

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

Thursday, April 6, 2000

MINUTES OF THE GOVERNING COUNCIL meeting held on Thursday, April 6, 2000
at 4:30 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall.

Present:

Ms Wendy M. Cecil-Cockwell (In the Chair)	Mr. Kashif S. Pirzada
Mrs. Mary Anne V. Chambers, Vice-Chair	The Honourable Robert K. Rae
The Honourable Henry N. R. Jackman, Chancellor	Professor Emmet I. Robbins
Professor J. Robert S. Prichard, President	Professor Wendy Rolph
Professor Mary Beattie	Mrs. Susan M. Scace
Dr. Robert Bennett	Professor Adel S. Sedra
Mr. Brian C. Burchell	Professor Kenneth Sevcik
Professor John R. G. Challis	Mr. Amir Shalaby
Professor W. Raymond Cummins	Mr. Robert G. Spencer
The Honourable William G. Davis	Ms Wendy Talfourd-Jones
Dr. Shari Graham Fell	Professor Ronald D. Venter
Professor Vivek Goel	Ms Nancy L. Watson
Mr. Ljupco Gjorgjinski	Dr. Alexander R. Waugh
Dr. Robert J. Kyle	Ms Judith Wilson
Mr. Gerald A. Lokash	Mr. Vilko Zbogar
Professor John T. Mayhall	Mr. Louis R. Charpentier, Secretary of the Governing Council
Mr. Ahmed Rafi Mian	
Professor Heather Munroe-Blum	
Dr. John P. Nestor	<u>Secretariat:</u>
Mr. Elan Ohayon	Ms Susan Girard
Ms Jacqueline C. Orange	Ms Margaret McKone
The Honourable David R. Peterson	

Absent:

Professor Jack Carr	Professor Brian Langille
Ms Shruti Dev-Nayyar	Professor Ian R. McDonald
Ms Wanda M. Dorosz	Ms Rose M. Patten
Mr. Paul V. Godfrey	Dr. Joseph L. Rotman
Dr. Anne Golden	Mr. Terrence L. Stephen
Mr. Peter A. Herrndorf	Mr. John H. Tory

In Attendance:

Professor David Cook, Vice-Provost
Professor Michael G. Finlayson, Vice-President, Administration and Human Resources
Professor Derek McCammond, Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget
Professor Ian Orchard, Vice-Provost, Students
Professor Carolyn Tuohy, Deputy Provost
Professor Derek P. H. Allen, Vice-Provost and Dean of Arts, Trinity College
Professor Carl Amrhein, Dean, Faculty of Arts and Science

In Attendance: (cont'd)

Professor Rona Abramovitch, Director of Transitional Year Programme, and Provost's Advisor on Proactive Faculty Recruitment
Mr. George Altmeyer, Assistant Dean and Faculty Registrar, Faculty of Arts and Science
Ms Susan Bloch-Nevedt, Director, Public Affairs
Professor Rodolphe el-Khoury, Faculty of Architecture, Landscape, and Design
Dr. Beata FitzPatrick, Assistant Provost
Ms Rivi Frankle, Director of Alumni and Development
Professor Judith Globerman, Status of Women Officer
Professor Angela Hildyard, Principal, Woodsworth College
Mr. Paul Kutasi, Vice-President, Students' Administrative Council
Ms Manon LePaven, President, Association of Part-Time Undergraduate Students
Mr. Liam Mitchell, Scarborough Chair, Students' Administrative Council
Ms Vera Melnyk, member, Academic Board; Executive Assistant to the Dean, Faculty of Arts and Science
Ms Gillian Morton, Coordinator, Women's Centre
Ms Evelyn Napier, Counsel, University of Toronto Faculty Association
Professor Peter Pauly, Associate Dean, Rotman School of Management
Mr. Kasi Rao, Director of the Office of the President and Director of Government Relations
Professor Pekka K. Sinervo, Chair, Department of Physics
Ms Maureen Somerville, Chair, College of Electors
Mr. Paul Tsang, President, Graduate Students' Union

Chairman's Remarks

The Chairman and members congratulated the Honourable Henry N. R. Jackman on his re-election as the University's Chancellor. The College of Electors, comprising 40 alumni who were responsible for choosing the Chancellor, had met on March 6 and voted overwhelmingly in favour of the Chancellor's re-election for a second three-year term.

The Chairman welcomed Mr. Ljupco Gjorgjinski, who had recently been elected as a part-time student governor, replacing Mr. Jonathan Papoulidis.

The Chairman also welcomed members of the College of Electors and its Chair, Ms Maureen Somerville, who were in attendance to view the Governing Council's proceedings.

The Chairman noted that, in addition to several speaking requests concerning matters on the agenda, which she would speak to later in the meeting, she had received a request from Ms Karen Thom to address the Council on matter not on the agenda - hiring practices at the University of Toronto. In view of the length of the Council's agenda for today's meeting and the number of speakers addressing matters on the agenda, she had declined this request.

The Vice-Chair announced that Ms Wendy M. Cecil-Cockwell had been acclaimed Chairman of the Governing Council for another one-year term. Members joined the Vice-Chair in congratulating the Chairman. The Chairman thanked members for their confidence and their support.

Vary the Agenda

The Chairman noted that there were a number of important approval items that required the Council's consideration this afternoon. She was also aware of a number of early-evening commitments for which members had to leave early, including the Public Policy Forum. Therefore, she requested that the Council's agenda be varied so that the President's report followed those items requiring approval.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT pursuant to By-Law number 2, section 52, the order of the agenda be varied so that the President's Report followed immediately the items of business requiring the Council's approval.

1. Minutes of the Previous Meeting

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT the minutes of the meeting of February 10, 2000 be approved.

2. Business Arising from the Minutes of the Previous Meeting

The Chairman noted that she was aware of four items of business arising from the previous meeting:

- (a) potential savings from the teaching assistant strike;
- (b) use of savings for a multi-faith facility;
- (c) an administrative response to Professor Shah's recommendations on hiring and diversity; and
- (d) preparation of a Briefing Book for governors on the matter of Dr. Chun.

