

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

REPORT NUMBER 155 OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD

March 6, 2008

To the Governing Council,
University of Toronto

Your Board reports that it held a meeting on Thursday, March 6, 2008 at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall at which the following were present:

Professor Michael R. Marrus (Chair)	Ms Tiffany Chow	Dr. Chris Koenig-Woodyard
Professor Brian Corman (Vice- Chair)	Mr. Aaron Christoff	Professor John R. Miron
Professor Vivek Goel, Vice- President and Provost	Dr. Christena Chruszez	Professor Faye Mishna
Professor Paul Young, Vice- President, Research	Professor Elizabeth Cowper	Ms Carole Moore
Professor S. Zaky, Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget	Professor Alister Cumming	Professor Sioban Nelson
Professor Stewart Aitchison	Mr. Ken Davy	Mr. Kaspar Ng
Professor George Baird	Professor Charles Deber	Professor Linda Northrup
Professor Clare Beghtol	Professor Miriam Diamond	Mr. Roger P. Parkinson
Professor Katherine Berg	Professor Guy Faulkner	Professor Susan Pfeiffer
Professor John W. Browne	Professor Meric Gertler	Ms Judith Poe
Professor Ragnar Buchweitz	Professor Robert Gibbs	Mr. Paul Ruppert
Mr. Ryan Matthew Campbell	Ms Bonnie Goldberg	Miss Pamela Santora
Professor Brian Cantwell Smith	Professor Avrum Gotlieb	Professor Andrea Sass-Kortsak
Mr. Mitchell Chan	Ms Pamela Gravestock	Miss Lorenza Sisca
	Ms Emily Gregor	Professor J.J. Berry Smith
	Professor Hugh Gunz	Professor Tattersall Smith
	Mrs. Bonnie Horne	Miss Maureen J. Somerville
	Miss Milka Ignjatovic	Professor Kim Strong
	Professor Ronald H. Kluger	Dr. Donald A. Wasylenki
Regrets:		
Professor Varouj Aivazian	Miss Jemy Mary Joseph	Professor Doug W. Reeve
Professor Derek Allen	Professor Gregory Jump	Professor Cheryl Regehr
Mr. Taufik Al-Sarraj	Dr. Allan S. Kaplan	Professor Jolie Ringash
Professor Cristina Amon	Mr. Alex Kenjeev	Professor Yves Roberge
Professor Christy Anderson	Professor Bruce Kidd	Dr. Wendy Rotenberg
Professor Jan Angus	Professor Hon C. Kwan	Mr. Joshua Rubin
Professor Gage Averill	Professor Audrey Laporte	Professor Anthony N. Sinclair
Professor Sylvia Bashevkin	Dr. Lesley Ann Lavack	Professor Ron Smyth
Dr. Terry Blake	Professor Robert Levit	Professor Lorne Sossin
Ms Marilyn Booth	Professor Lori Loeb	Professor Suzanne Stevenson
Professor John Coleman	Professor Rhonda Love	Dr. Robert S. Turnbull
Professor David Cook	Professor Hy Van Luong	Professor Njoki Wane
Mr. Joe Cox	Dr. Gillian MacKay	Mr. Yang Weng
Professor Luc F. De Nil	Professor Roger L. Martin	Professor Catharine Whiteside
Dr. Alice Dong	Professor Jill Matus	Dr. Cindy Woodland
Professor Dickson Eyoh	Professor Brenda Y. McCabe	Mr. Ahmed Yousif
Dr. Shari Graham Fell	Professor Douglas McDougall	
Mr. John A. Fraser	Professor Cheryl Misak	
Professor Jane Gaskell	Ms Michelle Mitrovich	
Professor Rick Halpern	Professor David Mock	
Professor Russell Hartenberger	Professor Michael Molloy	
Professor Wayne K. Hindmarsh	Professor Mayo Moran	
Professor Ellen Hodnett	Professor David Naylor	
Professor Brad Inwood	Professor Donna Orwin	
Mr. James Janeiro	Professor Janet Paterson	
Professor Yuki Mayumi Johnson		

Non-voting Assessors:	In Attendance (cont'd)	In Attendance (cont'd)
Professor Angela Hildyard, Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity	Professor Michael Escobar, Interim Chair, Department of Public Health Sciences	Mr. Henry Mulhall, Assistant Secretary of the Governing Council
Professor Edith M. Hillan, Vice-Provost, Academic	Dr. Anthony Gray, Special Advisor to the President	Ms Linda Vranic, Director, Operations, Office of the Vice-President, Research and Associate Provost
Mr. David Palmer, Vice-President, Advancement	Mr. Matthew Lafond, Committee Secretary, Office of the Governing Council	
Ms Elizabeth Sisam, Assistant Vice-President, Campus and Facilities Planning	Ms Helen Lasthiotakis, Director, Policy and Planning, Office of the Vice-President and Provost	Secretariat: Ms Mae-Yu Tan
In Attendance:		
Mr. Neil Dobbs, Deputy Secretary of the Governing Council		
Ms Sheree Drummond, Assistant Provost		

In this report, items 7, 8, 9, and 10 are recommended to the Governing Council for approval. The remaining items are reported for information.

