

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL
REPORT NUMBER 404 OF
THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Thursday, April 12, 2007

To the Governing Council,
University of Toronto.

Your Committee reports that it held a meeting on Thursday, April 12, 2007 at 5:00 p.m. in the Boardroom, Simcoe Hall, with the following members present:

Ms Rose M. Patten (In the Chair)
Mr. John F. (Jack) Petch, Vice-Chair
Professor David Naylor, President
Ms Susan Eng
Dr. Shari Graham Fell
Professor Ellen Hodnett
Mr. Timothy Reid
Professor Arthur S. Ripstein
Ms Estefania Toledo

Non-Voting Member:

Mr. Louis R. Charpentier

Secretariat:

Mr. Henry Mulhall, Secretary

Regrets:

Mr. P.C. Choo
Miss Coralie D'Souza
The Honourable William G. Davis
Professor Barbara Sherwood Lollar
Mr. Robert S. Weiss

In Attendance:

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

1. Report of the Previous Meeting

Report Number 403 of the Executive Committee meeting held on March 8, 2007 was approved.

2. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting

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

3. Minutes of the Governing Council Meeting of March 29, 2007

Members received for information the minutes of the Governing Council meeting held on March 29, 2007.

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

There was no business arising from the minutes of the Governing Council meeting.

5. Report of the President

(a) Awards and Honours

The President reported that the impressive record of success in recent weeks by members of the University's faculty in securing prestigious awards was continuing unabated. In addition to the long list of award winners that he had noted in his report at the last meeting of the Governing Council, he was pleased to report that three faculty members had recently been awarded prestigious Guggenheim Fellowships. Professors Michael Goldstein of the Department of Mathematics at the St. George and Scarborough campuses, Jerry Mitrovica of the Department of Physics, and Peter Zandstra of the Institute for Biomaterials and Biomedical Engineering had been selected from among approximately 2,800 applicants on the basis of their distinguished past achievement and exceptional promise for future accomplishment. The continuing success of members of the faculty in such competitions was a recognition of their international distinction, and was a great source of pride for the University.

(b) Student Recognition Events

The President had attended a number of very positive student recognition events in recent days. On April 11 he had hosted the second annual President's Banquet in honour of outstanding student-athletes. Over 300 intercollegiate athletes had attended the event, joined by their parents and coaches, and the Silver "T" awards had been given out to recognize outstanding career athletic performance by members of Varsity Blues teams. On April 12, the President had also hosted a luncheon in the Great Hall at Hart House to recognize student leaders. The event had been well attended, and the President particularly wanted to thank the many governors who had made time to be there. He believed that everyone had enjoyed the opportunity to dialogue informally with student leaders.

(c) Government Relations

It was expected that two research and innovation strategy papers would be released in the next few weeks – one by the Provincial Government and the other by the Federal Government. The latter was expected to elaborate on funding announcements made in the Federal Budget on March 19, 2007, and to provide an indication of how the Federal Government intended to advance its research and innovation agenda. It was unclear when the Provincial Government intended to release its Ontario Innovation Strategy, about which there had been little detail in the Provincial Budget of March 22, 2007. The Provincial strategy paper was known to be in draft form and had been so for a matter of months. The University was particularly hopeful that it would make provisions for increased support for graduate

5. Report of the President (cont'd)**(c) Government Relations (cont'd)**

students. Both papers were likely to reflect inputs by the executive heads of Canadian universities, the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC), as well as the Science and Technology Forum co-chaired by President Naylor and President Indira Samarasekera of the University of Alberta in June 2006.

(d) Vision 2030

The President reported that final revisions were being made to the preliminary Vision 2030 framing document. The President, Vice-Presidents and Vice-Provosts (PVP) group would provide further input during the next week, and then it would be circulated to members of the Executive Committee for comment and revisions.

