

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL
REPORT NUMBER 429 OF
THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Thursday, March 25, 2010

To the Governing Council,
University of Toronto.

Your Committee reports that it held a meeting on Thursday, March 25, 2010 at 4:00 p.m. in the Boardroom, Simcoe Hall, with the following members present:

Mr. John F. (Jack) Petch, Chair
Dr. Alice Dong, Vice-Chair
Professor David Naylor, President
Mr. Ryan Campbell
Mr. P.C. Choo
Mr. Ken Davy
Ms Judith Goldring
Dr. Gerald Halbert
Professor Ron Kluger
Mr. Joseph Mapa
Professor Arthur S. Ripstein
Miss Maureen J. Somerville
Professor Janice Stein

Non-Voting Member:

Mr. Louis R. Charpentier

Secretariat:

Mr. Henry Mulhall, Secretary
Mr. Anwar Kazimi

Regrets:

Mr. Timothy Reid

In Attendance:

Ms Nora Gillespie, Legal Counsel, Office of the Vice-President and Provost, and Office of the Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity *
Dr. Anthony Gray, Special Advisor to the President
Professor Edith Hillan, Vice-Provost, Faculty and Academic Life *
Mr. Christopher Lang, Director, Office of Appeals, Discipline, and Faculty Grievances *
Professor Louise Lemieux-Charles, Chair, Academic Board and Member of the Governing Council
Professor Cheryl Misak, Vice-President and Provost, and Member of the Governing Council
Mr. Richard Nunn, Chair, Business Board and Member of the Governing Council
Ms Catherine Riggall, Vice-President, Business Affairs
Ms B. Elizabeth Vosburgh, Chair, University Affairs Board and Member of the Governing Council

* In attendance for agenda item 12.

1. Report of the Previous Meeting

Report Number 428 (February 11, 2010) of the Executive Committee 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

Members received for information the Minutes of the Governing Council meeting held on February 25, 2010.

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) University and Provincial Budgets

The President reported that the process of developing the University's 2010-11 budget had been more challenging than in recent years as a result of the many uncertainties that existed. As he had reported to the Business Board a few days previously, the budget was as firm as possible, and could be characterized as prudent and reasonable in its management of risk and uncertainty. One significant uncertainty was expected to be clarified by the Provincial Budget delivered that day. There had been indications that the Government would provide coverage to prevent Basic Income Unit (BIU) proration due to growth, both for future years, and possibly retroactively by means of a one time only payment. Other outstanding uncertainties that could significantly affect the budget included the solvency test to be applied to the pension liability, the outcome of the ongoing collective bargaining with the University of Toronto Faculty Association (UTFA), the terms of any new tuition framework, and whether new support would be provided by the Provincial Government for graduate fellowships.

(b) Federal Government Relations

Following the release of the Federal Budget on March 4, 2010, the President had joined with the Presidents of Canada's thirteen largest research-intensive universities in issuing a statement of appreciation for the Budget that had been generally well-received, including in Ottawa. He made the following observations concerning the Budget. Unlike previous efforts to address federal deficits, it appeared that transfer payments to the provinces would not be reduced. In the past these cuts had been passed on by the provincial governments through reductions in education and healthcare spending that had directly affected universities, hospitals and other institutions. Secondly, the budget had recognized the importance of basic research and development, as well as innovation to Canada's future in the knowledge economy. New funds had been allocated for basic research through the granting councils, and there was confirmation of renewed support for research infrastructure. The President particularly welcomed the proposed national review of public research and development spending. The University had advocated for such a review with the goal of developing a truly national strategy to improve Canada's international competitiveness in this area.

(c) Campus Elections and Events

The President congratulated Mr. P.C. Choo for his re-election to the Governing Council for a three-year term, and expressed his gratitude to Mr. Ken Davy for his three years of excellent service to the governance of the University. The Students' Administrative Council (SAC)

5. Report of the President (cont'd)**(c) Campus Elections and Events (cont'd)**

elections had also occurred the previous week with the incumbent slate being elected. There had been a clear diversity of views and heated debate, and a number of complaints about the process had been received. It was encouraging that the level of engagement had been higher than in recent years, and there had been a marked focus on local issues and the needs of students. The previous week had also seen the passage of the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC) campus referendum on the student financial levy to support a new athletics and recreation complex for the PanAm Games and the UTSC campus. Vigorous “Yes” and “No” campaigns had been organized, and there had been a strong voter turnout. The clear victory by the “Yes” campaign, led by the Scarborough Campus Students’ Union (SCSU), could be seen as a pragmatic choice by students to leverage their contribution of \$30 million to bring about the creation of a \$171 million facility for their campus.