The Chair welcomed members to the meeting. He then congratulated Professor Goel on his appointment as Founding President and Chief Executive Officer of the Ontario Agency for Health Protection and Promotion. On behalf of the Academic Board, the Chair expressed appreciation of Professor Goel's numerous contributions to the work of the Board as its senior assessor.

1. Approval of Report Number 154 of the Meeting held on January 31, 2008

Report Number 154 of the meeting held on January 31, 2008 was approved.

2. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting

There was no business arising from the Report.

3. Report Number 143 of the Agenda Committee (February 28, 2008)

The Chair stated that Report Number 143 had been circulated electronically to members on March 5th and copies had been available at the door. He noted that details of the academic administrative appointment to the Faculty of Medicine reported on page 3 would remain confidential until the beginning of April at the request of the appointee.

The Chair reminded members that, in the past, the Academic Board had approved each of the academic administrative appointments. However, given the size of the Board, it was not necessarily the appropriate forum for confidential personnel discussions to take place. As such, in February, 2006, authority for approval of the academic administrative appointments had been delegated to the Agenda Committee by the Academic Board. The Agenda Committee had recently recommended to the Executive Committee that the planned review of the amended approval process of academic administrative appointments be postponed until the next phase of the governance review had been initiated as part of the *Towards 2030* process.

4. Report from the Vice-President and Provost

Professor Goel reported on a number of matters.

(a) Interim Vice-President and Provost

Professor Goel reported that on March 4th the Governing Council had approved the appointment of Professor Cheryl Misak as Interim Vice-President and Provost, effective July 1, 2008 until June 30, 2009 or until such time as a new Provost was appointed and took office. As part of her responsibilities, Professor Misak would serve as senior assessor to the Board. She had hoped to attend the Board meeting but had been required to deal with some pressing matters.

(b) Provincial Funding

Professor Goel drew members' attention to some recent funding announcements that had been made by the Province of Ontario. Last week, the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities had announced a \$15-million investment in the Robarts Library. The funds would be used for renovations to meet student needs. Professor Goel noted that the Academic Board had approved the Project Planning Report for the Robarts Library Renewal and Expansion at its meeting of January 31st. The Board had been informed that each phase of the proposal could be completed as a discrete project as funding became available. Now that sufficient resources had been provided, work on some of the smaller projects could be initiated immediately. The momentum that would occur as a result of the renovations would likely accelerate the process of obtaining funding for the larger phase of the proposal.

Approximately four weeks ago, the Province had announced that it would provide \$200-million to colleges and universities for campus renewal projects. Of that amount, \$25.6-million would be allocated to the University of Toronto and the federated universities. The funds would be used for deferred maintenance and other areas of importance such as enhancement of campus security. The investments were most welcome, and the University looked forward to receiving further investments that might be announced as part of the upcoming provincial budget.

(c) Federal Budget

Professor Goel highlighted a few items from the federal budget released on February 26, 2008:

- The creation of 500 new Canada Graduate Scholarships to be awarded to eligible doctoral students.
- A new program to establish up to 20 Canada Global Excellence Research Chairs based on merit.
- A modest investment of \$80-million per year to the three university granting councils for research – the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR), the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council (NSERC), and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC).
- A \$15-million increase per year for the Indirect Costs of Research program which would cover slightly less than the current proportion of indirect costs for the additional \$80 million of research funds. With the formula that was used for the distribution of this funding, the University's share of the recovery of costs would decrease even further.

The provision of funds for student aid was also most welcome. With the expiration of the Canada Millennium Scholarship Foundation, which would have exhausted its funds in 2009, the majority of the funds to be provided by the Federal government would maintain the level

4. Report from the Vice-President and Provost (cont'd)

(c) Federal Budget (cont'd)

of need-based aid previously available. Further reforms to the Canada Student Loans Program and increased funding for student financial aid could perhaps be anticipated for the future.

(d) *Towards 2030*

Professor Goel informed members that the *Towards 2030* Task Forces had been extremely busy preparing their reports for submission to the President. Much interaction between the Chairs and Vice-Chairs of the five Task Forces had occurred, as many of the issues under consideration were inter-related. It was expected that upon reviewing the reports, the President would present to the University community the plan for the next phase of the exercise.

