

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL
REPORT NUMBER 143 OF
THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD

May 29, 2007

To the Governing Council,
University of Toronto.

Your Board reports that it met on Tuesday, May 29, 2007 at 4:30 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, with the following members present:

Dr. Claude Davis, In the Chair
Ms B. Elizabeth Vosburgh, Vice-Chair
Professor David Naylor, President
Professor David Farrar, Deputy Provost
and Vice-Provost, Students
Ms Anne E. MacDonald,
Director, Ancillary Services
Professor Varouj Aivazian
Ms Diana A.R. Alli
Ms Simona Chiose
Mr. Robin Goodfellow
Ms Margaret Hancock
Mr. Richard Hydal
Ms Rae Johnson
Professor Bruce Kidd
Mr. Josh Koziebroeki

Mr. Faraz Rahim Siddiqui

Non-Voting Assessors:

Ms Susan Addario, Director, Student Affairs
Mr. Louis R. Charpentier, Secretary of the
Governing Council
Mr. Jim Delaney, Associate Director and
Senior Policy Advisor, Student Affairs
Mr. Mark Overton, Dean of Student Affairs,
University of Toronto at Mississauga
Ms Marilyn Van Norman, Director, Student
Services

Secretariat:

Mr. Neil Dobbs
Mr. Henry Mulhall

Regrets:

Miss Coralie D'Souza
Professor William Gough
Mr. Steven Kraft
Mr. Chris McGrath
Ms. Melanie Tharamangalam
Professor John Wedge
Ms. Johanna L. Weststar

In Attendance:

Mr. Kristofer Coward, Member of the Governing Council
Mr. Tad Brown, Counsel, Office of Business Affairs and Division of University Advancement
Mr. Courtney Gibson, Executive Member, Hart House Rifle and Revolver Clubs
Dr. Anthony Gray, Special Advisor to the President
Ms Mae-Yu Tan, Special Projects Officer, Office of the Governing Council

REPORT NUMBER 143 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – May 29, 2007

ALL ITEMS ARE REPORTED FOR INFORMATION.

Vary the Agenda

It was agreed to vary the agenda to add the following item.

1. *Towards 2030: Planning for a Third Century of Excellence at the University of Toronto*

President Naylor provided an overview of *Towards 2030* to the Board during which the following points were highlighted.

Introduction:

The purpose of the *Towards 2030* planning exercise was to establish a strategic framework within which to articulate long-term directions and goals for the University. Five year planning cycles had been used with considerable success over the previous 15 years, but there was now a need to take a longer-term view to position the University in what would be a very different higher education environment by the time of its second centenary in 2027.

Key Issues:

(a) **University's Future Role in Education and Scholarship**

- The University's evolving core mission needed to strike an appropriate balance between education, scholarship, and outreach to the external community.
- A key challenge was that the student-faculty ratio at the University (26.6) was the highest among its peer institutions, the Canadian peer mean being 22.1. It was also much higher than all peer institutions in the USA.
- There was a misalignment between the University's current enrolment balance, which was overwhelmingly undergraduate, and its research focus. In 2006-07, enrolment had been 82% undergraduate, and 18% graduate (6% professional masters, 4% masters and 8% Ph.D.). Graduate enrolment was higher at most of its Canadian and American peer institutions.
- The research strength of the University, as measured by indexed publications and citations, was remarkable given its limited resources compared to many peer institutions. This was a significant institutional competitive advantage.
- Per capita funding of higher education in Ontario was the lowest among Canadian provinces. Investment in research was not expected to grow dramatically in the years ahead, and funding for the indirect costs of research remained inadequate.

Strategic Questions:

- What is the appropriate balance between undergraduate and graduate enrolment to allow the University to achieve its core missions of education and research?
- How can the University exploit its research strengths to promote an enhanced pedagogical and student life experience for its undergraduate and graduate students alike?
- Should the University advocate for differential investment in centres of excellence?

