Undergraduate Laboratories, Final Phase***(Arising from Report Number 148 of the Academic Board (February 15, 2007 - Item 9)*

Professor Marrus reported that the proposed project would complete the renovations needed for the undergraduate chemistry laboratories in the Lash Miller building. The plan addressed space and design deficiencies and deferred maintenance. It would allow an increase in the number of students using the laboratories, and enhance the student experience.

A member asked for clarification regarding the “outstanding funding requests” of \$3,500,000 cited in the motion. Professor Goel responded that requests had been made for funding to complete the project from the Academic Initiatives Fund (AIF) and the Student Experience Fund (SEF). It was expected that recommendations for the allocations would occur prior to consideration of the project planning report by the Governing Council at its March 29, 2007 meeting. It was appropriate to use the Student Experience Fund to support projects which enhanced all aspects of the student experience, both inside and outside the classroom.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation

1. THAT the Project Planning Report for the Phase II Chemistry Undergraduate Practical Laboratory renovations, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 148 of the Academic Board as Appendix “D”, be approved in principle.
2. THAT the total project scope consisting of approximately 2,175 NASM with a Total Project Cost of \$5,000,000 be approved with the funding sources identified as:

FAS & Department of Chemistry (50%-50%)	\$1,080,000
Faculty of Engineering	\$350,000
Faculty of Pharmacy	\$70,000
Outstanding funding requests	\$3,500,000
Total	\$5,000,000

(e) School of Graduate Studies: Master of Arts Program in Cinema Studies*(Arising from Report Number 148 of the Academic Board (February 15, 2007)- Item 10)*

Professor Marrus reported that the proposed one-year, course-based M.A. program in Cinema Studies followed upon the recent establishment of the Cinema Studies Institute by the Governing Council on February 1, 2007. No questions had been raised by members of the Board.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation

THAT the proposed Master of Arts (M.A.) Program in Cinema Studies, as described in Appendix “E” to Report Number 148 of the Academic Board, be established within the Faculty of Arts and Science, commencing September 2007.

7. Reports for Information

Members received the following reports for information.

- (a) Report Number 147 of the Academic Board (January 11, 2007)
- (b) Report Number 148 of the Academic Board (February 15, 2007)
- (c) Report Number 154 of the Business Board (January 15, 2007)
- (d) Report Number 139 of the University Affairs Board (January 16, 2007)

Student Experience

A member referred to Report Number 139 of the University Affairs Board, which detailed the Vice-Provost, Students' recent Report to the Board on the Student Experience. During discussion, it had been suggested that student perceptions that were critical of the University might in part have arisen from its very high academic standards.² In the member's view, this discussion had raised a fundamental issue for the University, with ramifications for its public reputation that needed to be addressed. He suggested, as a first step, that focus groups be conducted by outside professionals with first-year students who dropped courses, left the University during first year, or did not return for second year.

The Provost responded that this was a significant issue that had been highlighted by the data derived from the 2006 National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), and was being actively addressed by the University. Focus groups were being used, and he would take under advisement the suggestion that these be conducted by independent parties. Faculty members at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE/UT) and throughout the University with expertise in the area were also carrying out research on the student experience. Among other initiatives, the Faculty of Nursing had established a Centre for Innovation and Learning, and the Faculty of Engineering had created programs to assist students with the transition to first year and to reduce the first-year attrition rate. A member added that the first-year seminars in the Faculty of Arts and Science (199Ys) provided a small classroom experience for about 20% of the Faculty's first-year students, and allowed faculty to provide instruction in research and writing skills, and the avoidance of plagiarism.

The Provost noted that the Council of First-Entry Deans would be addressing the complex issue of grading practices and student perceptions of grades, where data varied considerably between and within faculties. The President added that, given this variation, strategies would need to be developed at the divisional and departmental level once clarity had been achieved. The NSSE data indicated a clear student perception that they had to work harder for their grades than did students at peer institutions, and this had a demoralizing effect. A member added that, in his experience, high school students had a similar perception of the University's rigorous academic standards, and believed that they would be more likely to achieve the grades necessary for entrance into graduate and professional programs if they attended peer institutions. A member noted that many professional faculties had a sense of the range of academic standards and grading practices at different institutions, and took this into consideration in their admission decisions.

Student Services

A member stated that the Council on Student Services (COSS) had, on March 2, 2007, voted not to approve the operating plans and budgets of the Faculty of Physical Education and Health

² See: <http://www.utoronto.ca/govcncl/bac/details/ua/2006-07/uar20070116.pdf>, p. 6. "Students often achieved grades considerably lower than they had in high school, and lower than they thought they would have received if they had attended another Ontario university ... grades at the University, particularly in first year, were lower than at peer institutions."