6. Items for Confirmation by the Executive Committee**(a) Connaught Fund Terms of Reference**

(Arising from Report Number 149 of the Academic Board [April 5, 2007]- Item 5)

Professor Marrus reported that the proposed changes to the terms of reference of the Connaught Fund were relatively minor. They consisted primarily of a slight change in the membership of the Connaught Committee to make it less specific, and an updating of the section on the investment of the Fund to reflect the fact that that it was invested with other endowment funds in the University's long-term investment pool. No concerns had been expressed by members of the Academic Board at its meeting on April 5, 2007.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE CONFIRMED THE DECISION OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD

THAT the proposed revised Terms of Reference of the Connaught Fund, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 149 of the Academic Board as Appendix "A", be approved, replacing the Terms of Reference approved by the Governing Council on June 25, 1992.

7. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council**(a) Research Agreements and the Recovery of Indirect Costs of Research**

(Arising from Report Number 149 of the Academic Board [April 5, 2007]- Item 6)

Professor Marrus reported that this proposal was a further product of the major review of research policies that had been carried out by the Vice-President, Research and Associate Provost. The revised policy contained three significant areas of change. It included the principle that the University should seek to recover the indirect costs of all research agreements, grants as well as contracts. The distribution formula for payments for indirect costs had been removed, reflecting the fact that the new budget model provided that all overhead revenue flowed to the academic division of the principal investigator. Finally, the revised Policy stated clearly the requirement for review of research agreements and for their approval by the Vice-President, Research and Associate Provost. A number of questions of clarification had been raised at the Academic Board, and no concerns had been expressed.

7. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council (cont'd)**(a) Research Agreements and the Recovery of Indirect Costs of Research (cont'd)**

On motion duly moved and seconded,

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

THAT the proposed revised *Policy on Research Agreements and the Recovery of Indirect Costs of Research*, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 149 of the Academic Board as Appendix “B”, be approved, replacing the *Policy on Research Contracts and the Recovery of Indirect Costs of Research* approved by the Governing Council on January 25, 1999.

(b) School of Graduate Studies / Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto: Doctor of Education Program in Curriculum Studies and Teacher Development – Program Closure

(Arising from Report Number 149 of the Academic Board [April 5, 2007]- Item 7)

Professor Marrus reported that in 2005, the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto (OISE/UT) had introduced a flexible-time option for its Ph.D. Program in Curriculum Studies and Teacher Development. As a result, most new students had elected to apply to the Ph.D. rather than to the Doctor of Education (Ed.D.) program, as many employers preferred the Ph.D. to the Ed.D. degree. After extensive discussion, OISE/UT had decided to suspend admission to the Ed.D. program in Curriculum Studies and Teacher Development. It was now being proposed that the program be closed when the last student in the program had completed her/his degree. Students currently in the Ed.D. program would have the option to transfer to the flexible-time Ph.D. No questions had been raised by members of the Academic Board. Given that Governing Council approval was required for the establishment of programs, it was appropriate that the same governance process be followed for their closure.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

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

- (a) THAT the proposal from the School of Graduate Studies and the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto to cease admission to the Curriculum Studies and Teacher Development Program, Ed.D., a copy of which is attached to Report Number 149 of the Academic Board as Appendix “C”, be approved, and
- (b) THAT the closure of the Ed.D. program be approved when no students are registered in it. The entry for the program will be removed from the School of Graduate Studies calendar on a permanent basis, effective September 2007.

7. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council (cont'd)**(c) Academic Initiative Fund: Allocations**

(Arising from Report Number 149 of the Academic Board [April 5, 2007]- Item 8)

The Academic Board had been informed that thirty-two proposals had been submitted in the fourth round of the Academic Initiative Fund (AIF), with requests totaling \$22-million. It was recommended that funding be allocated for the 14 projects listed in Appendices 2 and 3 of the attached documentation. No questions had been raised by members of the Board.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

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

THAT the Fourth Round of the Academic Initiative Fund be allocated as per the table in Appendices 2 and 3 to the Memorandum from the Vice-President and Provost dated February 26, 2007, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 149 of the Academic Board as Appendix "D".

