

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

Wednesday, March 4, 2009

MINUTES OF THE GOVERNING COUNCIL meeting held on Wednesday, March 4, 2009 at 3:30 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, University of Toronto.

Present:

Mr. John F. (Jack) Petch (In the Chair)
Dr. Alice Dong, Vice-Chair
The Honourable David R. Peterson
Professor C. David Naylor, President
Ms Diana Alli
Mr. Ryan Matthew Campbell
Mr. P.C. Choo
Mr. Ken Davy
Dr. Claude S. Davis
Ms Susan Eng
Ms Judith Goldring
Mr. Grant Gonzales
Professor Ellen Hodnett
Ms Shirley Hoy
Professor Ronald H. Kluger
Dr. Stefan Mathias Larson
Mr. Joseph Mapa
Professor Michael R. Marrus
Ms Florence Minz
Professor Cheryl Misak
Mr. Gary P. Mooney
Mr. Richard Nunn
Professor Ian Orchard
Mr. Jeff Peters
Professor Arthur S. Ripstein
Mr. Stephen C. Smith
Ms Maureen J. Somerville
Mr. Oliver Sorin
Mr. John David Stewart

Ms Rita Tsang
Ms B. Elizabeth Vosburgh

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

Secretariat:
Ms Alison Webb

Absent:

Professor Varouj Aivazian
Mr. David Asper
Professor Brian Corman
Mr. David Ford
Professor William Gough
Dr. Gerald Halbert
Dr. Joel A. Kirsh
Mr. Joseph Koo
Professor Louise Lemieux-Charles
Mr. Geoffrey Matus
Mr. George E. Myhal
Miss Anna Okorokov
Professor Doug W. Reeve
Mr. Timothy Reid
Ms Melinda Rogers
Professor Elizabeth M. Smyth
Dr. Sarita Verma
Mr. Larry Wasser
Mr. W. David Wilson

In Attendance:

Professor Christina Kramer, Member-Elect of the Governing Council
Professor Angela Hildyard, Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity
Mr. David Palmer, Vice-President, Advancement and Chief Advancement Officer
Ms Catherine Riggall, Vice-President, Business Affairs
Professor Edith Hillan, Vice-Provost, Academic
Professor Jill Matus, Vice-Provost, Student Life
Professor Safwat Zaky, Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget

Ms Rivi Frankle, Chief Operating Officer and Assistant Vice-President, Alumni Relations
Ms Lucy Fromowitz, Assistant Vice-President, Student Life
Mr. Tim McTiernan, Assistant Vice-President, Research, and Executive Director of Innovations Group
Ms Elizabeth Sisam, Assistant Vice-President, Campus & Facilities Planning
Mr. Daniel Atlin, Assistant Vice-President Government, Institutional and Community Relations
Mr. Jim Delaney, Director, Office of the Vice-Provost, Students
Ms Sheree Drummond, Assistant Provost
Ms Carrie Hardy, Legal Counsel, Real Estate Operations
Ms Helen Lasthiotakis, Director, Policy and Planning
Dr. Anthony Gray, Special Advisor to the President
Bryn MacPherson, Director, Office of the President and University Events
Mr. Steve Moate, Senior Legal Counsel, Office of the President
Ms Meredith Strong, Special Assistant to the Vice-President, University Relations
Mr. Tim McTiernan, Associate Vice-President, Research
Mr. Neil Dobbs, Deputy Secretary of the Governing Council
Mr. Henry Mulhall, Assistant Secretary of the Governing Council
Ms. Mae-Yu Tan, Assistant Secretary of the Governing Council
Mr. Emanuel Istrate, Academic Program Coordinator, Institute of Optical Sciences
Ms Eisha Mehta (Science Rendezvous Logistics Coordinator), 3rd Year Undergraduate Student, Human Biology, Animal Physiology, & Geology
Mr. Mubdi Rahman (Science Rendezvous Site Chair for University of Toronto), 2nd Year PhD Student, Astronomy & Astrophysics
Mr. Dan Weaver (Science Chase Coordinator), an Alumnus, Political Science & Astrophysics

IN ACCORDANCE WITH A DETERMINATION BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE PURSUANT TO SECTION 38 OF BY-LAW NUMBER 2, ITEMS 9 AND 10 WERE CONSIDERED BY THE GOVERNING COUNCIL *IN CAMERA*

1. Chair's Remarks

The Chair thanked members for accommodating the earlier start time and reminded them that, following its usual practice, the meeting was being broadcast on the web.

a) Documentation on Table

Members were advised that a copy of the proceedings of the Third Annual Retired Academics and Librarians of the University of Toronto (RALUT) Senior Scholars Symposium had been placed on the table at the request of the Chair of the RALUT Senior Scholars Committee.