She noted that the President would be addressing these items in his Report.

a) Item 10 (a) – Report Number 322 of the Executive Committee -- Application of Procedures for Non-members to Address the Governing Council and its Boards and Committees

A member recalled that at the previous meeting he had voiced his concern about the Executive Committee's application of the *Procedures for Non-Members to Address the Governing Council and its Boards and Committee*, as had been recorded in Report Number 322 of the Executive Committee. As a result of new guidelines, two requests to address the February 10 meeting of the Council had been declined. At that meeting he had advocated that the matter be discussed at a future meeting of the Council. The member continued that the Chairman had earlier announced that she had declined a request to address the Council at today's meeting. As well, he was aware of two additional requests to address matters that were on the Council's agenda that had also been declined. The member expressed his deep concern over the application of the *Procedures*, which provided for up to fifteen minutes by non-members to address the Council at each meeting. Specifically, the right of non-members to address the Council appeared to have been eradicated and he again requested that the matter be discussed by the Council, preferably at today's meeting.

2. Business Arising from the Minutes of the Previous Meeting (cont'd)

The Chairman responded that the Executive Committee had discussed the application of the *Procedures* in detail. She continued that she often received many requests to address the Governing Council on specific agenda items as well as matters not appearing on the agenda. In determining which requests should be granted, she took into account a number of factors, including the length of the Council's agenda. Where requests were declined, the individuals were invited to submit their comments in writing for distribution at the meeting – as they had done for today's meeting. On some occasions, the individuals were invited to submit speaking requests for subsequent meetings.

3. School of Graduate Studies and the Advanced Design Manufacturing Institute: Proposal for a New Joint Master of Engineering Degree Program in Design and Manufacturing (MEngDM)

(arising from Report Number 99 of the Academic Board – March 9, 2000)

Professor Mayhall noted that the proposal concerned a collaborative effort among four universities to provide, in modular format, an integrated graduate program in engineering and management. A self-funded program, it would have no resource implications for the operating budget. Professor Ron Venter had been congratulated for his leadership in establishing the new program.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT the proposal for the establishment of a Joint Master of Engineering Degree Program in Design and Manufacturing (MEngDM), effective July 1, 2000, as described in the submission from the School of Graduate Studies, dated September 1, 1999, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 99 of the Academic Board as Appendix "A", be approved.

4. Faculty of Arts and Science: 2000-2001 Calendar Changes – 15-Credit BA/BSc Degrees: Discontinuation

(arising from Report Number 99 of the Academic Board – March 9, 2000)

The Chairman noted that she had received several requests to address the Governing Council on this proposal. She had declined the requests of Ms Gillian Morton, Coordinator, Women's Centre, and Mr. Chris Turner, alumnus, because they had previously stated their concerns to the Academic Board. She referred members to the Report of the previous Academic Board meeting and to an excerpt of the December 2 Academic Board meeting that had been placed on the table. She said that both Ms Morton and Mr. Turner had been invited to submit additional comments in writing for distribution this afternoon.

The Chairman continued that she had granted speaking privileges on this proposal to Ms Manon LePaven, President, Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students (APUS), Mr. Paul Kutasi, Vice-President, Students' Administrative Council (SAC), and Mr. Paul Tsang, President, Graduate Students' Union (GSU). Although Ms LePaven and Mr. Tsang had also addressed the Academic Board on this proposal, speaking privileges were normally granted to heads of the recognized campus groups (APUS, SAC, GSU and the University of Toronto Faculty Association) for items on the agenda of the Governing Council.

4. Faculty of Arts and Science: 2000-2001 Calendar Changes – 15-Credit BA/BSc Degrees: Discontinuation (cont'd)

(a) Introduction

Professor Mayhall introduced the proposal noting that it had enjoyed a great deal of spirited debate at the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs, the Planning and Budget Committee and the Academic Board. Several members, speaking in support of the proposal, had provided detailed accounts of how the Faculty of Arts and Science had arrived at the decision to recommend the discontinuation of the 15-credit degrees. Other members had spoken in favour of retaining the degrees, noting that many students, particularly part-time students, would be disadvantaged by the elimination of the programs. Professor Mayhall drew members' attention to the Report of the Academic Board meeting for the details of these interventions.

It was duly moved and seconded,

THAT the proposal for the discontinuation of the 15-credit BA and BSc degrees, as described in the Faculty of Arts and Science submission, dated February 14, 2000, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 99 of the Academic Board as Appendix "B", be approved, effective for students first registering in the Faculty of Arts and Science on the St. George Campus in the academic year 2001-2002 and at the University of Toronto at Mississauga at a time to be determined by the Vice-President and Provost and the Principal.

(b) Questions for Clarification

Members posed a number of questions for clarification concerning the proposal, during which the following points were addressed.

- The Vice-President and Provost and the Principal would determine the date for implementation of the proposal at the University of Toronto at Mississauga. This decision would be brought to the Academic Board for information at least one year prior to the effective date. There would, therefore, be ample opportunity to address any concerns that Board members might have regarding the timing of implementing the proposal at Mississauga.
- If members desired further action on the proposal, the matter could be referred back to the Academic Board, with the Governing Council providing specific direction with respect to its expectations. Should members not endorse the proposal, it could not, under the Council's By-law, be considered again within a twelve-month period, unless it was so agreed by the Council with a two-thirds majority.
- The proposal applied only to the Faculty of Arts and Science, which included the University of Toronto at Mississauga. It arose from a curriculum review process within the Faculty and would be implemented at different dates on the two campuses because there were implementation issues still to be resolved at Mississauga.
- The University of Toronto at Scarborough was undertaking a review of its curriculum and as part of the process would consider whether the 15-credit degrees should be continued on that campus.
- The Status of Women Officer, Professor Judith Globerman, had discussed the proposal with both the President and the Dean of Arts and Science from the perspective of equity. A task force, to be chaired by the Principal of Woodsworth College, Professor Angela Hildyard, would address the issues raised by Professor Globerman, including access and financial assistance for part-time students.

4. Faculty of Arts and Science: 2000-2001 Calendar Changes – 15-Credit BA/BSc Degrees: Discontinuation (cont'd)

(c) Addresses by Non-Members

Representatives from the three major student organizations addressed the Council.