(d) UTM Professional Graduate Program Centre – Extra-Departmental Unit B (EDU:B)

(Arising from Report Number 149 of the Academic Board [April 5, 2007]- Item 9)

Professor Marrus reported that the proposed Professional Graduate Program Centre (PGPC) would serve as an administrative and academic centre for campus-based cross-disciplinary professional graduate master's degree and diploma programs located at the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM). The proposed Centre was intended to promote synergies among the graduate programs, and had the full support of the School of Graduate Studies. Again, no questions had been raised by members of the Academic Board.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

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

THAT the Professional Graduate Program Centre, as described in Appendix "E" to Report Number 149 of the Academic Board, be established as an Extra-Departmental Unit B within the University of Toronto at Mississauga, effective July 1, 2007.

(e) Community Affiliation Template Agreement between the University of Toronto and 15 Community Hospitals/Centres

(Arising from Report Number 149 of the Academic Board [April 5, 2007]- Item 10)

Professor Marrus reported that the community affiliation template agreement between the University and the community hospitals was similar to the full affiliation template agreement that had been approved by the Governing Council in February. The main differences were that not all of the community hospitals were recognized as teaching hospitals; nor did all of their medical staff have University appointments. Consequently, there would be less need for the University's policy framework to be recognized by the hospital than was the case with the fully affiliated hospitals.

7. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council (cont'd)**(e) Community Affiliation Template Agreement between the University of Toronto and 15 Community Hospitals/Centres (cont'd)**

On motion duly moved and seconded,

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

- (a) THAT the template for community affiliation agreements between the University of Toronto and the current community hospitals/centres, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 149 of the Academic Board as Appendix “F”, be approved, effective immediately;
- (b) THAT the President, or designate, be authorized to sign such agreements on behalf of the Governing Council, provided that the agreements conform to the approved template; and
- (c) THAT the agreements signed under the provisions of this resolution be filed with the Secretary of Governing Council.

(f) Capital Project: Project Planning Report – St. George Examination Facility
(Arising from Report Number 149 of the Academic Board [April 5, 2007]- Item 11)

Professor Marrus reported that it was proposed that the former warehouse building at 255/257 McCaul Street be renovated to become the St. George Campus Examination Centre, addressing the shortage of both in-term and final examination space. The facility would have a capacity of over 1,000 seats, with 105 specialized accessible writing facilities for students. It would also be used for student study space when not in use for exams, and would be rented as a general testing facility to outside users to generate revenue for the University. The proposal had been discussed thoroughly at the Academic Board. Members' questions had been answered to their satisfaction, and support for the proposal had been unanimous.

Professor Ripstein reported that the Business Board, at its meeting of April 11, 2007, had considered this project and approved its execution, subject to Governing Council approval of the Project Planning Report.

A member asked how the operating costs of the facility would be covered. Professor Goel responded that operation of the facility would be the responsibility of the Office of Space Management, which would recover costs to its budget from the academic divisions on a usage basis. Revenue from rental of the facility to external groups would be used to support the budget for the facility. The amount of such revenue was expected to be modest. One of the most significant benefits of the facility for the University would be the amount of classroom and other space currently used for examination and testing purposes that would be freed up for teaching and other purposes.

7. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council (cont'd)**(f) Capital Project: Project Planning Report – St. George Examination Facility (cont'd)**

On motion duly moved and seconded,

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

- (a) THAT the Project Planning Report for the St. George Campus Central Examination Facility to be located at 255/257 McCaul Street, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 149 of the Academic Board as Appendix “G”, be approved in principle.
- (b) THAT the project scope, having a space allocation of 2700 nasm at a cost of \$10.6 million in January 2007 dollars be approved with funding provided as follows:
- | | | |
|------|---|----------------------------|
| i) | Woodsworth College | \$\$.50 million |
| ii) | Facilities and Services (FRP) spread over two years | \$1.00 million |
| iii) | Office of Space Management annualized payments over 20 years | \$.75 million ¹ |
| iv) | Borrowing, amortized over 20 years | \$8.35 million |