(b) **Enrolment Growth**

- The University had grown rapidly in recent years, enrolment having increased by 35% over the past ten years and by 50% over the past twenty years.

REPORT NUMBER 143 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – May 29, 2007

1. *Towards 2030: Planning for a Third Century of Excellence at the University of Toronto* (cont'd)

(b) **Enrolment Growth** (cont'd)

- Since 1997, enrolment had grown as follows: at the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM), by 4,185 students or 70%; at the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC), by 4,934 students or 96%; and at the St. George Campus, by 9,377 students or 23%.
- Since 1997, enrolment in professional masters programs had almost doubled, while doctoral enrolment had increased by 30%.
- While it was possible that some economies of scale could be realized through continued growth on the UTSC and UTM campuses, there were not obvious economies of scope or scale from further expansion of the St. George campus.
- Demand for post-secondary education was projected to intensify through 2031, particularly in the Greater Toronto Area (GTA), which would result in continued pressure on the University to grow.
- The University could play a role in meeting demand for higher education in the GTA by:
 - developing a fourth GTA campus for the University;
 - increasing enrolment on the existing campuses as much as possible;
 - partnering with outside institutions, and assisting their entry into the GTA;
 - promoting the creation of a new university in the GTA; and/or
 - limiting undergraduate enrolment, but promoting alternatives such as the movement of GTA students to universities in other parts of the Province.

Strategic Questions:

- What is the right balance between graduate and undergraduate enrolment and between domestic and international enrolment?
- What is the optimum enrolment for the University as a whole and for each of the three campuses?

(c) **University's Financial Model**

- Per-capita funding and the proportion of Gross Domestic Product (GDP) devoted to post-secondary education in Ontario was the lowest of all Canadian provinces.
- In 1991-92, the provincial grant had accounted for 76% of the University's core operating revenue, while tuition fees had accounted for 20%.
- By 2004-05, the provincial grant had accounted for just 48% of the University's revenue, while tuition fees had accounted for 37%.
- The Basic Income Unit (BIU) model of provincial funding that had begun in the 1960's was based on a weighted average of the number of students in various programs, and estimates of the costs of educating students in those programs.
- This per student funding model applied to all universities, and did not appropriately account for differences in institutional roles in research, or the differing costs and quality of academic programs.
- The model also did not offer incentives that were aligned with the University's institutional strengths and student experience-focused goals.
- Ontario B.A. tuition fees had risen from an average of \$2,925 in 1996-97 to \$4,343 in 2006-07. Recent increases had outpaced increases in the Consumer Price Index (CPI), but the trend over 30 years tracked provincial wages and salaries.
- The University was committed to accessibility and to the principle that no student should ever be forced to leave without completing his or her degree on the basis of financial need.

REPORT NUMBER 143 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – May 29, 2007

1. *Towards 2030: Planning for a Third Century of Excellence at the University of Toronto* (cont'd)

(c) University's Financial Model (cont'd)

- Student groups and others opposed rising tuition levels, but the relationship between those levels and accessibility was complex and sometimes counterintuitive. Paradoxically, higher tuition levels often translated into higher participation rates.
- The University's peer institutions in the USA had substantially higher per student funding:
- In 2004-05, the mean per-student funding of public peers of the Association of American Universities (AAU) had been \$50,630 (US) compared with the University's per-student funding of \$22,663 (US). Per-student funding at the top AAU private institutions, with whom the University also competed, in some cases exceeded \$400,000 (US).

Strategic Questions:

- Which approach to accessibility and specialization was most appropriate for the University?:
 - the University of California model (featuring two groups of universities, one with a stronger undergraduate focus and the other more academically demanding and more research-intensive);
 - the Beijing University model, with enrolment evenly split between undergraduate and graduate students, and highly differential government funding support in a pyramidal model (rather than the two-tiered California model);
 - the University of Melbourne model (on its own initiative, Melbourne was re-structuring its enrolment to focus on graduate education, including substantial expansion of professional masters' degrees).
- What alternative sources of funding should be considered by the University?
 - Tuition self-regulation with redistribution of tuition revenues into student aid to maintain access;
 - German-style competitive funding with extra support to designated research-intensive institutions based on provincial or national competitions;
 - Prioritization of expendable and capital gifts in philanthropy, together with expanded annual giving;
 - Increased revenues from commercialization of research.