Ms Manon LePaven, President, Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students (APUS).

Ms LePaven spoke against the proposal, noting that it would negatively affect part-time students, who represented a large segment of the University's population. Many members of this constituency would be excluded from attending the University should the option of obtaining a 15-credit degree be eliminated. While it was true that students who wished to pursue 15-credit degrees could do so within the GTA by attending Ryerson Polytechnic University or York University, the University of Toronto would remain as the desired choice of many. Ms LePaven continued that many part-time students did not have the time nor the resources to complete 20-credit degrees. Some were single parents with childcare responsibilities and taking the increased number of courses would not be possible. She commended the creation of a task force to consider issues including financial aid; however, she noted that no increase in funds had been committed. She asked that the Council defer its consideration of the proposal until the views of part-time students had been solicited through a questionnaire.

Mr. Paul Kutasi, Vice-President, Students' Administrative Council (SAC). Mr. Kutasi noted that SAC was opposed to the proposed elimination of the 15-credit degrees for many reasons. In the current environment where students had to deal with rising tuition and huge debt loans, the elimination of the 15-credit degrees was a dangerous move backwards that would put an enormous burden on students. Students would be required to pay approximately \$5000 in tuition for the extra year of study. The University would, therefore, be placing a huge and difficult strain on students. The Report of the Provost's Task Force on Tuition and Student Financial Support had stated that "the University of Toronto should guarantee that no student offered admission to its programs will be unable to enter or complete the program due to lack of financial need." Mr. Kutasi noted that clearly, the University had taken the steps to encourage an accessible education for all qualified applicants. However, by eliminating the three-year degree, the University would be systematically eliminating those students who would not be able to afford an extra year of study. This was a reversal of its own policy. Mr. Kutasi continued that the most qualified students, especially those at the lower income scale, would not be able to afford to attend the University. The administration had stated that a 20-credit degree was the standard for being accepted into graduate programs. Although this was true for certain programs, it was not true for all. There were a number of graduate schools in Canada and abroad, such as in Law, where a 15-credit degree was acceptable. Current OSAP eligibility policies required students to take at least a 3.5 course load -- a full-time load - - in order to receive a student loan. Since the majority of students enrolled in the 15-credit degree programs were part-time, it will be difficult for those students to pay tuition in the absence of loans. Therefore, the students' debt loads would increase at the same time they were required to pay for an additional year of study. In the administration's response to the elimination of 15-credit degrees, Provost Adel Sedra had stated in an interview with the *Toronto Star* that the proposal was "...premised on existence of five-year high school curriculum....With the demise of that curriculum, the legitimacy of continuing to offer a three-year degree is called into question." Dean Carl Amrhein had been quoted in the *Annex Gleaner* as saying, "We no longer have (Grade 13) and so our only option, to be consistent with the North American standard, is to move to a 20 credit (four-year) baccalaureate degree." Mr. Kutasi questioned this rationale when the current high school curriculum was not eliminating a year of study but condensing five years into four. He believed the University's rationale was short-sighted and did not offer a good explanation for the elimination of the three-year

4. Faculty of Arts and Science: 2000-2001 Calendar Changes – 15-Credit BA/BSc Degrees: Discontinuation (cont'd)

degrees. When a student earned a university degree, the degree's value was predicated on the quality of education in that university at that time. He wondered about the legitimacy of those 15-credit degrees held by University alumni.

Mr. Paul Tsang, President, Graduate Students' Union (GSU). Mr. Tsang voiced the GSU's opposition to the proposal, noting that it would compromise academic diversity and equity at the University. The GSU's Executive Committee had approved the following resolution:

Whereas the 3-year degree is a significant component of academic diversity, equity and accessibility at the University;

Be it resolved that the GSU support the retention of the 3-year degree program in the Faculty of Arts and Science.

Mr. Tsang explained that the GSU was concerned about the proposal because it affected the academic community, which comprised many constituencies. The long-term health of the University was dependent on the well-being of each of these constituencies. He did not believe concerns regarding access to and diversity at the University had been adequately addressed. As well, he was unclear as to the rationale for the proposal. Initially he had thought it was predicated on the need to plan for the elimination of grade 13 and the impending double cohort and increased enrolment due to demographic changes; however, it now appeared that the rationale for the proposal was to eliminate confusion caused at other institutions by the fact that the University had two different baccalaureates. He hoped that this rationale was not in fact the driving influence, as it would put other degree programs at risk. He continued that the elimination of the 15-credit degrees would be a disservice to the University and he emphasized that diversity equaled excellence. The University benefited from diversity in ideas and its academic programs. By eliminating diversity the University was in fact enforcing conformity since students chose to complete 15-credit degrees for a number of reasons, and not only for the purpose of pursuing graduate or professional degree programs.

(d) Discussion

A member noted his concern that the three major student governments were opposed to the proposal. He continued that one of the academic rationales for the proposal was to eliminate confusion caused at other institutions by the fact that the University had two different baccalaureates; however, the member believed this confusion would be further enhanced by the fact that the proposal did not also pertain to the 15-credit degrees offered by Scarborough. A second rationale was that the Faculty of Arts and Science was committed to a strong broadly-based liberal arts undergraduate curriculum, which included writing proficiency, scientific literacy, computer competency and experiential learning. The model for incorporating these components into the undergraduate curriculum had been the 20-credit degree; however, this rationale was abstract and alternative solutions had not been identified. It had also been argued that a 15-credit degree was not adequate preparation for entrance into graduate and professional degree programs; however, not all students planned to pursue these programs. The member expressed concern that with the increased enrolment in the Faculty of Arts and Science because students would now be enrolled for 20 credits, the University might not be able to respond adequately to the impending enrolment increases. He applauded Scarborough for its careful approach in not immediately recommending a similar proposal for that campus. For these reasons, the member noted that debate of the matter should be adjourned until such time as student governments had been consulted and all concerns had been addressed.