(e) Faculty of Physical Education and Health Decanal Advisory Committee

Expanding on the Chair's earlier comments on the need for confidentiality when considering academic administrative appointments, Professor Goel emphasized that such discussions must be held in absolute confidence. Members of advisory and search committees required assurance of the confidentiality of comments made, and candidates who were considered also required such assurances. The *Search Committee Principles and Practices*¹, developed a few years ago, outlined best practices by which committee members agreed to abide.

Professor Goel stated that, due to a serious breach of confidentiality, he had recommended to the President that he dissolve the Faculty of Physical Education and Health Decanal Advisory Committee. A written warning had been issued in January to committee members by Professor Goel after suggestions that there had been a breach of confidentiality. More recently when it became clear that there had been a serious breach of confidentiality, the unfortunate step of dissolving the Committee had been taken. The next steps in the process to appoint a Dean would be taken in the coming weeks, including the appointment of a new advisory committee at an appropriate time. A memo informing the community about the matter had been issued and was available on the website of the Office of the Vice-President and Provost.

5. *Performance Indicators for Governance Annual Report for 2007*

Professor Goel noted that this was the tenth annual *Performance Indicators Report* that had been presented to the Governing Council. Over the last few years, some of the highlights of the Report had been presented for information to the Board. Professor Goel informed members that aspects of the University's work on the Report had been adopted by other institutions for their reporting frameworks. The University had taken a leadership role, influencing the Multi-Year Agreements used by the Province of Ontario, work by the Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario, and even some media that reported on the quality of higher education.

The University continually strove to improve the Report. For 2007 there had been a continued emphasis on identifying metrics that measured the quality of the University's performance rather than simply measuring the volume of activity. There had also been a move towards focusing on process and outcome measures and measures of student/faculty/staff experience and teaching.

By means of a Powerpoint presentation, Professor Goel presented the highlights of the *Performance Indicators Report*.

¹ <http://www.provost.utoronto.ca/policy/searches.htm>
40816

5. *Performance Indicators for Governance Annual Report for 2007* (cont'd)

Institutional Mission Measures

Student Entering Grade Averages

One measure used to assess the overall quality of the University's students was their entering grade averages. Across the three campuses and programs, the entering grade averages of students had remained stable over time, despite the significant change in the number of applicants and growth in the system.

Student Entrance and Exit Awards

A new measure of undergraduate student entrance and exit awards had been added for this year's report. Of some of the entrance awards given to Canadian universities, University of Toronto (U of T) students had received 11% of the TD Scholarships and 7% of the Millennium Excellence Awards. As well, U of T students had been recipients of 38% of the Knox Fellowships, a merit-based, exit award. Over a 35-year period, 32% of the Rhodes Scholarships recipients from Ontario had been from U of T.

Faculty Awards

Recently, improved methods of identifying faculty for nomination of awards had been developed. In 2007, 100 Leadership in Faculty Teaching (LIFT) Awards had been presented by the Province of Ontario. Of those given to universities, 21% had been awarded to U of T faculty. Given that U of T faculty represented approximately only 14% of the faculty in the Province of Ontario, the LIFT results emphasized the quality and excellence of teaching that existed at the University. Leadership and resources were required in order to submit nominations, and Professor Goel thanked Ms Pamela Gravestock, Associate Director, Office of Teaching Advancement, for developing a profile of teaching award programs and for her contributions in assisting nominators to prepare application packages for submission.

Scholarly Output

Professor Goel stated that, in past years, many had commented on the lack of measures for scholarly output in the humanities and social sciences fields, where the book was the main form of scholarly output. In the sciences, one could examine the citation counts of articles, but in the humanities and social sciences, there was no analogous measure. In an effort to redress this issue, a few years ago, Professor Misak, while Dean, University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM), had struck a committee to examine the matter. Comprised of four humanities departmental Chairs (including Professor Corman, Vice-Chair of the Academic Board), the committee had prepared a comprehensive report on potential research measures for the humanities. Publication and reviews of books and the placement of graduate students were some of the options that had been generated by the committee. Over the last year, the University had been conducting pilot studies using measures of research output for the Departments of English and Philosophy. However, in order to make greater progress, comparisons from other Canadian peer departments were needed. The G13 group of Canadian research intensive Universities was now considering working with the University to replicate the study in their own institutions and develop needed bibliographic tools. There was significant interest in this project from members of the American Association of Universities (AAU) as well. This was another example of ways in which the University was continuing to take a leadership role in higher education accountability issues.