(g) Tuition Fee Schedule for Publicly Funded Programs, 2007-08

(Arising from Report Number 156 of the Business Board [April 11, 2007]- Item 3(c))

Professor Ripstein reported that the Business Board recommended approval of the proposed tuition fee schedule for publicly funded programs for 2007-08. The schedule was fully consistent with the University's Tuition Fee Policy. That policy required that every effort be made to secure adequate public funding for the University. It then stipulated that the University should supplement that public funding with sufficient revenue from tuition fees in order to offer students a quality educational experience. Programs of student aid were to be the means to maintain accessibility to students of varying financial means. The proposal was also fully consistent with the Provincial Tuition Framework, which regulated the tuition fees charged to domestic students. That framework limited tuition fee increases within various categories. It also limited increases overall for any institution to 5%. The increase proposed for 2007-08 amounted to 4.28%.

Professor Ripstein outlined the increases proposed for the various categories of domestic students. For most programs, fees for entering students would increase by 4.5% and for continuing students by 4%. For all graduate programs, fees would increase by 4%. For students in the Doctor of Medicine program, the Provincial Government would provide additional funding, allowing the University to increase tuition fees by only 2%. For other professional programs, including Engineering, Law, Dentistry, the Master of Business Administration (MBA) program and the Master's degree program in Nursing, the proposed increase was 8%, reflecting program costs. In some programs, including Commerce and Computer Science, fees increased beginning in second year. Such fees were listed in Table 2 of Appendices B and C, where the fees for both 2007-08 and 2008-09 had been submitted for approval. The increases

¹ Secretary's Note: This amount corrects a typographical error in the original motion, which read \$.075 million. This correction was approved by the Agenda Committee at its meeting of April 17, 2007.

7. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council (cont'd)**(g) Tuition Fee Schedule for Publicly Funded Programs, 2007-08 (cont'd)**

proposed beginning in second year were 8%, again reflecting program costs. For international students, the increase proposed was 5%. To facilitate planning, the proposed tuition fee schedule for international students was provided for both 2007-08 and 2008-09.

The Business Board had also received information regarding the outcomes of the proposal. For more than 60% of domestic students, the cost of the fee increase would be \$200 or less, and 94% of domestic students would face fee increases of 4.5% or less. For needy students, higher tuition fees would be taken into account in their assessments for student aid. For the University, the tuition increase would generate \$18.6-million of additional revenue. Revenue was also projected to increase by \$9.5-million as the result of increasing enrolment, and by \$1.9-million from Provincial operating grants. Expenditures were also projected to increase by well over \$60-million.

In making its recommendation, the Business Board had had before it the Enrolment Report, which showed that both enrolment and the quality of the entering class had remained strong. The University's fees were not threatening its ability to attract excellent students. The Board had also had before it the annual report on Student Financial Support, reporting on the 2006 survey of students. The University's spending on need-based student financial support had increased from \$1.5-million in 1992-93 to \$40.3-million in 2005-06. That supplemented government support, which had been improved considerably in 2005-06, as well as support from other external sources and other student awards provided by the University, including graduate student funding and merit-based awards. The annual report demonstrated that accessibility to the University by students from traditionally underrepresented groups had remained stable.

For international students, who formed almost 10% of the student population, the University continued to expand its scholarship program to attract the very best students. It also continued to offer emergency aid to students whose expenses were to be met by families or other sponsors, but who experienced unexpected financial emergencies. The University also monitored debt load. Only 41% of graduates from first-entry programs in 2006 had OSAP debt, and their average debt-load was approximately \$18,000. It was clear that the University continued to meet its obligation under its *Policy on Student Financial Support* to ensure that no student offered admission by the University should be unable to enter or complete the program because of a lack of financial means.