The President noted that the annual Israeli Apartheid Week (IAW) had occurred during the first week of March. The three-day event had been quiet, with moderate attendance, and no untoward incidents to report. There was reason to be optimistic that the University’s strong stance on free speech and open, respectful, and civil debate, combined with the provision of general guidance to organizers in advance of events, was proving effective. The University’s student life staff, led by Mr. Jim Delaney, were to be commended for their efforts in this regard. The cancellation of the speech by Ms Ann Coulter at the University of Ottawa a few days previously had demonstrated how easily campus events could get out of control, and how well-intentioned actions by university administrators could have the unintended effect of drawing attention to, and ultimately generating sympathy for, controversial speakers.

The Committee moved *in camera* and was briefed by the President on a university relations matter.

The Committee returned to closed session.

6. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council

- (a) University of Toronto at Scarborough and School of Graduate Studies: Doctor of Philosophy in Environmental Science**
(Arising from Report Number 166 of the Academic Board [March 23, 2010]- Item 5)

Professor Lemieux-Charles reported that this proposed program in environmental science represented the first tri-campus doctoral program that would be housed at the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC). Located within the Department of Physical and Environmental Sciences, it would align well with the current undergraduate and graduate programs offered at UTSC, and would be intended for students with a broad scientific background and interest rather than one strongly specialized in a particular discipline. UTSC had committed to providing all of the resources needed for the program, and so there were no resource implications for the University’s operating budget. Questions regarding the interdisciplinary component of the program had been raised by members at the Academic Board meeting, and the Vice-Dean, Graduate Education and Program Development at UTSC had responded that that aspect of the proposal had been discussed extensively over the previous two years during consultations with deans and chairs of relevant units. Following discussion, the Academic Board had recommended approval of the proposal.

6. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council (cont'd)**(a) University of Toronto at Scarborough and School of Graduate Studies: Doctor of Philosophy in Environmental Science (cont'd)**

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

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

THAT the proposed Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) Program in Environmental Science, as described in the proposal from the University of Toronto at Scarborough dated January 8, 2010, be approved, with enrolment commencing September 2010.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 166 of the Academic Board as Appendix “A”.

(b) University of Toronto at Mississauga: Proposal to Disestablish the Institute of Communication and Culture and Establish an Institute of Communication, Culture and Information Technology (Extra Departmental Unit: A (EDU:A)) and a Department of Visual Studies

(Arising from Report Number 166 of the Academic Board [March 23, 2010]- Item 6)

Professor Lemieux-Charles reported that this proposal had arisen from an external review of the Institute of Communication and Culture, and it recommended a new administrative structure that would better meet the needs of University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM) teaching staff and students. Broad consultation had taken place within the UTM community and with the Sheridan Institute of Technology and Advanced Learning. The proposed Institute of Communication, Culture and Information Technology (CCIT) would combine two units: Communication, Culture and Information Technology; and Professional Writing and Communication. As an extra-departmental unit A, the CCIT would house a number of academic programs. The proposed Department of Visual Studies would house the Art and Art History, Visual Culture Communication, and Cinema Studies programs. As part of the restructuring, the Biomedical Communications program, which was currently located in the Institute of Communication and Culture (ICC), would be relocated to the UTM Department of Biology. At its meeting on March 2, 2010, the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs had approved the deletion of the Human Communication and Technology and the Health Science Communication programs which had also been offered through the ICC. Professor Lemieux-Charles noted that existing operating resources would be realigned to support the two new units, and that there would be no changes in ongoing funding resources at the University level. No questions had been raised by the Academic Board regarding the proposal.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

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

1. THAT the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM) Institute of Communication and Culture be disestablished, effective July 1, 2010;
2. THAT the UTM Institute of Communication, Culture and Information Technology be established as an Extra-Departmental Unit A (EDU:A), effective July 1, 2010; and,
3. THAT the UTM Department of Visual Studies be established; effective July 1, 2010.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 166 of the Academic Board as Appendix “B”.

6. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council (cont'd)**(c) Capital Project: Project Planning Report for the Biozone: Bioengineering Research Facility**

(Arising from Report Number 166 of the Academic Board [March 23, 2010]- Item 7)

Professor Lemieux-Charles reported that this was a proposal for the construction of 350 gross square metres of space on the rooftop of the Wallberg Building, and the renovation of 420 gross square metres of space on the third floor of the same building, in order to accommodate new laboratory and research facilities. The Department of Chemical Engineering and Applied Chemistry's Biozone Research Facility had been awarded \$1.8 million from each of the Canadian Foundation for Innovation (CFI) and the Ontario Research Fund (ORF) for an expansion of its facilities, and the Department and the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering would each contribute funds towards the total project cost of \$4.429-million. The costs of some secondary effects of the project, including the displacement of a computer engineering facility, would also be assumed by the Faculty. If the proposal were approved, construction would begin in December 2010 with occupancy planned for January 2012. No questions about the proposal had been asked by members of the Academic Board.

Mr. Nunn reported that the Business Board had considered a recommendation to authorize execution of the project, and subject to Governing Council approval of the project planning report, had given its assent.

A member stated that renovations to part of the Galbraith Building a few years previously had had a negative impact on the ventilation provided to the rest of the building. He wanted to make sure that this would not be the case with the current proposal. He asked what consideration had been given to the ventilation impact on the rest of the Wallberg Building, and whether sufficient ventilation would be provided for the new computer laboratory. The Vice-President, Business Affairs undertook to make enquiries and follow up with the member.¹

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

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

1. That the Project Planning Report for the Biozone: Bioengineering Research Facility for Energy, Environmental, and Economic Sustainability be approved in principle.
2. That the project scope as identified in the Project Planning Report be approved in principle at a Total Project Cost of \$4,429,000 with funding as follows:

¹ Ms Riggall subsequently provided the following information to the member. The newly constructed space would have its own HVAC system. The renovated space on the third floor would utilize the existing HVAC system, but the demands on it would decrease as a result of the decommissioning of existing fumehoods. In other words, the ventilation needs of the Biozone would be less than the current ventilation needs of the same space, and so the project would have no negative impact on the ventilation of the rest of the building. The relocation of the computer lab was not part of the proposed project. The Project Planning Report stated that the lab would be re-accommodated in renovated space provided by Chemical Engineering and Applied Chemistry (Wallberg room 255); that the new room would be fitted out to match as much as possible the specifications of the displaced computer laboratory; that the costs were not part of the Biozone project; that funding anticipated to be in the range of \$75,000 would be borne by the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering; and that approval, according to the Policy on Capital Planning and Capital Projects for projects under \$2 million, would be through the Accommodation Facilities Directorate.

6. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council (cont'd)**(c) Capital Project: Project Planning Report for the Biozone: Bioengineering Research Facility (cont'd)**

Canada Foundation for Innovation	\$ 1,771,679
Ontario Research Fund	\$ 1,771,679
Department of Chemical Engineering and Applied Chemistry	\$ 485,642
<u>Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering</u>	<u>\$ 400,000</u>
Total	\$ 4,429,000

Documentation is attached to Report Number 166 of the Academic Board as Appendix “C”.

(d) Student Financial Support: Report of the Vice-Provost, Students, January 2010

The Chair noted that this Report had been provided for background information to the tuition fees item, and would also be provided to the Governing Council when it considered the tuition fees at its meeting on April 8, 2010.

A member referred to the chart on page 3 of the Report entitled “Total OSAP Repayable – Convocating First Entry Programs”. He recommended that the data be adjusted for inflation, and noted that it would be helpful if more detail were provided regarding the distribution of students’ debt load by subdividing the chart into more categories. He also recommended that the following sentence on page 3 of the Report be revised: “Students enrolled in a courseload of 60 per cent or more (40 per cent for students with a permanent disability) are defined as fulltime by both the University and the federal and provincial governments, and hence are eligible to be considered for OSAP and UTAPS.” To his understanding, definitions of full-time status varied among divisions. In the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering, for example, a courseload of 80% was required to be considered full-time and thus eligible for OSAP and UTAPS.

The Vice-President and Provost noted that the University had developed a unique assessment methodology to provide need-based aid to part-time students and those requiring accommodation through the Noah Meltz Program. The Program was currently under review, in part to ensure that it was being accessed adequately given the need for aid that existed.