Priority Objectives

Student-Faculty Ratios

Professor Goel reported that the University's student-faculty ratio was relatively high in comparison with other Canadian, research-intensive universities. Importantly, however, he noted that with various student definitions (e.g. full-time or part-time) and faculty inclusions that were possible (e.g. full-time, part-time, faculty with graduate appointments, etc.) the student-faculty

5. *Performance Indicators for Governance Annual Report for 2007* (cont'd)

Priority Objectives (cont'd)

Student-Faculty Ratios (cont'd)

ratio could actually range from 6.7 to 37.2 depending on the definition used. For this reason, it was particularly important to understand the data employed in generating such ratios at various institutions and in reports from the media.

Class Size Experience

Professor Goel referred to a question of the University's average class size that had been raised by a member at the Governing Council meeting on March 4th. Professor Goel pointed out that the average did not reflect an accurate assessment of the class size experience of undergraduate students due to the varying sizes of some courses. Some classes were very large and others were very small. For that reason, the average did not allow for comprehensive analysis of student class-size experience across institutions.

An examination of the class-size experience for undergraduate first-year courses on the St. George campus from 2001 to 2006 had revealed that the proportion of class-size experience with more than 200 students had grown from 46% in 2001 to 53% in 2006. In comparison, at least four out of five of the fourth-year classes had enrolments of 50 students or less. Professor Goel commented that despite budget difficulties, the Faculty of Arts and Science had been able to increase the proportion of students who had small class-size experiences in first year. The University would need to consider carefully whether there was an appropriate goal for class-size experience in the future.

Interdisciplinary Collaborations

One of the priorities articulated in the *Stepping Up* academic plan had been to foster and support interdisciplinary research and teaching. U of T student responses from the Canadian Graduate and Professional Student Survey (CGPSS) demonstrated that a large number of graduate students perceived their programs to provide opportunities for them to engage in interdisciplinary research work. As well, faculty responses on the *University of Toronto Faculty and Staff Experience Survey (Speaking UP)* had indicated that faculty agreed they had opportunities to collaborate.

Library

In 2007, measures of the University's library resources and usage had been expanded with the addition of the LibQUAL survey. That survey, which was based on best practices in assessing customer satisfaction, had been valuable in providing a sense of the University's performance relative to the users' expectations. One interesting observation was that U of T library users tended to have higher levels of expectations for service.

The Chair thanked Professor Goel for his presentation, noting that much effort and substantial resources had been expended in the production of this valuable Report.

Discussion

Among the matters that arose in questions and discussion were the following.

a) **Next Steps**

Members expressed their appreciation of the *Performance Indicators Report*, stating that they were pleased with the movement towards the use of outcome measures. A member asked whether the indicators allowed an assessment of the next steps that should be taken to build on the University's efforts. Professor Goel replied that over the past several years, the indicators had

5. *Performance Indicators for Governance Annual Report for 2007* (cont'd)

Discussion (cont'd)

a) **Next Steps** (cont'd)

been aligned with the University's planned objectives as articulated in the University's academic plan, and there were indicators that would assist in identifying areas that would require further work. He added that James Downing, the President of the Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario, had commented that the University's Report was very honest. The University was careful to balance the messages it communicated in its reports while ensuring that its excellence was retained.

b) **Class Size**

A member stated his observation that the size of large classes at the University had grown over the years, and it was more difficult for committed faculty to get to know their students when their class size was very large. Another member commented that, as an instructor of a large class held in Convocation Hall, he believed that students could benefit from taking a course with a large class size. Although an instructor could not get to know individual students in a class of 1,500, with the appropriate course organization and provision of support through teaching assistants and group leaders, the course could be effective. Using the example of a large, first-year life science course, the member noted that many more faculty would be needed to teach the same material in order to offer such a course in a smaller class size.

c) **Per-Student Funding**

A member referred to the table on page 23 of the *Performance Indicators Summary* that demonstrated that the University's revenue per student was significantly lower than the mean revenue per student of its Association of American Universities (AAU) peers. According to his calculations, that represented a difference of approximately \$1.5-billion. How could the University compete with other institutions given such a difference in per-student funding? Professor Goel acknowledged the disparity, commenting that it would be difficult to reduce class size without an increase in per-student funding. He suggested that in working towards ensuring that students had particular experiences at U of T, the University would need to set its goals accordingly in the next planning phase. Those goals might include such objectives as ensuring that each student had an opportunity to get to know a faculty member, or that each student experienced a small class size in their first year.

The Chair added that the *Towards 2030* Task Force on Governance had been discussing the significance of encouraging genuine deliberation within the Governing Council and its Boards and Committees, while limiting the more mechanical aspects of governance approvals. The generation and implementation of appropriate solutions, such as institutional goal setting, would be managed in the next phase of the *Towards 2030* process.