2. Minutes of the Previous Meeting of January 26, 2009

The minutes of the meeting of January 26, 2009 were approved.

3. Business Arising from the Minutes of the Previous Meeting

There was no business arising from the meeting.

4. Report of the President

(a) Student Presentation: Emergency Medical Response Group

The President introduced students, and others, representing the University of Toronto's Science Rendezvous:

- Mr. Mubdi Rahman (Science Rendezvous Site Chair for the University of Toronto): second year PhD student in Astronomy and Astrophysics;
- Ms Eisha Mehta, (Logistics Coordinator): third year undergraduate student with concentrations in Human Biology, Animal Physiology, and Geology
- Mr. Emanuel Istrate, Academic Program Coordinator, Institute of Optical Sciences; and,
- Mr. Dan Weaver (Science Chase Coordinator), an Alumnus from both Political Science and Astrophysics.

Mr. Rahman advised that the University of Toronto was one of a number of partners involved in the second annual Science Rendezvous taking place on Saturday, May 9, 2009. Science Rendezvous was a free public event organized at various locations around the Greater Toronto Area. It provided a forum for the University to present its cutting edge research to the public in a new and innovative way. Graduate students, faculty and staff had the opportunity to talk about their work and engage audiences outside of academia. Visitors of all ages were encouraged to explore the exciting ideas and discoveries that science and technology brought to everyday life, and to meet the people who made it all happen.

At the University of Toronto, the venue for the event was a street festival of science. Departments had pavilions set up on the street showcasing their research. There was also a live stage for a number of planned acts, and game show like events. The Science Chase had participants compete in a race to complete a number of activities located around the St George campus, and INVENTours provided tours into working laboratory's to show the public where research dollars were being spent.

External partners in Science Rendezvous included, among others, York University, Ryerson University, and the University of Ontario Institute of Technology. The University of Toronto was, however, the flagship institution, and last year attracted over 8,500 of the 15,000 total participants. This was also a unique, on-campus partnership that involved a variety of faculties and departments, and over 500 faculty, student, and staff volunteers working together to ensure the event's success.

Mr. Rahman advised that Science Rendezvous was in need of additional financial and administrative support, as well as help with publicity. He hoped that science related outings, such as Science Rendezvous, became a staple in Toronto, and that the University, as Canada's premier scientific research institution, continued to showcase its research to the public in this way.

4. President's Report (cont'd)

(b) Kyoto Prize Celebration

The President advised that the celebration and reception in honour of University Professor Anthony Pawson, the first Canadian scientist to be awarded the prestigious Kyoto Prize in basic sciences, was held on February 18, 2009. The event was an extraordinary success, with several Governors among those in attendance to hear wonderful addresses from Dr. Pawson, and Professor Emeritus Charles Taylor from McGill University, the first Canadian laureate in the Arts and Philosophy category.

(c) Awards and Honours

The President drew Governors' attention to the impressive list of faculty, student and staff awards and honours that accompanied the agenda packages. He highlighted the extraordinary discovery by Dr. Andras Nagy, and his team from Mount Sinai Hospital, of a new method of creating stem cells. Dr. Nagy was a Senior Investigator at the Samuel Lunenfeld Research Institute at Mount Sinai, and Canada Research Chair in Stem Cells and Regeneration at the University of Toronto.