The President assured the member that the language in the Report would be revised appropriately prior to the Governing Council meeting to reflect this interdivisional variability regarding full-time status. He also agreed with the suggested revisions to the Chart, and added that it should be adjusted temporally to reflect the shift by many students from a 3-year to a 4-year degree with a consequent effect on their graduating debt load. Finally, he stated that the University should consider measuring and analyzing levels of non-OSAP student indebtedness as well as levels of student employment. This had been done in the past, and despite the possibility of self-reporting bias, it ought to be considered again.

A number of members noted that the Report was not comprehensive in that it did not include significant sources of student aid provided by academic divisions such as the professional faculties and colleges. Professor Misak agreed that the Report was not as positive as it might be regarding the total amount of aid available, and added that this was in part the result of limitations on staff time that could be devoted to the reporting process.

A member expressed his general concern with the levels of graduating student OSAP debt, and the fact that the Provincial Government provided loan forgiveness to reduce loans to a maximum of just \$7000 per year of study.

6. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council (cont'd)**(e) Tuition Fee Schedule for Publicly Funded Programs, 2010-11**

(Arising from Report Number 180 of the Business Board [March 22, 2010]- Item 3(c))

Mr. Nunn reported that the Business Board had received a full presentation on both the tuition-fee schedule and the budget report. It had been satisfied that the proposed tuition-fee increases were required in the light of the University's budgetary needs. The proposal had been formulated in a situation of some uncertainty, since the Province's tuition-fee framework had expired, and the proposal had therefore been based on an assumption that its terms would continue in effect. The maximum average fee increase permitted under the old tuition framework was 5%, and the University's average amounted to 4.31% for Canadian citizens or residents. The weighted average cost increase was slightly over \$300, while the median increase was \$225. The Board had also received the annual enrolment report. Overall enrolment levels had slightly exceeded the target. Applications for 2010-11 were very strong, and the Board had been satisfied that the fee increases had not been pricing the University out of the market. Finally, the Board had also reviewed the report on student financial support.

A member asked for clarification regarding the contribution made to student assistance from the proceeds of fee increases. The Provost and President noted that from 1997-98 to 2005-06, the Government of Ontario had required that 30% of the proceeds be set aside for student aid. However, with the advent of partial deregulation of tuition fees in 2006-07, that requirement had been replaced by the Government's Student Access Guarantee (SAG) which required universities to ensure accessibility regardless of students' financial means. The Report on Student Financial Support demonstrated that the University continued to provide need-based aid at a level that exceeded the guidelines of the SAG.

A member referred to the tables on pages 4 and 7 of the Tuition Fee Schedule. The former applied to domestic students and included both the percentage increases as well as the actual fee level. The latter applied to international students, and included only the percentage increases. He recommended that they be made consistent.

There followed a discussion of what constituted the most appropriate relative balance between tuition fee levels for domestic students and those for international students. At one time the difference had been determined formulaically, but with partial deregulation of tuition fees, institutions had been given discretion to determine the appropriate level for international fees. Among the points raised in discussion were the following. Under the formulaic system, domestic fees had tended to subsidize international fees, while the opposite was more commonly the case under the current system. International fees were set at a level to include the fee charged to a domestic student for the same program, the Basic Income Unit (BIU) amount provided by the Government for a student in that program, as well as a premium to meet the costs arising from the special needs of international students. International fees did not generate significant new revenue for the University unless a substantial premium was included. A case could be made that this was justifiable for international students who had the financial means and the willingness to pay such fees. However, in that case financial aid should then also be provided to ensure accessibility for international students who lacked such means, especially those from developing countries. It was also important that the University not become overly reliant on revenue from international fees, since international enrolment levels tended to fluctuate significantly in response to changing global economic and political conditions. Financial considerations aside, it was noted that international students contributed much to the diversity of the University, and that many of them eventually chose to remain in Canada where they made important contributions to society. Those who returned home often helped develop valuable relationships between Canada and their home country. In a number of countries, such as India, there currently existed large numbers of excellent students who could not access high quality higher education, and this represented an opportunity for the University in expanding its

6. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council (cont'd)**(e) Tuition Fee Schedule for Publicly Funded Programs, 2010-11 (cont'd)**

international enrolment. There was agreement that this was a significant policy issue that merited ongoing consideration by the University.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

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

THAT the Tuition-Fee Schedule For Publicly Funded Programs in 2010-11, as described in Professor Misak's March 3, 2010 report to the Business Board, and the tuition fees in 2010-11 and 2011-12 for the special programs identified in Tables B2 and C2 of Appendices B and C of the report, be approved.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 180 of the Business Board as Appendix "A".