(d) Other Key Issues

The President noted that the *Towards 2030* document also considered the key issues of 'Campuses, Colleges, and Affiliates' and 'Governance and Administration'. He would address these issues in his upcoming presentations to the Academic and Business Boards, as well as the Governing Council.

Timelines and Process

Phase I: Summer 2007

- Presentations to Principals and Deans, and to governance bodies including the Academic Board, the Business Board, the Executive Committee, and the Governing Council.
- Distribution in *The Bulletin* (June 12, 2007)
- Posting on University website (<http://www.towards2030.utoronto.ca/>) .
- Speeches, presentations, off-line sessions to the University community;
- Fostering of discussion and soliciting of feedback from the community.

REPORT NUMBER 143 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – May 29, 2007

1. *Towards 2030: Planning for a Third Century of Excellence at the University of Toronto* (cont'd)

Timelines and Process (cont'd)

Phase II: Fall 2007

- Establishment of standing committees and task forces, based on issues distilled from Phase I.
- Framing of issues and options.
- Public forums, including symposia, conferences, faculty council meetings, Town Halls, and special purpose lectures.
- Continuation of electronic distribution, feedback, on-line forums, and the President's blog.

Phase III: Early 2008

- Creation of synthesis document.
- Articulation of long-term directions.
- Development of recommendations to inform academic planning cycle and to guide advancement and university relations activities.

Discussion

A member asked why class sizes continued to increase even as levels of government funding increased. The President responded that inflation-adjusted funding per student had not increased adequately to allow class sizes to be reduced. Enrolment increases in response to accessibility pressure had resulted in increased revenue in recent years, but it had not been sufficient to cover increased costs.

A member asked to what degree it was intended to engage the broader external community in the *Towards 2030* dialogue. The President responded that the document would be distributed widely, and that the dialogue would be carried out selectively with key decision makers in government, the private sector and the wider community. It would be important to ensure that there was a focus on issues concerning quality, in addition to discussion of accessibility. The new budget model would be very useful for these discussions, in explaining the total costs of the institution, and the resources needed to bring about quality enhancements in academic programs and the student experience.

2. Reports of the Previous Meetings

Report Number 141 (April 17, 2007) and Report Number 142 (May 1, 2007) were approved.

3. Business Arising from the Reports of the Previous Meetings

The Chair referred to page 4 of Report Number 142, and reminded members that the proposed fee decrease for the Student Teachers' Union had been approved by the Board on the condition that the society hold a referendum in order to receive member support for the change. He reported that the Union had held the referendum, and that 94% of voters had supported the decrease in fees. There was no other business arising from the reports of the previous meetings.

4. Code of Conduct for Trademark Licensees: Annual Report

The Chair noted that this was an annual accountability report, and that the Board's responsibility was to satisfy itself that there was appropriate compliance with the *Trademark Licensing Policy*. Mr. Tad

4. Code of Conduct for Trademark Licensees: Annual Report (cont'd)

REPORT NUMBER 143 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – May 29, 2007

Brown, Counsel for the Office of Business Affairs and Division of University Advancement introduced the Report. He reminded the Board that the University had in 2000 been the first university in Canada to establish this type of policy, and that it continued to play an active leadership and outreach role, both domestically and internationally, in promoting the establishment of similar policies at other universities. The *Trademark Licensing Policy* provided rigorous systems to register and monitor trademark licensees, and to provide public disclosure of this information. It was seen as a model, and the University was frequently asked to make presentations on its policy at other institutions, including most recently in London, U.K. and Hong Kong. During the last year, the University had also led a national initiative to promote full disclosure among Canadian universities. It had continued to work closely with monitoring organizations, including during the past year in addressing the issue of how best to carry out monitoring in a global environment. He was pleased to report that there had been no complaints to report under the *Policy* during the past year.