(d) TVO Best Lecturer

The President advised that four of the ten finalists in the TVO Best Lecturer contest were from the University of Toronto, three from the St. George campus, and one from the University of Toronto at Scarborough. Carleton University, with two finalists, was the only other university with more than one nomination in the top ten. Each finalist presented a televised public lecture and voting determined the winner. Lectures began at 4:00 p.m. on TVO, and the President encouraged Governors to tune in and vote either online, by telephone, or by text message. The Secretary agreed to send a schedule of the lectures to all Governors.

(e) CUPE Agreement

The President advised that the University's agreement with CUPE 3902 had received a 97% ratification vote. This had been an important negotiation and an agreement that mattered for many reasons, most notably because CUPE 3902 represented the University's graduate students in their roles as teaching assistants working for the University. He thanked and congratulated Professor Hildyard, Vice-President, Human Resources, and all the members of her team, as well as the negotiating team from CUPE 3902. The bargaining process had been very constructive and had led to a very positive resolution.

(f) Economic Update and Budget

The President advised that the recent Federal Budget was significantly aligned with the Government's stimulus goals, and was somewhat mixed with regard to its impact on Universities.

4. President's Report (cont'd)

(f) Economic Update and Budget (cont'd)

There was a very welcome \$1.4 billion for university infrastructure across Canada. The infrastructure announcement carried language about investment for research and development, however the budget was somewhat ambiguous about how funding would be directed towards the special needs of research intensive universities, and about how planning for capital renewal would be harmonized between the Federal and Provincial governments. The President expressed concern about the timing challenges if the Federal Government managed the flow of these funds on a project-specific basis, rather than moving funds promptly to provincial envelopes. Several provinces already had major infrastructure renewal programs underway, as well as routine deferred maintenance envelopes that they allocated to institutions using agreed formula. This was the case in Ontario.

The Federal Government followed up its scheduled strategic review of the granting councils by returning most of the five percent cut as graduate scholarship funding. On the negative side however, the total budget of each of the granting councils had been reduced, and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) graduate scholarships had been specifically tagged for thesis topics in management and business education, reducing the scope of access to those specific funds.

Another positive feature of the federal Budget was an extra \$700 million for the Canadian Foundation for Innovation (CFI). The University had undertaken a rigorous CFI proposal process, overseen by Vice-President, Research, Professor Paul Young, and there were many compelling applications. The internal peer review process for these applications should help the University achieve a higher success rate in the competition.

Provincially, on the budget front, the President noted that it was not yet possible to say very much. Due to the current economic circumstances, and the scale of the Provincial indebtedness, the President was not optimistic that there would again be special year-end support of higher-education, as had occurred last year. The Provincial tuition framework was still in place for 2009-10, and he expected that there would be considerable debate over this issue in the year ahead.

On the other hand, the McGuinty Government continued to signal that higher education was a priority, and that it was planning to provide capital support to institutions through the Courtyard Group process. The allocations remained unclear, and it was not yet known how the Provincial infrastructure process would harmonize with the new Federal stimulus spending program. Nonetheless, the President advised that the University was preparing for rapid cycle responses to calls for proposals for infrastructure renewal, be it coordinated with the province or driven in the first instance from Ottawa.

The University of Toronto Budget process was well underway, and the *Budget Report, 2009-10* would go before Governing Council in the next governance cycle, arriving at the Business Board on March 23. The Budget would be guided by the importance of protecting the University's core functions and retaining as much money in the divisions as possible. It had been necessary to make meaningful cuts at the centre, and divisions had also faced significant cuts and been very

4. President's Report (cont'd)

(f) Economic Update and Budget (cont'd)

prudent in their planning. However, with revenue flat, and with no pay-out likely from the endowment this year given the state of the markets, it was likely that some borrowing would be required to ensure that permanent damage was not done to divisional activity. The deficit would be modest, but was essential given the impact of the economic downturn on the institution. Details would be forthcoming shortly.

A member noted that a number of recent media stories had highlighted that the Humanities and Social Sciences in particular, were not seen to be good candidates for stimulus spending, and indeed the Federal budget had given support to those fears. He questioned whether there would be any university representation on this matter.