7. Reports for Information (cont'd)**Student Services (cont'd)**

Co-Curricular Programs, Services and Facilities. This decision by COSS, in his view, reversed a previous commitment by recognized student groups to support a \$10.00 per student fee in support of the new Varsity Centre. The operating plans and budgets would have to be revised prior to submission to the University Affairs Board for approval, and \$750,000 less operating revenue would be available than had been anticipated. As a result, the new Varsity Centre facilities would have to be rented out to external groups more extensively, and student access would be limited. The member asked whether it would be possible for the University to make a one-time operating grant to the Faculty while a review was carried out of the COSS process.

Professor Goel clarified that the previous commitment in 2002 to the \$10.00 per student athletics fee had not been made by the recognized campus groups themselves (the Students' Administrative Council, Graduate Students' Union, and Association of Part-time University Students), but rather by members from each group on the Project Planning Committee for the Varsity Centre acting in an individual capacity. He also noted that all the operating plans submitted to COSS had been defeated, including those for Hart House, Student Services and Health Services, and Student Affairs. The operating plans for Student Services at the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM) had also been defeated by an equivalent body, the Quality Services to Students Council (QSS) at UTM. The one exception had been the operating plans for student services at the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC), which had been approved by the Council on Student Services (CSS), the equivalent body on that campus. Under these circumstances it would not be fair to provide a one-time operating grant to the Faculty of Physical Education and Health without doing so for all these other offices whose operating plans had not been approved by COSS. The President commented that it was regrettable that student access to the Varsity Centre would be reduced given that the facility had been built primarily for the purpose of enhancing the student experience outside the classroom.

8. Date of the Next Meeting

Members were reminded that the next regular meeting of the Executive Committee was scheduled for Thursday, April 12, 2007 at 5:00 p.m.

9. Other Business

There was no other business.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

IT WAS RESOLVED

THAT, pursuant to sections 28 (e) and 33 of *By-Law Number 2*, consideration of items 10, 11, 12, and 13 take place *in camera*, with the Board Chairs, and Vice-Presidents admitted to facilitate the work of the Committee, with the exception of item 13 (b) for which the Vice-Presidents will absent themselves.

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

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

THAT the recommendation for expulsion contained in the Memorandum from the Secretary of the Governing Council dated March 8, 2007 (Agenda Item 10 [a]), be placed on the agenda for the March 29, 2007 meeting of the Governing Council; and

THAT the recommendation for expulsion contained in the Memorandum from the Secretary of the Governing Council dated March 8, 2007 (Agenda Item 10 [b]), be placed on the agenda for the March 29, 2007 meeting of the Governing Council; and

THAT the recommendation for expulsion contained in the Memorandum from the Secretary of the Governing Council dated March 8, 2007 (Agenda Item 10 [c]), be placed on the agenda for the March 29, 2007 meeting of the Governing Council; and

THAT pursuant to Sections 38 and 40 of By-Law Number 2, these recommendations be considered by the Governing Council *in camera*.

11. Appointment to the Governing Council

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation contained in the Memorandum from the Secretary of the Governing Council dated February 27, 2007 for an appointment to the Governing Council.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

THAT, pursuant to Section 38 of *By-Law Number 2*, the recommendation be considered by the Governing Council *in camera*.

12. External Appointments

(a) McClelland and Stewart Ltd.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

THAT the following individuals be approved and nominated as directors of McClelland and Stewart Ltd. for one year terms until the 2008 annual meeting of the Corporation, or until their successors are appointed, effective immediately.

Dr. Avie Bennett (Chair)
Ms Trina McQueen
Mr. Douglas Pepper (President and Publisher)
Ms Catherine Riggall
Ms Judith Wolfson

13. Senior Appointments

- (a) On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED

to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation for a senior appointment contained in the memorandum from the President dated March 6, 2007.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

THAT, pursuant to Section 38 of *By-Law Number 2*, the recommendation for the senior appointment be considered by the Governing Council *in camera*.

- (b) On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED

to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation for a senior appointment contained in the memorandum from the President dated March 7, 2007.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

THAT, pursuant to Section 38 of *By-Law Number 2*, the recommendation for the senior appointment be considered by the Governing Council *in camera*.

The Committee returned to closed session.

The meeting adjourned at 6:30 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

March 16, 2007