4. Faculty of Arts and Science: 2000-2001 Calendar Changes – 15-Credit BA/BSc Degrees: Discontinuation (cont'd)

It was duly moved and seconded,

THAT debate of the proposal for the discontinuation for the 15-credit BA and BSc degrees be adjourned.

The vote was taken on the motion to adjourn debate.

The motion was defeated.

A member requested that the Ms Morton and Mr. Turner, both of whom had been denied speaking privileges, be permitted to address the Council. In the member's opinion, it was important that the Council hear from its alumni and from the Women's Centre, a watchdog at the University.

It was duly moved and seconded,

THAT Ms Morton be permitted to address the Council on this matter.

The vote was taken on the motion.

The motion was defeated.

It was duly moved and seconded,

THAT Mr. Turner be permitted to address the Council on this matter.

The vote was taken on the motion.

The motion was defeated.

Discussion of the proposal continued.

A member stated that he had obtained a 15-credit degree, which had been at that time a sufficient prerequisite for his admission to an MSc degree at the University of Toronto. He continued that he believed the rationale for the proposal remained unclear. For example, the draft paper on enrolment expansion had indicated that the proposal was premised on the elimination of grade 13. However, now the proposal appeared to arise from academic planning and curriculum review processes in the Faculty of Arts and Science and was intended to improve the academic experience and to include key Faculty priorities, such as writing proficiency. Supporting documentation had indicated that the proposal was in part premised on the fact that other institutions were confused by the University's 15- and 20-credit degrees. However, during the Executive Committee's discussion of the proposal, this had not proven to be one of the primary rationales. At the Executive Committee meeting, the member had raised the need for recognition of work completed by students who completed 15 credits prior to admission to professional faculties. This concern had not been addressed and there were no statistics to illustrate the impact of the proposal on those students who would be entering professional faculties. The member expressed concern that with impending enrolment increases system-wide, Ryerson Polytechnic University and York University would not be able to handle the demand in increased numbers of students seeking 15-credit degrees as a result of the elimination of the degree program at the University of Toronto. The member asserted that it was important to strike a balance between achieving the goals of *Raising our Sights* to ensure the University

4. Faculty of Arts and Science: 2000-2001 Calendar Changes – 15-Credit BA/BSc Degrees: Discontinuation (cont'd)

ranked with the best institutions in North America and ensuring accessibility. The three major student governments had spoken against the proposal and the member stated that the Council should listen to the students. For these reasons, he would vote against the proposal. The member asked for a recorded vote of the final decision.

The required three members later supported the request for a recorded vote.

A member noted that next year's calendar for the Faculty of Arts and Science listed a 15-credit specialist degree program. The offering of this program did not appear to be consistent with the proposal before the Council. The member agreed that further confusion would be caused if two of the University's three campuses ceased to offer a 15-credit degree. As well, he worried about the equivalency of degrees offered by each campus.

A member clarified that the proposal was clearly a curriculum issue. With changes in the semester system and summer offerings students could, if they wished, complete a 20-credit degree in three years, the same amount of time it currently took students to complete a 15-credit degree. He therefore did not agree that the proposal would affect access to the University, as had been suggested. He cited a recent example in the Department of Health Administration in which a two-year MHSc had been restructured from five days a week to three days every third week. There had been an increase in the number of women and single parents enrolling in the program, and students had been able to complete the program in two years.

A member spoke in support of the proposal. After the initial discussion of the proposal at the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs, he had had many questions. He had since spent a great deal of time discussing the proposal with representatives of many constituencies. He had concluded that the proposal, which represented a major change in the Faculty's curriculum addressed both the *Raising our Sights* planning process and the spirit of the University's mission to rank with the best international universities. For these reasons, the member believed the proposal should be endorsed.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Professor Carl Amrhein, Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Science responded to some of the concerns raised. He first addressed the timeline for the Faculty's consultative process, which had included an unprecedented level of student participation. The primary student governments representing students in the Faculty of Arts and Science -- the Arts and Science Students Union (ASSU) and the Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students (APUS) -- had been an integral part of the process at every step, beginning with the development of the Faculty's response to *Raising our Sights*. The need for revisiting the Faculty's curriculum had first been raised at a retreat of Chairs and Principals held in April, 1998. In October, 1998 the issue had been raised at a meeting of the Council of the Faculty of Arts and Science, comprising representatives of ASSU and APUS, a large number of student representatives, chairs and principals. The Faculty's Curriculum Review Committee, which had been charged with a review of the Faculty's curriculum, had met regularly through April 1998 to June 1999 and had reported on its progress at each meeting of the General Committee of Faculty Council, which met approximately five times a year. In June 1999 the Curriculum Review Committee had concluded that the only viable model to ensure appropriate balance between depth and breadth was a 20-credit degree. Representatives of ASSU and APUS had supported the conclusions of the Curriculum Review Committee. Dean Amrhein clarified that the Faculty did not routinely consult on its undergraduate curriculum with representatives of the Students' Administrative Council, 16,000 members of which were also members of ASSU, or with the Graduate Students' Union. In November, 1999, Principals and Deans

4. Faculty of Arts and Science: 2000-2001 Calendar Changes – 15-Credit BA/BSc Degrees: Discontinuation (cont'd)

had voted overwhelmingly in support of the proposal. Following its approval by the General Committee of the Council of the Faculty of Arts and Science, the proposal had been brought forward to governance. It had now enjoyed the support of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs, the Planning and Budget Committee and the Academic Board. Long-time observers of governance had informed Dean Amrhein that the quality of debate and discussion of the proposal was unprecedented.

Dean Amrhein continued that the restructuring of its curriculum to offer only 20-credit BA/BSc degrees would allow the Faculty to enrich its curriculum to deliver a superior undergraduate experience that included writing proficiency, scientific literacy, computer competency and experiential learning. Students, alumni and employers had indicated that this was the right direction for the Faculty in ensuring a broad liberal arts component.

In response to concerns regarding access and equity for part-time students, Dean Amrhein noted the following statistics in the Faculty of Arts and Science:

- 33% of part-time undergraduate students were currently enrolled in 20-credit degree programs;
- part-time undergraduate students took, on average, only 12 months longer than full-time students to complete 20-credit degree programs;
- many part-time undergraduate students came to the Faculty with transfer credits and were able to complete 20-credit degree programs in only two years.