In response, the President advised that a number of the University Presidents had expressed concern about ensuring that research infrastructure did not focus only on science and technology, and that a broad range of disciplines should be considered relevant to successful societies and knowledge-based economies. In that regard he had been in touch with the President of SSHRC and discussed how advocacy for those disciplines could be improved, and how business and industry leaders who were supportive of the humanities and social sciences could be brought together with government leaders. Also, the report of the Council of Chairs of Ontario Universities (CCOU) to the Government on how infrastructure dollars should be used, had presented a broad definition of research and development, rather than a specific focus on science and technology.

In response to a question about declining industry support for research, Associate Vice-President Research, Dr. Tim McTiernan, advised that there had been only a limited number of deferrals or withdrawals of industry obligations to support research due to the current financial circumstances. The research office was monitoring this carefully. While research partnerships were progressing well, technology transfer and commercialization activities would likely be slower in the coming year than they had been in the past, as venture capital was now much more difficult to access.

In response to a question about the possibility of offering free tuition for those students most affected by the economic downturn, the President advised that the University had thought carefully about student aid and effective tuition, and those numbers would be brought forward during the upcoming Budget discussions. He noted however, that any analysis of tuition at this institution would show that between OSAP bursary support and bursaries derived from tuition set asides, there were a substantial number of students who received sufficient support to effectively reduce the combined cost of tuition and ancillary fees to zero. In some cases, meaningful support was added on top of the total offsetting of tuitions so as to subsidize living costs. Further expansion of this type of student aid would require a major commitment by the Government of Ontario, and the institution could not reasonably be asked to do more.

5. Items for Governing Council Approval

(a) Centre of Criminology: Disestablishment in the School of Graduate Studies and Establishment as an EDU:A in the Faculty of Arts and Science

Professor Marrus advised that the proposal for the disestablishment of the Centre of Criminology in the School of Graduate Studies (SGS) and its establishment as an extra-departmental unit A (EDU:A) in the Faculty of Arts and Science had the full support of the Academic Board.

He noted that the Faculty of Arts and Science made an appropriate administrative home for the Centre due to its strong interdivisional nature, and its connection to the undergraduate program in Criminology at Woodsworth College. Professor Desloges, Principal of Woodsworth College, attended the meeting and said he welcomed the move, noting that it provided synergies with undergraduate teaching. The administration and operating budget of the Centre would be transferred to the Faculty of Arts and Science, and there would be no other implications for the University's budget.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

THAT the Centre of Criminology be disestablished as an academic unit in the School of Graduate Studies and re-established as an extra-departmental unit A (EDU:A) within the Faculty of Arts and Science, effective May 1, 2009.

(b) Declaration of Property as Surplus to University Requirements: 245 College Street, Toronto

Professor Marrus advised that the proposal arose out of an opportunity for the University to lease the small piece of property at 245 College Street to a developer who would like to build a residence facility, partly on this site. Once built, the University would have the capacity to place students in the residence. The developer was committed to ensuring a quality experience for students, and the University would advise the developer in establishing residence life policies, standards, and procedures. The 99-year lease agreement was also a sound business proposition. The revenue generated would be used for Student Life activities. Due to the wording of the Business Board's terms of reference, it was necessary to handle the transaction in this manner, declaring the property as surplus to University requirements.

Professor Marrus advised that during a full discussion of the Academic Board, the following points had been raised.

- There was an unmet need for affordable residence space for upper-year and international University of Toronto students.
- The proposal provided a reasonable alternative to the University itself developing a residence, and the financial arrangement was very favourable.
- One member expressed opposition to the proposal, given the need for office space for student organizations. In response, Professor Misak advised that the University administration was working to address multiple priorities so that they would all be met.

5. Items for Governing Council Approval (cont'd)**(b) Declaration of Property as Surplus to University Requirements: 245 College Street, Toronto (cont'd)**

In discussion, a member commented that as the land was purchased out of general university funds, the lease revenue from the property should be used where the need was the greatest, and should not be restricted by the Motion for use by one particular office. In response, the Provost advised that the use of the revenue would remain at the discretion of the University. However, improving student services, and the student experience remained a priority and these funds would be dedicated there at this time.