6. **Annual Report of the Vice-President, Research for 2006-2007**

Professor Young informed members that the format of the Annual Report had been altered somewhat this year. In previous reports, features of researchers had been interspersed with informative data. In this Report, the two groupings had been separated, resulting in two parts: *By the Numbers*, which provided statistical information about the University's research activities, and *In Profile*, which highlighted distinguished scholars at the University. The new format would be particularly beneficial, given the wider circulation of the Annual Report that was planned for advocacy purposes.

6. Annual Report of the Vice-President, Research for 2006-2007 (cont'd)

Professor Young presented the highlights of the Annual Report.

By the Numbers

Global Research and Productivity

Professor Young stated that the University possessed great strength in global networking capability; 43% of the University's research involved collaboration with researchers outside of Canada. He also noted that the productivity of U of T researchers could be assessed through the use of output measures as well as by the citation count per faculty. In comparison with universities worldwide, U of T produced the third-greatest number of publications, and in comparison with other Canadian universities it produced the greatest number. U of T scholars were some of the most highly cited researchers nationally; however an assessment of all disciplines was not currently covered. It was hoped that in future years suitable measures of book publications could be used.

Funding

The University had been consistently successful in attracting investments from federal and provincial granting agencies. The innovative work being conducted with respect to the creation of spin-off companies and technology-transfer projects was being extremely well received nationally and internationally. Industry partners invested in research across all disciplines at the University, providing approximately 10% of the total research income. The affiliation agreement with the ten partner hospitals was an arrangement unique to the University that resulted in one of the world's largest and most innovative health research forces. Over the years, the Connaught Fund had enabled the University to provide internal funding for research areas of particular importance, regardless of other external priorities. The Fund had been used for a variety of programs such as matching grants and providing start-up grants for faculty.

Professor Young emphasized that University faculty were the recipients of numerous awards and honours, and he presented a slide that listed a selection of the awards granted over the past five years.

In Profile

The *In Profile* publication focused on people and the University's excellence in research. Short features highlighted key innovations and some of the significant questions that were posed by University faculty such as "How do we define ourselves?" and "How did our universe begin?" Some of the researchers for tomorrow were also presented, including Wojciech Gryc, a U of T graduate who had recently received a 2008 Rhodes scholarship.

Going Forward:

Professor Young outlined some of the initial priorities that the Research Office would focus on in the coming year. The University hoped to increase the number of awards and honours given to its faculty, as it possessed excellent faculty who had already conducted outstanding research. The slight increase in effort and resources needed to generate competitive applications would be most worthwhile if it resulted in greater research funding for faculty. Collaboration and coordination across University divisions would strengthen applications for some of the larger awards, and there was no limit to the number of international awards that U of T faculty could win.

\$400M was to be awarded for infrastructure in the Fall 2008 Canada Foundation for Innovation (CFI) competition which would leverage \$1 billion, and the University intended to intensify its efforts in working with principal investigators to submit successful CFI proposals. In previous competitions the University had done significantly better than in the last competition. The new infrastructure fund was highlighted where the university only won 7% of its ask. The Research

6. Annual Report of the Vice-President, Research for 2006-2007 (cont'd)

Going Forward (cont'd)

Office had launched a new CFI Toolbox designed to assist researchers in creating excellent applications for this current competition with plans for increased peer review prior to submission.

As part of the Science and Technology Strategy, the Research Office had been examining priority research areas identified by the government and conducting some research mining. The University possessed great strength in breadth and depth of research. By reviewing the topics on the priority area provincial and federal list, the Research Office could then work towards identifying University faculty conducting research on those topics and create inventories for researchers to aid networking and convergence. By producing research theme (eg. Digital Media, Environment, etc.) inventories for the University, faculty could better connect within and across campuses. Then if faculty applied for funding opportunities that were tied to the government's Science and Technology Strategy, the University would be better-positioned to form strategic partnerships within and outside of the University.

The Research Office would be developing a new Research website as part of its advocacy function, as well as a celebration of the work being conducted at the University. The website would provide a unique conduit to the University's research excellence. Users would be able to view information on research being conducted by entering the site through topics such as arts and culture, science and technology, health, business, environment, etc. The website would be interactive, informative, and celebratory, working in harmony with the new Research Report to add value for our researchers and partners.

Discussion

The Chair asked what the timeframe was for the launching of the new website. Professor Young replied that his Office hoped to have the initial version ready in April.

A member commented that the objective of increasing the recovery of indirect costs of research from 20% to 40% had not been mentioned as a priority of the Research Office. In response, Professor Young stated that the short-term objectives of his portfolio had been presented. He noted that it was the University's intent to fully assess all costs of research in order to strengthen its advocacy efforts. The new budget model was a powerful tool that would allow the administration to examine every aspect of the true indirect costs of research, which was actually closer to 50% than 20%. Professor Goel added that Ms Judith Wolfson, Vice-President, University Relations, had primary responsibility for all government advocacy. The role of the Research Office was to ensure that the needed information was made available to assist with that process. While advocacy for the recovery of the indirect costs of research was one of the University's top priorities with respect to the Federal Government, it was also necessary for the University to expend its efforts in areas where it was most likely to be successful. For example, the President and Ms Wolfson, along with colleagues from other institutions, had focused on and experienced some success in advocating for increased graduate scholarships.