(f) Tuition Fee Schedule for Self-Funded Programs, 2010-11

(Arising from Report Number 180 of the Business Board [March 22, 2010]- Item 3(d))

Mr. Nunn reported that the self-funded programs received no government funding, and that their fees were set to recover at least their direct costs. The Business Board had recommended approval of the proposed fees.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

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

THAT the tuition-fee schedule for self-funded programs for 2010-11, a copy of which is attached to Professor Misak's February 5, 2010 memorandum to the Business Board as Table 1, be approved.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 180 of the Business Board as Appendix "B".

(g) Budget Report, 2010-2011 and Long Range Budget Guidelines, 2010-11 to 2014-15

(Arising from Report Number 166 of the Academic Board [March 23, 2010]- Item 8, and from Report Number 180 of the Business Board [March 22, 2010] – Item 4)

Professor Lemieux-Charles reported that the Academic Board had received a combined presentation on the budget and tuition fee schedules at its meeting on March 23, 2010. The Vice-President and Provost had noted at the outset that the University had not been immune to the financial pressures faced by universities worldwide during the previous year. The Executive Director, Planning and Budget and the Vice-Provost, Academic Operations had then provided a detailed presentation of the proposed 2010-2011 Budget Report and Long Range Budget Guidelines. The Board had had a full discussion on a number of points related to revenue and expense items, student enrolment, and the University Fund. Some student members had expressed concern regarding the budget assumption of increased tuition fees, noting that increases for incoming and international students would be even greater than the average 4.31% increase anticipated for continuing domestic students. A student had also stated that the program fee that had been introduced during the current year in the Faculty of Arts and Science had been perceived by many as a mechanism for increasing tuition fees. In response, Professor Misak had explained that the practice of charging a program fee was a common one, both for

6. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council (cont'd)**(g) Budget Report, 2010-2011 and Long Range Budget Guidelines, 2010-11 to 2014-15 (cont'd)**

many programs at the University as well as at other Ontario universities. She had emphasized that it was a different way of collecting tuition rather than a tuition fee increase.

Some members of the Academic Board had asked for an elaboration on the University's plan to spend a total of \$30 million to replace the existing student information system (ROSI). The Vice-Provost, Academic Operations had emphasized the pressing need for a multi-functional system that would enable enhanced connectivity, and that would provide the foundation necessary to support future technologies. The University was in part responding to student demand for an improved system that could handle heavy usage during peak periods. In response to a query about the University-wide expense of shared-infrastructure investments, Professor Misak had explained that the \$18.9-million allocated for 2010-11 should be considered as an increase over two years rather than one. As a result of the University's constrained financial situation during the previous year, spending on these initiatives had been very limited. She added that a large portion of that cost would be used to launch a major fundraising campaign.

Mr. Nunn reported that it was the role of the Business Board to advise the Governing Council on the financial prudence of the budget. In addition to a detailed presentation similar to that received by the Academic Board, the Business Board had also received an evaluation of the prudence of the budget from the President. The Board had been pleased that the budget, at the institution-wide level, would be balanced. Certain divisions would pay down over five years the debt they had incurred during the previous year in order to manage in the absence of a payout from the endowment. The administration recognized and made clear the very real financial challenges facing the University in the long run, including: the very large pension deficit, the cost of employee future benefits, the cost of deferred maintenance, and the debt incurred by the academic divisions and the ancillary operations for buildings. The Business Board had voted to support the Budget, concurring with the recommendation of the Academic Board that it be approved.

A member referred to page 17 of the documentation which stated that "a cost containment of \$3.2M (2%) will be applied to the administrative divisions." He asked how many job losses were expected to result from this cost containment. The Vice-President and Provost clarified that the statement applied to the University's central administration, that is the vice-presidential portfolios. Most of the cost containment would occur without the loss of positions. There could be reorganizations, and portfolios might have to do more with fewer resources. The President added that the central administrative divisions varied greatly in size, for instance his own portfolio was very small compared to that of the Vice-President, Business Affairs. There existed little capacity in any of them to reduce positions significantly, and there was no plan to do so. He could not guarantee that there would be no job losses, but reductions would be at the margins, and largely accomplished by natural turnover.