5. Recognized Campus Groups, 2006-07: Report #2

Professor Farrar introduced this information item, the second Report of this type to be received by the Board for the 2006-07 year. The more than 400 recognized campus groups that were listed gave a sense of the impressive range of opportunities available for students to experience learning outside the classroom. In response to a question about the nature of the groups, Mr. Delaney noted that a very significant number had a focus on a particular spiritual tradition or cultural group. Others had close ties to groups or communities within the City of Toronto and Greater Toronto area. Finally, there was a large number of groups involved in recreational sports, many of which had connections with athletics programs offered through the Faculty of Physical Education and Health or Hart House.

6. Student Crisis Response Programs: Annual Report, 2005-06

Professor Farrar noted that the Student Crisis Response Program had been established by the Vice-Provost, Students in 2000 in response to a growing need at the University for preventive strategies to assist students in crisis. The Program had a mandate to help staff and faculty develop additional skills and resources to enable them to respond to students in difficulty and difficult students. Professor Farrar wished to acknowledge with thanks the work of Ms Rae Johnson who had held the position of Coordinator of Student Crisis Response Programs since its outset, and had established the office and many of its programs. She would be leaving the University at the end of the current academic year to take on a faculty position at the Santa Barbara Graduate Institute in California. Ms Johnson thanked Professor Farrar and all the colleagues in Student Affairs and Student Services with whom she had worked during her time at the University. In response to a question, she stated that the restructuring of Student Services and Student Affairs that was currently underway had the potential to allow capacity building for the student crisis response programs across the University's three campuses. Adequate resources were needed to be able to work effectively at the 'grassroots' level to identify and support students in crisis. Ms Johnson noted that a different format from previous years had been used for the 2005-06 Annual Report. In response to many questions from members of the University community following the tragic shootings that had occurred at Virginia Polytechnic Institute on April 16, 2007, it had been decided to present the report in a question-and-answer format.

REPORT NUMBER 143 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – May 29, 2007**7. Report of the Review and Advisory Committee for Hart House and the Warden of Hart House, and Administrative Response to the Report**

Professor Farrar thanked the 17 individuals who had served on the Review and Advisory Committee for Hart House and the Warden of Hart House that he had chaired. The Committee had met extensively over several months, had reviewed a great deal of information including the reports of past reviews of Hart House, and had interviewed members of the University community with connections to Hart House. As was customary at the end of the term of a unit head, a Review Report had been drafted to provide direction and recommendations to the incoming Warden. The Vice-President and Provost had provided an Administrative Response to the Report, and both documents were before the Board for members' information.

Professor Farrar wished to acknowledge the outstanding leadership provided by Ms Margaret Hancock as Warden of Hart House from 1997-2007. As the Review Report recognized, her leadership and vision, and the support of the superb staff team that she had assembled, had resulted in significant changes and improvements at the House in the past decade. A number of members expressed their thanks to Ms Hancock for her many contributions to the enrichment of student life at the University.

The Chair invited Mr. Kristofer Coward, a member of the Governing Council to address the Board. He wished to respond to Recommendation #12 in the Review Report that recommended that the University "permanently withdraw permission for firearms to be kept or used at Hart House or at any of its facilities", and to the statement in the Administrative Response to the Report that "the Vice-President, Business Affairs [had] agreed to implement Recommendation #12 as soon as possible". He considered it inconsistent that the University, at the same time that it was developing facilities such as the Centre for High Performance Sport to support international-level athletes, would take such a step that would significantly affect the ability of the Hart House Rifle and Revolver Clubs to continue to operate. Several current members of these clubs were international-level athletes. He also considered the University's decision to be inconsistent with one of the key objectives of the *Stepping Up* academic plan, namely the enhancement of the student experience, including opportunities for out-of-classroom learning. In his experience over the previous four years, these Clubs had provided unparalleled opportunities for out-of-classroom learning. Mr. Coward also disagreed with the Report's assertion that the Clubs' operation was inconsistent with the current values and mission of the University. In his view, the operation of these clubs was consistent with academic freedom and the right to examine controversial issues in a spirit of free enquiry. Finally, in his experience, the operation of these Clubs had directly supported the research activities of the University in that they organized a firearms license course that was taken by many researchers who required firearms for their fieldwork. Mr. Coward concluded by stating that the wrong decision had been made, and that he had contributed to this error by failing as an executive member of these Clubs and as an academic to adequately promote their successes and benefits. To convey this message, and to challenge the reaction that "guns are bad" he intended to begin a personal fast.