Professor Ripstein noted that the Business Board had had a good debate on the proposal. It had heard eloquent speeches from representatives of the University's graduate and undergraduate students. It had considered at length a motion to refer the fees schedule back to the administration to implement a fee reduction to 2005-06 levels and to undertake a joint lobbying campaign with student leaders to seek full funding for the cost of such a tuition decrease. The Board had rejected that motion to refer back. However, the President had undertaken to work with student leaders to advocate improved per-student funding, so long as there was no precondition of a tuition freeze or roll back, which would place the University at unacceptable financial risk.

The President added that he and the Vice-President, University Relations had scheduled a meeting with the executive of the Students' Administrative Council (SAC) in the days ahead to plan such a joint advocacy effort without any precondition of a tuition decrease.

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

(g) Tuition Fee Schedule for Publicly Funded Programs, 2007-08 (cont'd)

A member asked how the University's proposed tuition increases compared to those planned at other Ontario universities. The President responded that data from the Council of Ontario Universities (COU) indicated that most universities were proposing increases similar to those of the previous year, that is closer to 4.5% rather than the maximum allowable 5%. The University's proposed average increase of 4.28% was therefore consistent with most other institutions.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

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

THAT the Tuition-Fee Schedule For Publicly Funded Programs in 2007-08, as described in Professor Goel's March 14, 2007 memorandum to the Business Board, and the tuition fees in 2007-08 and 2008-09 for the special programs identified in Table 2 of Appendices B and C of the memorandum, be approved.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 156 of the Business Board as Appendix "A".

(h) Tuition Fee Schedule for Self-Funded Programs, 2007-08

(Arising from Report Number 156 of the Business Board [April 11, 2007]- Item 3(d))

Professor Ripstein reported that the Business Board also recommended approval of the proposed tuition fee schedule for self-funded funded programs for 2007-08. He noted that these programs received no government funding, and that their fees were set to recover their costs, at least their direct costs.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

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

THAT the proposed tuition-fee schedule for self-funded programs for 2007-08, a copy of which is attached to Professor Goel's March 14, 2007 memorandum to the Business Board as Table 1, be approved.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 156 of the Business Board as Appendix "B".

8. Appointment to the Governing Council, and Appointment to the Committee to Review the Office of the University Ombudsperson

The Chair noted that, since the previous meeting of the Executive Committee on March 8, 2007, there had been need, because of time constraints, to consider two items by means of email ballots. She read the motions from the ballots into the record in order officially to record the approvals.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

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

THAT Mr. Ken Davy serve on the Governing Council beginning March 30, 2007 and until his term ends on June 20, 2008.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

THAT Ms Elizabeth Vosburgh be appointed to the Committee to Review the Office of the University Ombudsperson, effective immediately.

9. Reports for Information

Members received Report Number 155 of the Business Board (February 26, 2007) for information, as well as a draft excerpt of Report Number 149 of the Academic Board (April 5, 2007).

10. Date of the Next Meeting

Members were reminded that the next regular meeting of the Executive Committee was scheduled for Thursday, May 17, 2007 at 11:30 a.m.

11. Other Business

There was no other business.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

IT WAS RESOLVED

THAT, pursuant to sections 28 (e) and 33 of *By-Law Number 2*, consideration of items 12, and 13 take place *in camera*, with the Board Chairs, and Vice-Presidents admitted to facilitate the work of the Committee.

12. External Appointments:

University of Toronto Asset Management Corporation (UTAM)

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

THAT the following individuals be approved and nominated as members and directors of the University of Toronto Asset Management Corporation for one year terms until the 2008 annual meeting of the Corporation and until their successors are appointed.

Ira Gluskin (Chair)
Robert W. Morrison (Vice Chair)
Felix P. Chee (*ex officio*)
Catherine A. Delaney
William E. Hewitt
Eric F. Kirzner
Anthony R. Melman
Florence Minz (Member, Governing Council)
James J. Mossman
David Naylor (*ex officio*)
Catherine J. Riggall (*ex officio*)
Thomas H. Simpson

13. Senior Appointment

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED

to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation for a senior appointment contained in the memorandum from the President dated April 12, 2007.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

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

The Committee returned to closed session.

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

April 19, 2007