A member expressed support for the Research Office's goal of increasing the number of awards and honours received by U of T faculty. In his opinion, if the departments were supportive of that effort, it would be successful.

A member asked whether the Research Office would monitor the success rate of proposals submitted to the various granting councils. Professor Young stated that that information had been collected and had been provided for some purposes already but would be circulated to all Deans shortly.

7. *Collections Policy*

The Chair informed members that the *Collections Policy* was the final research policy to be considered since the general review of such policies had begun in 2006.

Professor Sass-Kortsak said that the University had assembled many valuable collections in the course of research and teaching. The proposed *Policy* set out very general principles about how the University would acquire, manage, and (where appropriate) dispose of collections. It required that decisions be made in accordance with legal requirements, ethical principles, the University's stewardship role, and the highest academic standards, but all in a manner that deployed the University's resources in a responsible manner. The proposed *Policy* required that collections be specifically named or accessioned and that an inventory be maintained. It also stipulated that an administrator (normally the head of the academic unit) be designated for each collection. The administrator was required to name a specific monitor for each collection, and the Vice-President and Provost, and the Vice-President, Research, were empowered to issue more specific regulations for the management of collections.

A member expressed his surprise at learning that there were currently no requirements for analysis of the financial implications of maintaining the collections. What were the benefits or burden to the University if a collection were approved for accession or if it had to be dispersed? Professor Goel replied that, in the past, the University had often become the custodian of collections that had been "owned" by any one faculty member, and the associated costs, such as management or security costs, then had to be borne by the faculty housing the collection. For this reason, the purpose of the *Policy* was to indicate that the administrator of a collection must be identified before the collection would be accepted. It was necessary for a Principal or a Dean to ensure that responsibility for the collection was assigned and to support it.

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the proposed Collections Policy, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "A", be approved.

8. **School of Public Health – Extra-Departmental Unit A (EDU:A) – Establishment**

The Chair explained that the proposal for the establishment of a School of Public Health had been considered by the Planning and Budget Committee (P&B) on February 27, 2008. The proposal would be considered for approval by the Governing Council on April 10, 2008, on the recommendation of the Academic Board.

Professor Gottlieb stated that the proposal was for the creation of a School of Public Health to support academic public health activity at the University, coordinated across several units. As an Extra-Departmental Unit A (EDU:A), the School would have its own budget and authority to administer research grants. It would also have the authority to offer academic programs, enroll students, and make primary faculty appointments. The existing Department of Public Health Sciences would provide the core faculty membership, education, research programs, and administrative structure for the School, and the Director of the School would report to the Vice-President and Provost or designate. All revenues and costs associated with the School would be included in the budget of the Faculty of Medicine and subject to its budgetary procedures, and all administrative staff matters would be dealt with through the Faculty's human resources functions.

Invited by the Chair to comment, Professor Michael Escobar, Interim Chair of the Department of Public Health Sciences, stated that a School of Hygiene had been established at the University in 1925 with the support of the Rockefeller Foundation. In 1975, programs from the School had

8. School of Public Health – Extra-Departmental Unit A (EDU:A) – Establishment (cont'd)

merged with departments in the Faculty of Medicine to create a Community Health Sector. With the current level of public health activity, it was now time to establish a School of Public Health.

A member commented that when the School of Hygiene had been disbanded, the laboratory scientists who had been working there had become part of the Microbiology Department as well as other units. Would laboratory scientists be accommodated in the proposed School? Professor Escobar replied that the School would have many internal and external partners including other health science faculties and clinical and basic science departments within Medicine, other University Divisions, hospitals, research institutes and public health agencies locally, provincially and nationally. It was intended that the School would be a nexus of activity but not necessarily replicate all such activity.

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the School of Public Health be established as an Extra-Departmental Unit A (EDU:A) teaching and research entity, effective immediately.

Documentation is attached hereto as Appendix “B”.

9. Capital Project: Project Planning Report – University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM) South Building Master Plan

The Chair said that the Project Planning Report – University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM) South Building Master Plan had been considered by P&B on February 27, 2008. The proposal would be considered for approval by the Governing Council on April 10, 2008, on the recommendation of the Academic Board.