This information had been reported to the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs and had been made widely available. In discussions with the Status of Women Officer, Dean Amrhein had shown that there would be no equity differences between a 15-credit and a 20-credit degree.

Dean Amrhein offered assurance that part-time students were very much valued within the Faculty of Arts and Science and that it would do everything possible to ensure that part-time students were able to complete their degree programs in as little time as possible. He believed that with the introduction of a three-semester system, part-time students should be able to complete a 20-credit degree in 36 months. Small advances in this area included the recently introduced proposal to apply University credits to courses taken in the Pre-University Program.

In response to concerns that students seeking admission to professional faculties would want to receive 15-credit degrees, Dean Amrhein noted the following statistics for the University of Toronto:

- 95% of students who were admitted to the Faculty of Law had 20-credit degrees -- 20% of those had graduate degrees;
- 90% of students who were admitted to a Bachelor of Education had 20 credit-degrees -- 10% of those had graduate degrees;
- 67% of students admitted to the Faculty of Medicine had 20-credit degrees -- including some who had doctoral degrees.

Therefore, while entrance criteria to many professional faculties stated a minimum requirement of 15 credits, experience showed that the overwhelming number of students admitted had completed 20-credit degrees.

4. Faculty of Arts and Science: 2000-2001 Calendar Changes – 15-Credit BA/BSc Degrees: Discontinuation (cont'd)

In conclusion, Dean Amrhein noted that the elimination of its 15-credit BA/BSc degrees would enable the Faculty of Arts and Science to focus its energy and limited resources on the key priorities identified by its Curriculum Review Committee.

A member spoke in support of the proposal, which focused on the Faculty's strengths and was consistent with the University's mission and its commitment to differentiation. In response to concerns regarding accessibility for part-time students, the member was assured by the change to a three-semester system, which included more summer offerings. The member agreed with earlier comments that the offering of degrees should be consistent across the University's three campuses. He therefore advocated that Mississauga and Scarborough adopt the same standard as the St. George campus. The offering of 15-credit BA/BSc degrees at Scarborough would only lead to confusion. In response to data supplied by Dean Amrhein with respect to admission criteria for professional faculties, the member advocated that these criteria be reassessed to better reflect the credentials of successful applicants. In conclusion, the member agreed that the proposal was consistent with the University's overall mission. It focussed on the Faculty of Arts and Science's strengths and distinctive character.

A member recalled that when he had first come to the University many decades ago, part-time students had been treated very badly. In fact, they had been prevented by statute from obtaining 20-credit degrees and had only been able to enroll in 15-credit degree programs with the creation of Woodsworth College. The member believed that part-time students had now been fully integrated into the University and that it was essential that they not be ghettoized, even if it meant the completion of an additional five credits. The University's 20-credit BA/BSc degrees had a long and honourable history and he believed the proposal before the Council was an historic watershed. Part-time students would be better served as a result. The member agreed with the previous member's comments that the elimination of the 15-credit BA/BSc degrees should take place on all three campuses to avoid confusion to applicants and in marketing the University. As well, he agreed that the admission criteria for professional faculties should be revisited to better reflect actual requirements.

The President clarified that the offering of 15-credit BA/BSc degrees at Scarborough would be considered through the usual deliberative process on that campus. In light of Scarborough's desire to become more co-op intensive, he believed it was the Principal's expectation that Scarborough would follow a similar direction as the Faculty of Arts and Science.

A member raised a number of concerns with the proposal. She did not believe that all the ramifications had been considered in the current uncertain political and financial climate. While the motion originated with the Faculty of Arts and Science, it represented the most important, far-reaching and invasive change made to the product (a degree) provided to the University's clients (the students) in many years. She believed the current government had demonstrated little concern for funding university education and as a result of the recent funding announcements from the government, the University now faced substantial cutbacks - especially of faculty. She questioned how the University could provide the extra support the addition of a fourth year would entail in faculty, staff and services. In addition, the full impact of the double cohort on the university system remained unknown. The member therefore questioned the timing of the proposal, which would lead to increased enrolment and might affect the University's ability to respond to the increase in demand for admission. The government had indicated that it would pay for enrolment expansion; however, the member wondered what would happen if the government refused to fund the expansion for the "fourth-year" enrolment. Was the University certain that it could pay for the extra year?

4. Faculty of Arts and Science: 2000-2001 Calendar Changes – 15-Credit BA/BSc Degrees: Discontinuation (cont'd)

The Framework for Enrolment Expansion at the University of Toronto stated that if the proposal was approved, there would still be no enrolment expansion of first-year entry on the St. George campus. Would this put the University at odds with the government? Also, what would the ramifications be to the undergraduate/graduate balance on the St. George campus? The member believed the humanities and social sciences to be at risk under the present government and she wondered if the elimination of the 15-credit degree would further endanger enrolment in these programs?

The member understood that one of the rationales for the proposal was that the University was trying to establish its own “niche” by offering only 20-credit degrees – differentiating itself from the other numerous universities in this province. However, the member advocated that the University should be opening up its options to its students rather than narrowing them. The University had an excellent reputation and should make itself available to all qualified students who wished to obtain a University of Toronto degree, whether it be 15-credit or 20-credit.

The member continued that the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Science had said that consultations had included APUS and ASSU. However, a representative of APUS had indicated that APUS did not believe it had been a participant in the decision. In addition, GSU and SAC had not been involved. As well, the member believed that only three students had sat on the Arts and Science Curriculum Renewal Committee, which comprised eleven members and four assessors. With the entry of double-cohort students, the University would be admitting younger students who were less mature: intellectually, socially and emotionally. She wondered about the financial and psychological impact of an additional year of full-time studies on these students and their parents. She wondered if the University would lose students to Ryerson Polytechnic University, York University and the community colleges as a consequence of the proposal. At present, enrolment levels were high, but was the University sure of the future in these uncertain times? The member added that it was likely there would be private universities in the near future to draw students away. In conclusion, the member urged that the University look at the bigger issue. Who were the University’s clients? The University was a public university, funded with tax dollars and should expand its access to a wider public, rather than making itself inaccessible.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Professor Angela Hildyard, Principal, Woodsworth College, addressed the Council. In response to equity concerns, she noted that 55% of the University’s students were women. The proposal had been broadly discussed within Woodsworth College including its student association and its single parents group, which comprised mainly women. She had been appointed to chair a working group which would examine a range of relevant issues, including accessibility and make recommendations to ensure that part-time students were able to complete 20-credit degree programs. In addition, she had been asked to look at the potential for associate degrees or certificates for students who did not wish to complete 20 credits. For example, 75% of students who had enrolled at Woodsworth College in 1990-91 had completed less than five credits to date. Finally, there were discussions underway to examine ways of transferring credits between community colleges and universities. This would be another way to facilitate the completion by part-time students of 20-credit programs.