The Chair invited Mr. Courtney Gibson, an executive member of the Hart House Rifle and Revolver Clubs to address the Board. He also wished to express his concern about Recommendation #12 in the Report and the University's decision to implement it as soon as possible. In his view, the perfect safety record of the Clubs and the range, where no injuries had occurred in 88 years, had not been adequately taken into consideration in making this decision. Three key elements that had been overlooked were the stringent safeguards that were in place to protect the Clubs' firearms, the safety training that was required of Club members and range wardens, and the external reviews that were carried out by such organizations as the Ontario Provincial Police. He pointed out that the Clubs used Olympic-style target-shooting firearms that had a very different capacity for harm than military-style firearms. There was a

REPORT NUMBER 143 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – May 29, 2007**7. Report of the Review and Advisory Committee for Hart House and the Warden of Hart House, and Administrative Response to the Report (cont'd)**

culture of safety in the Clubs, with 38 instructors and 4 highly trained coaches for the more than 400 members. Some current members, including students, were highly ranked international-level athletes who had participated in the Commonwealth Games and were in training for the 2008 Olympic Games. Mr. Gibson concluded by asking the Board to intercede to prevent the University from implementing Recommendation #12 so that the Clubs could continue their current programming. If that were not possible, the Clubs wished to explore alternative programming such as the use of Olympic-style air pistol and air rifle equipment in place of traditional firearms. They requested clarification whether that would be permissible under the University's *Statement on the Bearing of Firearms*.

A member thanked the guest speakers for their comments regarding what were very difficult issues. He had great respect for the athletic achievements of members of the Clubs, and acknowledged the strict safeguards in place and the perfect safety record of the Clubs. Ultimately, however, this was an educational issue that focused on whether it was appropriate to teach members, many of whom were students, how to use firearms. In his view, it was no longer appropriate for the University to do so. Another member echoed these sentiments, stating that safety within the Clubs was not the issue; rather, it was the message communicated to the external community by the Clubs' activities. It was problematic to encourage the use of firearms in the context of rising gun violence in society.

Professor Farrar clarified that the decision made by the University had been to withdraw permission for firearms to be kept or used at Hart House. It had not decided to abolish the Rifle and Revolver Clubs, as this was a programming issue that was under the jurisdiction of the Hart House Board of Stewards. The University's decision had not been made on the basis of safety concerns as the record of the Clubs in this regard was excellent. Rather, it had been made on the basis of the current values and mission of the University, and of what were considered appropriate activities according to those values. Ms Hancock added that the Board of Stewards had received the Report and Administrative Response, and it would consider them at its next meeting on September 20, 2007. A member noted that the Clubs could still continue to exist but carry out their shooting activities at another location off campus.

8. Report of the Senior Assessor

Before inviting the Senior Assessor to make his report, the Chair expressed the gratitude of all members to Professor Farrar for the almost four and a half years of service that he had provided to the Board in this capacity. As of June 30, 2007, he would be completing more than 25 years of distinguished service to the University of Toronto as Professor of Chemistry, Chair of the Department of Chemistry, Vice-Provost (Students), and Deputy Provost to take up a new post as Vice-President, Academic and Provost at the University of British Columbia. The Chair extended best wishes on behalf of all members, and wished Professor Farrar well as he took up this important new position.