Professor Gottlieb stated that the Planning and Budget Committee had strongly supported the proposal. He explained that since 2000/01, enrolment at UTM had increased approximately 71%, creating pressure on campus infrastructure. In that time, five new buildings had been constructed at UTM, and some of those had had a significant impact on the use of the South Building, which was the busiest pedestrian area on campus. The proposal, which would proceed in phases, would allow the consolidation and expansion of UTM's student services, the creation of a Student Plaza, and additional space necessary for academic and administrative departments.

Phase 1 of the proposal, for which approval was sought, had an estimated total project cost of \$10.057-million, with \$3.5-million in a cash contribution from the UTM operating budget, and \$6.557-million through borrowing to be repaid from the UTM operating budget. Additional phases would be brought forward to governance for further approvals as required.

There were no questions.

9. Capital Project: Project Planning Report – University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM) South Building Master Plan (cont'd)

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

1. THAT the Project Planning Report for the South Building Master Plan, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix “C”, be approved in principle.
2. THAT Phase One of the South Building Master Plan, approximately 1906 net assignable square meters (3270 gross square meters), having a total estimated project cost of \$10,057,000 be approved.
3. THAT the \$10,057,000 funding required for Phase One of the South Building Master Plan comprise:
 - \$3,500,000 cash contribution from the University of Toronto at Mississauga operating budget.
 - \$6,557,000 through borrowing paid from the University of Toronto at Mississauga operating budget.
4. THAT the interim planning report for Phases Two and Three and the Completion of the Student Plaza be approved in principle.
5. That the component parts of Phases Two and Three and the Completion of the Student Plaza be brought forward for further approvals through the Accommodations and Facilities Directorate for components valued at less than \$2 million and to the Governing Council for those exceeding \$2 million in accordance with the *Policy on Capital Planning and Capital Projects*.

10. Budget Report, 2008-09

The Chair said that the Budget Report, 2008-09 had also been considered by P&B on February 27, 2008. The proposal would be considered for approval by the Governing Council on April 10, 2008, on the recommendation of the Academic Board.

By means of a Powerpoint presentation, Professor Goel highlighted the following key points of the Budget Report, 2008-09.

Objectives of the New Budget Model

- The goal of the new budget model was to provide increased transparency and to ensure that academic priorities drove budgetary allocations.
- The types of information made available from the new budget model facilitated the examination of expenses such as the institutional costs of research.
- The model provided incentives for divisions to obtain new revenue and to control expenses at the central and divisional level.

Methodology

- A divisions' net revenue was based on its share of the University's gross revenue less its share of expenses and its contribution to student aid and to the University Fund.
- All of the revenue received by the University was assigned to divisions; most revenue was tied to specific educational programs.

10. Budget Report, 2008-09 (cont'd)**Methodology (cont'd)**

- The University Fund allowed for the reallocation of funds based on the University's academic priorities.
 - The initial University Fund allocation gave each division at least the same funding it would have received under the old budget model; that historical amount was captured in the "Reference Level".
- Occupancy costs for divisional space accounted for a large proportion of the amount of shared university expenses charged to a division's revenue.

Budget Review Processes

- New processes for comprehensive academic budget reviews had been created, allowing for budgets to be reviewed centrally on a multi-year basis.
- Service units also prepared multi-year strategic and budget plans that were informed by the needs of the academic divisions.
 - The University-wide division budgets were reviewed by the Budget Planning and Priorities Committee, which had been established by the President and featured decanal leadership.

Proposed Rolling Window Approach

- The University had been using a fixed, six-year budget planning cycle, which had been somewhat inflexible.
- In the past, large deficits had been introduced in the early years of a cycle, and on occasion new cycles had been started prior to the completion of the previous cycle in order to delay possible severe expense containment at the end of a cycle.
- A rolling five-year budget cycle with a balanced budget at the end of each cycle was proposed in the new model.
- The accumulated deficit would be fully paid down by the end of the five-year cycle through one-time-only payments.
- The proposed approach would assist the Business Board, which had responsibility for the long-range framework, to better monitor the University's circumstances.
- Such an approach would also allow for end-of-year variances to be appropriately dealt with, without necessarily adding to the University's accumulated deficit.
- In exceptional circumstances, the University might absorb large variances over several years, while ensuring that there was no accumulated deficit at the end of the planning cycle.

Context

- The University had been receiving a low level of per-student government funding over a number of years; no assumptions of increases in government funding for the future had been made.
- For decades, the University's revenue growth had been less than its expense growth, but that situation had been partially masked by enrolment growth, deficit budgets, and new sources of revenue.
- The *Towards 2030* Task Force on University Resources had been examining the University's resources and was contemplating various options for the future.
- While the University's situation had not fundamentally changed, the new budget model would make the issues it faced more transparent.
- One of the revenue assumptions had been the need for tuition fee increases, particularly since tuition fees together with provincial government grants provided a major proportion of the University's operating revenue.