A member spoke against the proposal because he believed it was predicated on limited resources rather than curriculum reform. He expressed his gratitude to Principal Hildyard for the initiatives she had outlined, noting that part-time students were often out of necessity forced to complete courses in many different venues. The member also expressed concern that there might not be funding forthcoming for the anticipated double cohort and the

4. Faculty of Arts and Science: 2000-2001 Calendar Changes – 15-Credit BA/BSc Degrees: Discontinuation (cont'd)

demographic “bulge”. The proposal would greatly limit the University’s ability to cope in this circumstance. Finally, the member spoke in support of differentiation among the University’s three campuses, disagreeing with earlier statements that Scarborough should follow suit.

Professor Wendy Rolph, Chair of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs, and Vice-Dean, Faculty of Arts and Science, supplemented the comments made earlier by Dean Amrhein. She drew attention to Report Number 323 of the Executive Committee, which outlined her intervention concerning the extensive consultation process and the rationale for the proposal. As many members were aware, the proposal had been debated in many fora. Representatives of the Faculty had listened very carefully to the discussions that had taken place and the concerns that had been raised. Issues such as accessibility and financial assistance would be considered in the task force to be chaired by Principal Hildyard and therefore she intended to vote in favour of the motion.

A member commented on the admission criteria for professional faculties and members’ advocacy for change. In the health sciences faculties, many programs had been restructured to ensure that applicants had wider and deeper backgrounds. He cited several examples of admission changes requiring applicants with a liberal arts to ensure critical thinking and problem-solving skills.

A member agreed with the Faculty’s commitment to ensuring that its graduates were well-rounded and had a broad liberal arts background; however, the proposal, which envisaged the University as “leading edge”, was premised on a North American rather than an international model. He noted that all three student governments had spoken against the proposal as had many student governors. This was a very clear message from the student constituency. Many members of the Governing Council, including himself, had benefited from a 15-credit degree. The member believed that the proposal was elitist and would effectively exclude the most vulnerable (e.g. single parents and working people).

A member spoke strongly in support of the proposal, noting that the admission requirements for the Faculty of Medicine were being amended to require a 20-credit degree.

The President congratulated Dean Amrhein, Vice-Dean Rolph, and Principal Hildyard for their excellent work over the past few years in bringing the proposal to fruition. He believed this to be an example of academic leadership at its best. He also believed the decision-making process to be exemplary. The proposal had been discussed thoroughly in many different fora and there had been many opportunities for participation. As he had indicated to the Executive Committee, he believed that the debate of the proposal by the Academic Board ranked with the very best in his time as President. At all stages, the proposal had enjoyed overwhelming support. The proposal built on the special capacity of the University to contribute to liberal education in Ontario. He strongly supported what he believed to be one of the most significant advances at the University to ensure liberal education at its best.

The vote was taken on the main motion.

The vote was carried with 23 in support, 8 against, and 1 abstention.

At the suggestion of the Chairman and with members’ agreement, the agenda was varied so that the proposed *Framework for Enrolment Expansion at the University of Toronto* could be considered at the end of the approval items and immediately prior to the Report of the President. Professor Mayhall then introduced and moved an omnibus motion for the following four items.

5. Academic Units: Disestablishment in the School of Graduate Studies and Re-establishment in the Faculty of Arts and Science

(arising from Report Number 99 of the Academic Board – March 9, 2000)

Professor Mayhall explained the proposal that two centres move their organizational home from the School of Graduate Studies to the Faculty of Arts and Science. There were no budget implications since the budgets for the Centres would move with them. Students' registration and status would remain unchanged.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT the Centre for Comparative Literature be disestablished as an academic unit in the School of Graduate Studies and reestablished as the Centre for Comparative Literature in the Faculty of Arts and Science, effective May 1, 2000.

THAT the Centre for Medieval Studies be disestablished as an academic unit in the School of Graduate Studies and reestablished as the Centre for Medieval Studies in the Faculty of Arts and Science, effective May 1, 2000.

A copy of the documentation is attached to Report Number 99 of the Academic Board as Appendix "C".

6. Capital Plan: Update, 1997-2002

(arising from Report Number 99 of the Academic Board – March 9, 2000)

Professor Mayhall noted that recent positive announcements about the availability of capital funding had provided an opportunity, and indeed a need, to update the University's Capital Plan. The SuperBuild Growth Fund announcement had ensured that a number of projects in the Plan could go forward. These included the Centre for Information Technology, Phase I of the Health Sciences Complex, the proposed School of Communication, Culture and Information Technology at the University of Toronto at Mississauga and the Academic Resource Centre at the University of Toronto at Scarborough. Additional details were contained in the Board's Report and in the appended Plan.

A member noted his concern that the University's Capital Plan did not include in its priorities a multi-faith facility. The President responded that Professor Orchard would be reporting on the University's endeavours in this area later in the meeting. He assured the member that this was indeed a priority for the University.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT the updated Capital Plan for 1997-2002, as described in Professor McCammond's schedule and memorandum, dated January 24, 2000, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 99 of the Academic Board as Appendix "F", be approved.