In response to a question regarding the timing of the lease, Ms. Hardy, Legal Counsel, Real Estate Operations, advised that income from the lease would not start until the developer had approvals in place for demolition and construction, which would take at least two years. She further noted that construction of the residence facility would take approximately two additional years following approval.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

That the 245 College Street property be declared surplus to University requirements.

(c) Joseph L. Rotman School of Management Expansion Project: Change of Scope

Professor Marrus advised that in October, 2007, Governing Council approved a capital project for the Expansion of the Rotman School of Management. Since that time, the Project Implementation Committee, which had been working with the consulting architects, had determined that one additional floor, or 650 nasm, was needed to fully meet the School's program requirements. No additional budget was requested at this time, and implementation would be contingent on the ability of the Rotman School to obtain sufficient funding for the full project.

At the Academic Board meeting, a member expressed concern about the project design and its impact on the surrounding community and the street scape. Ms Sisam, Assistant Vice-President, Campus and Facilities Planning, replied that much consultation with the community had occurred and would continue as further progress on the design was made. Also, in response to questions about parking spots that would be displaced because of the project, Ms Sisam assured members that parking, including dedicated spots for members from the University of Toronto at Mississauga, and the University of Toronto at Scarborough, would be relocated to other university parking lots in order to maintain the parking requirement by-law.

In response to a concern raised by a Governor during discussion, about whether the Council could feel assured that this expansion would support the Rotman School's long-term growth requirements, the Provost advised that the additional floor was necessary to provide for future growth that could not be accommodated through a reconfiguration of the existing space.

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

(c) Joseph L. Rotman School of Management Expansion Project: Change of Scope (cont'd)

A member asked Governors to seriously consider the negative impact, and consequences of this expansion on the surrounding neighbourhood when voting on this Motion.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

THAT a change in project scope of approximately 650 nasm (1,035 gsm) new construction be approved for the Joseph L. Rotman School of Management expansion project with implementation contingent on full funding of the proposed change of scope.

With the agreement of the Council, the Chair varied the order of the agenda to allow the President's participation in the *in camera* items. The President had a longstanding commitment to travel overseas on University business and due to an airline scheduling change had to leave the meeting earlier than originally anticipated.

IN ACCORDANCE WITH A DETERMINATION BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE PURSUANT TO SECTION 70 (K) OF BY-LAW NUMBER 2, ITEM 6 WAS CONSIDERED BY THE GOVERNING COUNCIL IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE *IN CAMERA*.

IN ACCORDANCE WITH A DETERMINATION BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE PURSUANT TO SECTION 38 OF BY-LAW NUMBER 2, ITEM 7 WAS CONSIDERED BY THE GOVERNING COUNCIL *IN CAMERA*.

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL RESOLVED ITSELF INTO COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE.

6. Proposed Development Agreement

The Committee of the Whole adopted a recommendation concerning a property development agreement.

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL MOVED OUT OF COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

7. Senior Appointment

On Motion duly moved, seconded and carried

It was resolved

THAT the re-election of Mr. John Fraser as the Master of Massey College for a five-year term commencing July 1, 2009 be confirmed.

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL MOVED INTO OPEN SESSION.

THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE ROSE TO MAKE ITS REPORT TO COUNCIL.

The Chair reported that the Committee of the Whole had received a report on a proposed development agreement, and agreed with the recommendation provided by the President.

On Motion duly moved, seconded and carried

It was Resolved

THAT the Vice President Business Affairs be authorized (i) to negotiate the final conditions and to enter into the proposed development agreement, and (ii) to arrange the necessary financing not to exceed \$37.5 million, subject to the final terms of the financing being approved by governance.

8. Item for Governing Council Approval: Borrowing Authorization

Mr. Nunn reminded members that in 2004 the Governing Council approved the University's Borrowing Strategy that permitted the University to access the public markets for external borrowing requirements up to a maximum of 40% of the University's net assets, averaged over five years.

The purpose of the detailed resolution before Council was to provide the specific authorization, as required by lenders in the public markets, to the Vice-President Business Affairs to execute transactions on behalf of the University. The maximum amount of this tranche would be \$200-million, and most of the borrowing would be used to finance projects that had already been approved. Projects were added to the borrowing requirement as they were approved, however, access to the funds was not required until the projects moved forward.