10. Budget Report, 2008-09 (cont'd)

Context (cont'd)

- As the overall growth in University-wide expenses would be constrained to be less than the growth in revenues, significant cost-containment would be required for all administrative divisions as well as the academic divisions.
- The majority of the revenue (72%) was allocated to the academic divisions, with items such as occupancy cost, shared services, and library costs comprising the other major expenditures.
- It was critical for the University to repay the accumulated deficit and return to a balanced state in order to move forward.

The Chair thanked Professor Goel for his presentation.

Professor Gotlieb stated that the P&B Committee had had a thorough discussion, and it had fully supported the Budget. Members of the Board were invited to review the draft excerpt from the P&B Report that had been made available at the door.

Discussion

A member referred to the planning assumptions for 2008-2013, noting that expenditures on student aid were estimated to rise by \$4.3-million in 2008-09 and by an average of \$2-million a year after that. According to his rough calculations, despite the proposed increase in tuition fees in the coming year, the proportion to be allocated for student aid would decrease in comparison with the past year. In his opinion, it would be preferable to ensure that sufficient funds would be allocated to student aid. Professor Goel responded that sufficient funds would be allocated as necessary to student aid and that these were assumptions for planning purposes only. The University would continue to honour the access guarantee under its policy requirements and the provincial requirements. He noted, however, that with the enhancements to provincial needs-based funding and the proposed Federal government investments, the University would not need as large increases to this budget line. The University had traditionally invested a far greater proportion of its operating budget towards student aid than other institutions. The renewed government investments in this area allowed for the reduced rate of growth that was forecast.

A member asked whether the new budget model would allow for differences in funding between academic divisions to be addressed if it were found that the historical Reference Level had been incorrect. Professor Goel confirmed that the arrangement was not to try to revisit all past decisions and that it was not possible to determine whether the decisions that had led to the distribution of resources under the old model were correct or not. However, the information from the new budget model could be used to inform future allocation decisions for the University Fund as well as allocation of other special funds. He cautioned that it would take time to make distributional changes since allocations to other units would be affected. In future years, P&B and the Academic Board would be much more informed when reviewing the divisional allocations of the University Fund.

A member asked what had prompted the decision to reduce the accumulated deficit to 0% in such a short timeframe. Professor Goel replied that that decision had been made one year ago under the previous six-year plan, thus bringing it to zero in five years simply continued the process. Under the fixed-cycle approach, there had been a requirement to contain the accumulated deficit to a maximum of 1.5% of the operating budget by the end of the planning period. However, that had resulted in the University essentially financing its deficit from the operating budget, rather than allocating those funds for other purposes. As noted, the plan was to reduce the deficit to 0% by the end of the five-year cycle with annual payments of \$11-million. If the University was carrying a large deficit and was then faced with an equally large negative variance in a single year, the size of the deficit would become unmanageable. Over the last few years, the deficit had

10. Budget Report, 2008-09 (cont'd)**Discussion** (cont'd)

started to approach that level and the appropriate course of action was to put the University back on to a sound financial footing. Professor Goel recognized that this would have a significant additional impact on operations, given the constrained growth in revenue, but an unanticipated variance would likely be much more difficult to deal with.

A member stated that, to his understanding, there would be significant changes in central administrative portfolios. If that were the case, would the impact of those changes, particularly any costs that would be transferred to the divisions, be communicated? Professor Goel stated that, in the budget, the amount of the University management cost bins would essentially remain steady. He reiterated that a committee composed of central and divisional membership would review multi-year plans for administrative units and it would ensure that the needs of academic divisions were suitably represented in the decisions.

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

1. THAT the 2008-09 Budget be approved; and
2. THAT the Long Range Budget Guidelines for 2008-2013 and the Planning Assumptions for 2008-2013 be approved in principle.

Documentation is attached hereto as Appendix "D".

11. Items for Information

- (a) **Selection Committee for President's Teaching Award**
- (b) **Selection Committee for University Professors**

Members received the membership of the two selection committees for information. No questions were raised.

- (c) **Report Number 123 of the Planning and Budget Committee** (February 27, 2008)

The Chair noted that the draft excerpts from Report Number 123 of the Planning and Budget Committee had been available at the door. There were no questions.

- (d) **Status Changes and Appointments of Professors Emeriti**

The Chair stated that documentation had been included in the agenda package. There were no questions.

12. Date of Next Meeting

The Chair reminded members that the date of the next meeting was Thursday, April 24, 2008, at 4:10 p.m.

13. Other Business

There were no items of Other Business.

14. Quarterly Report on Donations - November 1, 2007 – January 31, 2008

Members received this report for information. There were no questions.

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

Secretary

March 17, 2008

Chair