7. Capital Project: King's College Road/Circle Precinct: Users' Committee Report
(arising from Report Number 99 of the Academic Board – March 9, 2000)

Professor Mayhall noted that one of the demonstration sites in the University's open space plan, *Investing in the Landscape*, involved King's College Road/Circle, Convocation Hall Plaza, Galbraith Road and Simcoe Hall. A Users' Committee had been struck for this project and it was proposed at this time that the Report of the Committee be approved in principle. Phase I of the project was the development of designs and working drawings; Phase II would be the construction of the project. The funding for the design and for part of the costs of the project would come from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund. Phase II would depend on the receipt of \$1.5 million of outside funding.

A member voiced his opposition to the proposal, which allocated funding for "cosmetic" purposes. Another member noted his support for the proposal, adding that it was important to support environmental initiatives.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT the Report of the King's College Circle Precinct Users' Committee, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 99 of the Academic Board as Appendix "G", be approved in principle;

THAT \$200,000 immediately be allocated from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund for Phase 1 of the project;

THAT \$2,500,000 be allocated from the UIIF for Phase 2 when outside funding of \$1,500,000 is obtained.

8. Academic Priorities Fund: Allocation - Joseph L. Rotman School of Management
(arising from Report Number 99 of the Academic Board – March 9, 2000)

Professor Mayhall noted that the Provost had proposed two one-time-only allocations in support of program quality enhancements and new academic appointments. The School was in an unusual position in that it did not have an approved academic plan. This was the result of a recent change in the School's leadership. In the normal course of events, the Provost would have brought forward recommendations for allocations from the Academic Priorities Fund in support of the division's academic plan. In this case he was proposing two one-time-only allocations. On-going base allocations for the division would be brought forward in conjunction with a new academic plan.

A member spoke against the proposal, noting that the School had received over \$1 million in one-time-only funding as well as additional funding to match donations. Part of the proposed funding was to upgrade computer equipment and facilities, however, the School was already well served in these areas. The member advocated that a similar amount of funding be allocated for disability issues.

8. Academic Priorities Fund: Allocation - Joseph L. Rotman School of Management
(cont'd)

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT the following allocations be made from the Academic Priorities Fund to the Rotman School of Management:

- \$767,410 OTO in support of program quality enhancements
- \$413,563 OTO in support of new academic appointments.

A copy of the documentation is attached to Report Number 99 of the Academic Board as Appendix "H".

9. A Framework for Enrolment Expansion at the University of Toronto
(arising from Report Number 99 of the Academic Board – March 9, 2000)

The President noted that there was insufficient time remaining in the meeting for the Council to consider properly this very important item. He would therefore seek members' permission to adjourn debate of the item so that it could appear on the agenda of the Council's next meeting.

It was duly moved and seconded,

THAT debate on this item be adjourned.

The vote on the motion was taken.

The motion was carried.

10. Report of the President

The President reported on the following matters.

(a) Re-election of Chancellor

The President congratulated the Honourable Henry N. R. Jackman on his recent re-election as Chancellor.

(b) Administrative Issues

Salary Disclosure. In compliance with provincial legislation, the University had issued its annual listing of employees earning in excess of \$100,000.

Construction Management Review. Professor Michael Finlayson, Vice-President, Administration and Human Resources, had reported to the Business Board on his review of construction management at the University and his intention to develop plans for changes in this area.

University of Toronto Investment Management Corporation. The Executive Committee had approved the appointment of the founding members to the board of directors of the University of Toronto Investment Management Corporation. Mr. Robert White, Chief Financial Officer and Chairman of the Board, had recently announced an excellent

10. Report of the President (cont'd)

appointment for the first Chief Executive Officer of the Corporation. This appointment would be effective May 1, 2000.

Settlement with Operating Engineers. Professor Finlayson and his team had achieved a very satisfactory settlement with the University's operating engineers.

(c) Chun Case

The President recalled that he had updated members on this matter at the previous meeting. Since that time, the University had filed its response to the Ontario Human Rights Commission's Investigator's report. As he had undertaken at the previous meeting, the President had provided members with briefing books concerning this case. Supplementary materials had since been distributed and, following a request from a member, additional newspaper articles had been placed on the table. Correspondence between a member and the President had also been placed on the table. The Ontario Human Rights Commission was to consider the University's response and would advise the parties on how it wished to proceed.

(d) Provincial Government Relations

Through the provincial government's SuperBuild Growth Fund, the University had received support for new facilities at the University of Toronto at Mississauga, the University of Toronto at Scarborough, and for the new Health Sciences facility, including the Centre for Cellular and Biomolecular Research, and the Centre for Information Technology.

The University remained concerned by the provincial government's announcement on operating grant funds. The province had announced a 1% fund to be distributed on the basis of specific performance indicators. While the University endorsed the principle of distribution of funds based on performance indicators, it had reservations about the calculation of the indicators.

The provincial announcement had also included the following:

- A 1% access fund to support future enrolment growth; however, the terms of reference would not allow the Universities of Toronto and Waterloo to qualify for funding because of enrolment growth realized the previous year. The University had communicated to the government that it would not be eligible for participation in the access fund for the coming year;
- Elimination of the pay equity envelope. The cost of this to the University was \$1.6 million of its operating grant; and
- A 2% per annum cap on tuition fee increases for the next five years. This would considerably restrict the financial flexibility of the University. This was especially worrisome given that the government had made no funding commitments to universities beyond the coming year.

The cumulative impact of this announcement would be disadvantageous to the University. The administration had made a decision to suspend the budgetary process for one month to provide an opportunity to take stock and to await the provincial government's May budget. In the interim, the University would make representations in an attempt to persuade the province to mitigate the above announcements and to make additional investments in public higher education.

10. Report of the President (cont'd)

The President continued that he did not believe this announcement should influence the *Framework for Enrolment Growth at the University of Toronto*, that would be considered by the Council at the next meeting. He believed this document continued to offer the prospect for strengthening the University over the next decade, provided there was an appropriate level of investment from the province. While the operating grant announcement was disappointing, the President believed that a longer term view should be taken and that the University should be policy makers and not just policy takers. The University should shape the policy debate and advocate its case to provincial decision-makers in the coming decade.

(e) Federal Government Relations

The federal budget had contained the following items, which were considered to be very good news for the University.