The Business Board had reviewed the Borrowing Strategy and concluded that the Strategy was still a sound one. Mr. Nunn advised that the permissible debt was under the median debt of peer U.S. public universities which was appropriate. Lenders approved of the University's disciplined approach which limited its borrowing. The University's credit ratings were very strong.

External borrowing had typically assumed the form of long, fixed-term, "bullet" debentures at advantageous rates of interest. The University paid the interest until the debentures became due, at which point the principal was repaid. The proposed new tranche of borrowing would be used only when rates appeared to be most advantageous, and when the money was required. The resolution needed to be in place to provide the University administration the flexibility to borrow as and when the markets were appropriate

The divisions responsible for each capital project signed an agreement to make blended principal and interest payments. The principal components were paid into a sinking fund – the Long-Term Borrowing Pool - which was used to pay the interest and expenses on the debentures, and to accumulate money to repay the principal when it becomes due, beginning in 2031.

8. Item for Governing Council Approval: Borrowing Authorization (cont'd)

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

- (a) THAT the University be authorized to borrow such amount, not exceeding \$200 million, as may be determined by the senior officer of the University responsible for financial matters, as so designated by the President, in addition to the \$160 million approved by the Business Board on January 15, 2001, the \$200 million approved by the Governing Council on June 26, 2003 and the \$150 million approved by the Governing Council on June 24, 2004;
- (b) THAT such senior officer responsible for financial matters be authorized to determine, in consultation with the University financial advisor, the most appropriate financing structure for this borrowing, including without limitation, by way of private debt placement, a public debenture issue, syndicated bank financing, or securitization and to negotiate, approve and execute and deliver for and on behalf of and in the name of the University, all agreements, documents, certificates and instruments, including without limitation any underwriting or agency agreement and any offering document, and to take all such other actions as such officer may determine to be necessary or desirable to give effect to such financing and offering of debt securities, the execution and delivery of any such agreements, documents, certificates or instruments, and the taking of such actions being conclusive evidence of such determination;
- (c) THAT such senior officer responsible for financial matters is further authorized to authorize any other officer of the University to execute and deliver, for and on behalf of and in the name of the University, such certificates, documents and instruments as may be contemplated by the principal agreements entered into with respect to such debt offering or as may be required in connection with the closing of the offering of debt securities authorized hereby;
- (d) THAT the borrowed funds be added to the Long-Term Borrowing Pool and invested by University of Toronto Asset Management Corporation until the funds are required for each project;
- (e) THAT the senior officer of the University responsible for financial matters be authorized to allocate borrowing as internal financing for spending that has been approved by the Business Board or is within the approval authority of the administration;
- (f) THAT principal and interest repayments related to debenture borrowing be placed in the Long-Term Borrowing Pool, or other sinking fund mechanism, and, together with investment income, be used to pay periodic interest payments to lenders, to pay issue and ongoing administrative costs, with the expectation that the net sum from these additions and draw downs will be sufficient to repay the bullet debentures at maturity; and
- (g) THAT the senior officer of the University responsible for financial matters report periodically to the Business Board on the status of the Long-Term Borrowing Pool.

9. Performance Indicators for Governance: Annual Report for 2008

The Chair noted that the Performance Indicators document was a major element of the University's accountability exercises, and consisted of a series of metrics of institutional achievement across a wide variety of indicators. The report was presented for information.

Professor Misak advised that this was the twelfth annual report brought forward to governance. The University of Toronto was a leader in measuring performance, and some positive changes and additions had been incorporated this year. Measures had been aligned to the *2030 Framework*, and highlighted the University of Toronto's distinctive role among universities in Canada. Professor Misak summarized the highlights from the report.

Faculty Honours: The University of Toronto continued to have award-winning faculty, and over the last 28 years had won more awards from prestigious international bodies than any other Canadian university. The more competitive the award was, the better the University's researchers had done.

Research Ranking: The University's research strength and output were unparalleled in Canada, as indicated by both its position in research-focused rankings, and by its publications and citations. The University ranked first among its Canadian peers in the following four rankings: Shanghai Jiao tong University; Times Higher Education Peer Review; Research Infosource; and, the Higher Education Evaluation and Accreditation Council of Taiwan.