Professor Farrar thanked members for their best wishes, and stated that it had been a pleasure to serve the University as Deputy Provost and Vice-Provost, Students. It had also been a wonderful learning opportunity, and for this he wished to express his appreciation to the Board Chairs and Vice-Chairs, Board members, staff and faculty colleagues, and student leaders with whom he had been privileged to work.

Professor Farrar informed the Board that interim project planning reports for two capital projects, the Varsity Centre 2007 and the Student Commons, were currently proceeding through governance. The first involved the planning and construction of the Varsity Entrance Building

REPORT NUMBER 143 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – May 29, 2007**8. Report of the Senior Assessor (cont'd)**

and the renovations to Varsity Arena, on site 21 at 299 Bloor Street West, as well the planning and construction of the Centre for High Performance Sport on Site 12 at 100 Devonshire Place. The second involved the development of a large node of student activity space, the proposed Student Commons, also on site 12. This would be a place for students to socialize, eat, and hold events, as well as the location of offices for various student groups such as the Students' Administrative Council (SAC) and the Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students (APUS). It was expected that students would contribute to the costs of the Student Commons in the form of a levy, proposed through a referendum planned for the fall of 2007. The University had made a commitment to contribute fifty cents against each dollar raised through the levy for the capital costs of the project, consistent with contributions that had been made to student centres on the UTM and UTSC campuses. If all outstanding issues were settled and it was decided to proceed with these two major student facilities, final project planning reports would come forward to governance for approval.

The Chair clarified the following points regarding the governance process being followed for the approval of the interim project planning reports to which Professor Farrar had referred. At this initial stage, the interim reports contained no specific plans for the projects, and were coming forward for approval in principle of the capital projects, and for assignment of their sites. They had been considered by the Planning and Budget Committee on May 22, 2007, and would proceed to the Academic Board, Executive Committee and Governing Council by the end of June. When the final project planning reports were ready to come forward for approval, they would also be considered by the University Affairs Board which would advise the Governing Council on the student and campus life aspects of the plans.

9. Date of the Next Meeting

The Chair informed members that the first regular meeting of the Board for the 2007-08 governance year was tentatively scheduled for Tuesday, September 25, 2007 at 4:30 p.m.

10. Other Business

The Chair thanked the members of the Board, its assessors, and all members of the administration who had contributed to the work of the Board over the course of the previous year. He offered special thanks to those who were completing their term of service on the Board, and wished everyone a safe and enjoyable summer. There was no other business to transact in open session.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

The Board moved *in camera*.

REPORT NUMBER 143 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – May 29, 2007

In Camera Session

11. Hart House, Warden: Appointment

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT Dr. Louise Cowin be appointed as Warden, Hart House for a term beginning July 1, 2007, until June 30, 2012.

12. Elections Committee, Chair: Appointment

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT Mr. Stephen Smith be re-appointed Chair of the Elections Committee for a one-year term from July 1, 2007 to June 30, 2008.

13. Report of the Striking Committee

(a) Co-Opted Membership of the University Affairs Board for 2007-2008

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the following be appointed as co-opted members of the University Affairs Board for one-year terms from July 1, 2007 to June 30, 2008:

Colin Campbell
Kaila Folinsbee
Richard Hydal
Christopher McGrath
Rebecca Spagnolo
Tian Tian
Jonathan Tsao

(b) Discipline Appeals Board: Appointment of Members for 2007-2008

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the following be appointed to the Discipline Appeals Board for one-year terms from July 1, 2007 to June 30, 2008:

REPORT NUMBER 143 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – May 29, 2007

13. Report of the Striking Committee (cont'd)

(b) Discipline Appeals Board: Appointment of Members for 2007-2008 (cont'd)

Ken Davy
Sherwin Desser
Saswati Deb
Cheryl Shook
Farraz Siddiqui
Estefania Toledo

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

The Board returned to open session.

The meeting adjourned at 6:25 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

July 29, 2007