A member commented that he agreed with the comments made by the Vice-President and Provost at the Academic Board regarding the Arts and Science program fee. In his opinion the new system was fairer in that full-time students no longer subsidized part-time students, fixed costs were shared equitably, and those who chose to extend the duration of their programs paid the cost of doing so. The President noted that it was also important to consider those who were unable to take a full-time course load as the result of limited financial resources and/or the need to take on paid employment, and to ensure that sufficient financial aid was provided. The member added that with the University of Toronto Advance Planning for Students (UTAPS) program provided such support.

6. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council (cont'd)**(g) Budget Report, 2010-2011 and Long Range Budget Guidelines, 2010-11 to 2014-15 (cont'd)**

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

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

THAT the Budget Report 2010-11 be approved; and

THAT the Long Range Budget Guidelines, 2010-11 to 2014-15, be approved in principle.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 166 of the Academic Board as Appendix “D”.

7. Reviews of Academic Units and Programs, July 2008-December 2009: Annual Report

Professor Lemieux-Charles reported that the Agenda Committee had decided that a report on the “review of reviews” that had been carried out by the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs (AP&P) should be provided to the Academic Board. In the report, the Chair of AP&P had informed the Board that the University’s programs continued to be regarded as outstanding ones, among the best in Canada, in North America, and internationally. In addition, it noted that AP&P had been entirely satisfied with the review process, documentation, and follow-up of fifteen of the nineteen reviews. With respect to four reviews (the Faculty of Forestry, the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, UTM’s Institute of Communication and Culture, and UTSC’s Department of Humanities) AP&P was awaiting additional updates or responses. Details of the report were contained in Appendix A to the Agenda Committee Report of March 9, 2010.

Two members commented on what they considered to be improvements to the review process, as well as AP&P’s review of the reviews, in recent years. There was evidence that the reviews were more rigorous, that they were being conducted by more objective external reviewers, and that increasingly effective follow-up was being carried out in response to the recommendations contained in the reviews.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

THAT the *Reviews of Academic Units and Programs, July 2008 - December 2009: Annual Report* be placed on the agenda of the Governing Council meeting of April 8, 2010.

8. Reports for Information

Members received the following report for information:

- (a) Report Number 179 of the Business Board (February 8, 2010)

9. Date of the Next Meeting

Members were reminded that the next regular meeting of the Executive Committee was scheduled for Thursday, April 29, 2010 at 4:00 p.m.

10. Other Business

There were no items of other business for consideration in closed session.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

IT WAS RESOLVED

THAT, pursuant to sections 28 (e) and 33 of *By-Law Number 2*, consideration of items 11-12 take place *in camera*, with the Board Chairs, Vice-Presidents, and Special Advisor to the President admitted to facilitate the work of the Committee.

In Camera Session

11. External Appointments

(a) Banting Research Foundation

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

THAT Dr. W. Raymond Cummins be appointed as a Trustee of the Banting Research Foundation for a three-year term, from April 12, 2010 until the Foundation's annual general meeting in 2013, or until his successor is appointed.

(b) University of Toronto Asset Management Corporation (UTAM)

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

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 effective immediately and until the 2011 annual meeting of the Corporation and until their successors are appointed:

Geoff Matus (Chair)
Sheila Brown
Shirley Hoy
Edward Iacobucci
George Luste
Gary Mooney
William W. Moriarty
David Naylor
Richard Nunn
David Palmer
Catherine J. Riggall
Stephen Smith
John Switzer

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

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

THAT the recommendations for expulsion contained in the Memoranda from the Secretary of the Governing Council dated March 18, 2010, be placed on the agenda for the April 8, 2010 meeting of the Governing Council; and

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

Update on Chair's Consultations with Governors

The Chair provided the Committee with an update on the consultations that he was conducting with members of the various constituencies of the Governing Council. He would also report on the outcome of the consultations at the Governing Council meeting on April 8, 2010.

The Committee returned to closed session.

The meeting adjourned at 5:50 p.m.

Secretary
April 2, 2010

Chair