Publications and Citations: In the science related fields combined, the University of Toronto was ranked first in Canada, and was in the top three in North America. Additional disciplines would be added to the next annual report.

Research Funding: In CIHR and NSERC funding, the University was still competing very well. However, for SSHRC funding, the University had dropped in rank to 5th in 2006-07. This was due to a trend of increasing applications to granting councils, and an increased desire on the part of the councils to spread their resources more broadly. Also, granting councils were now targeting specific areas of research that, in some cases, were not areas of focus for the University of Toronto.

Space Inventory: Since 1995-96, there had been a growing gap between space requirements and actual space on the three campuses. Growth in space had not kept pace with the growth in students. At present, the Scarborough campus was at 60% of its space requirement, the Mississauga campus at 71%, and the St. George campus at 80%.

Deferred Maintenance: Despite Government investments over the past years, deferred maintenance remained a significant issue, particularly on the St. George campus. The total deferred maintenance backlog amounted to \$276.5 million.

Student Recruitment: Yield rates remained favourable for doctoral-stream graduate students despite a period of expansion and increased competition.

9. Performance Indicators for Governance: Annual Report for 2008 (cont'd)

Student Retention and Graduation: Retention and graduation of first-entry undergraduate students remained at favourable and consistent levels. The data had shown that there had been no meaningful difference in retention rates over time between OSAP versus non-OSAP recipients. There had also been no meaningful change in retention rates, over time, as tuition had risen. Retention rates had actually declined during the tuition fee freeze. The graduation rate for doctoral students in all disciplines exceeded those of Canadian peers, and was one area where performance also exceeded that of U.S. institutions.

Student-Faculty Ratios: Ratios had stabilized but additional improvement was needed in this area, as they remained higher than those of the peers.

National Survey on Student Engagement (NSSE) Benchmarks: In the survey of undergraduate students conducted in the Spring 2008, progress had been made in every benchmark. Improvements were attributed to initiatives that had been put in place to improve the student experience on all three campuses. The University did, however, continue to lag behind its peers in a number of the NSSE benchmarks.

Graduate and Professional Satisfaction Survey: Satisfaction rates of graduate students had improved in all areas since 2005, and exceeded those of Canadian peers.

Annual Fundraising Achievement: 2007-08 had been a record year with regard to account pledges, realized planned gifts, and gifts in kind. The University was enormously grateful for this support.

Total Revenue per FTE Student: The University remained grossly under-resourced compared to U.S. peers. The AAU peer mean was \$60,104 and the University of Toronto was \$26,738.

Future Measures: Future reports would provide information on the following:

- expanded, field-specific publications and citations data (including Social Science fields)
- more specific measures of student engagement with faculty, including the numbers of University Professors, Canada Research Chairs, and endowed Chairs teaching undergraduate courses
- measures of the extra-curricular experiences of students.

A member suggested that it would be useful to include retention information based on categories of students (international, domestic, residence, etc) in future reports. He also suggested that similar data to that contained in the NSSE should be collected for graduate students, especially in light of the *2030 Report*. The member also felt specific data should be collected from those students who were not having a good student experience, to determine where improvements were needed from their perspective. The Provost agreed, and noted that the primary rationale for undertaking these surveys was to determine the areas where the University needed to improve.

The Chair suggested that if there was interest amongst Governors in an offline session on Performance Indicators, one would be arranged. In addition, a session could be incorporated into the Orientation for Governors that took place in September.

10. Reports for Information

Members received the following four reports for information:

- Report Number 150 of the University Affairs Board (February 3, 2009)
- Report Number 160 of the Academic Board (February 5, 2009)
- Report Number 420 of the Executive Committee (February 12, 2009)
- Report Number 172 of the Business Board (February 13, 2009)

11. Date of Next Meeting

The Chair informed members that the next meeting of the Governing Council was scheduled for **Thursday April 16, 2009**, at 4:30 p.m.

12. Question Period

There were no questions for members of the senior administration.

13. Other Business

There was no other business at this time.

Secretary

March 25, 2009

Chair