- a commitment to the Canada Research Chairs Program, previously known as the 21st Century Chairs. 2000 chairs would be funded over the next five years;
- an additional \$900-million allocation to the Canada Foundation for Innovation (CFI). Originally conceived as a sinking fund, the CFI would now be a significant source of support for research and innovation;
- the creation of a Human Genome Project, a national enterprise that would have at least one site in Ontario. The University was optimistic that its application would secure a site to be located within Toronto.
- increased Tax Exemption for Student Awards. The University was especially pleased with this announcement given its advocacy on the matter.

(f) Other Issues

The President indicated that he would be inviting Professor Ian Orchard to provide an update on a multi-faith centre. In addition, he would ask Professor Sedra to provide the administration's response to recommendations distributed by Professor Shah at the previous meeting concerning employment equity and to respond to a member's previous question concerning savings resulting from the teaching assistants' strike.

(g) Sweatshops and Licensing

The administration would be bringing forward a policy on licensing to the April 18 meeting of the University Affairs Board. Should the policy enjoy the Board's support, it would be brought to the next meeting of the Governing Council for consideration.

(h) Transition

The President reported that preparations for the transition to the next president were proceeding well. He was also pleased to report that following the customary approval process, Professor Robert J. Birgeneau had been granted tenure in the Faculty of Arts and Science's Department of Physics.

Meetings had been arranged to introduce the President-designate to senior officials, both at Ottawa and Queen's Park. Professor Birgeneau was also meeting on a regular basis with various members of the University's administration. The President and Professor Birgeneau had attended a meeting held the previous weekend of university presidents within Canada.

10. Report of the President (cont'd)

The President advised that he had to leave shortly to attend another commitment. He invited questions pertaining to his report, noting that Professor Sedra would serve as President during his absence.

(i) Multi-Faith Facility

Later in the meeting, Professor Orchard reported that the Office of Student Affairs had engaged in a dialogue with various groups on campus regarding a multi-faith facility. A Users' Committee was being established and its terms of reference would be forwarded for information to the Planning and Budget Committee. These terms of reference would include the identification of potential site and fundraising possibilities. This remained a priority for the administration.

A member commended the initiative, noting that it was important that the University provide seed funding toward the project to help increase the prospect for private giving.

(j) Administrative Response to Professor's Shah's Recommendations on Hiring and Diversity

Later in the meeting, Professor Sedra noted that the administrative response would be available in the near future, at which time copies would be distributed to members of the Council.

11. Question Period**(a) Millennium Scholarship Fund**

In response to a member's request, the President updated members on the status of the Fund. The AUCC continued to express reservations on behalf of universities. There had not yet been a flow through of funds to the province for allocation to students. The trustees of the Fund had expressed similar concerns.

(b) Dr. Chun

A member thanked the President for providing members with the briefing books concerning the Chun case. The member observed that in the University's response to the Ontario Human Rights Commission, it had noted that the Commission's investigator had been hired on contract. The President responded that the University had included this in its concerns regarding jurisdiction of the Commission. It appeared that use of a non-employee investigator was a breach of the Ontario Human Rights Commission Act. The University's solicitors had therefore recommended that this be recorded in the University's response.

A member also thanked the President for providing members with the briefing book; however, he noted that it was extensive and that members had not yet had adequate opportunity to digest all the information contained therein. The member advocated that equity issues be designated as an agenda item at a future meeting of the Council to provide an opportunity for full discussion of this and other equity-related matters on campus.

A member requested that the Chairman invite questions from representatives of the Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students, the Graduate Students' Union, and the Students' Administrative Council. The Chairman declined the request, noting that question period was restricted to members of the Governing Council.

11. Question Period (cont'd)

A member advocated a full inquiry by the Ontario Human Rights Commission, contrary to the University's position. Professor Sedra reiterated the University's belief that the report of the Commission's investigator was deeply flawed and contained factual errors. The University had in its submission documented its concerns with the investigator's report and advocated that there were no new facts to substantiate the considerable expense of a hearing. The member disagreed, noting that his deep concern that the matter of Dr. Chun's case against the University had not yet been satisfactorily resolved.

A member echoed his colleague's desire to see the matter proceed to a hearing before the Ontario Human Rights Commission. He believed there was substantial evidence to warrant a hearing.

(c) Private Universities

A member commented that the stories in the media had indicated the provincial government was exploring the possibility of private universities within Ontario. The member asked if the University had responded to this issue. The President responded that the University had not put forward a position on private universities during the Smith inquiry on future directions for post-secondary education. This matter had been one of the terms of reference in the review. Following consultation, it had been discovered that there was strong division on the matter within the University. The University had therefore abstained from commenting on the matter within its response. The University had however indicated that if private universities were permitted, they should be subject to the following conditions:

- Private universities should have no direct or indirect access to public funds, including publicly-subsidized financial-aid programs;
- Private universities should be subject to quality assessment to ensure they met minimum standards of quality and to ensure that they not be allowed to depreciate the value of an Ontario university degree.

The President continued that when the Smith report had been issued, the Governing Council had unanimously endorsed the report's recommendations, which had included the above two points and that only not-for-private universities be permitted. The government now appeared to be considering for-profit as well as not-for-profit private universities. The President reiterated that the University of Toronto's main concern and focus was to ensure strong public funding so that the University could fulfill its mission to be among the finest public research universities.

(d) Equity Issues

A member noted that students had struck a committee to examine equity issues on campus. The creation of a multi-faith facility was one of the items under discussion. The member suggested that the administration set up a forum to examine seriously equity issues on campus. This was an issue that he believed had not been adequately addressed in the past and was one that would be before governance on a continuing basis in the future.

12. Reports for Information

The Chairman noted that members had received for information the following reports:

- Report Number 99 of the Academic Board – March 9, 2000
- Report Number 103 of the Business Board – January 24, 2000
- Report Number 323 of the Executive Committee – March 27, 2000

13. Date of the Next Meeting

The Chairman reminded members that the next meeting of the Governing Council was scheduled for Thursday, May 11, 2000 and would take place at the University of Toronto at Mississauga.

The meeting adjourned at 7:00 p.m.

Secretary

April 26, 2000

Chairman