

**UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO**  
**THE GOVERNING COUNCIL**

**Thursday, February 1, 2007**

MINUTES OF THE GOVERNING COUNCIL meeting held on Thursday, February 1, 2007 at 4:30 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall.

**Present:**

Ms Rose M. Patten, (Chair)  
Mr. John F. (Jack) Petch, (Vice-Chair)  
The Honourable David R. Peterson, Chancellor  
Professor C. David Naylor, President  
Professor Varouj Aivazian  
Ms Diana A. R. Alli  
Mr. P.C. Choo  
Professor Brian Corman  
Mr. Kristofer T. Coward  
Dr. Claude S. Davis  
Miss Saswati Deb  
Dr. Alice Dong  
Miss Coralie D'Souza  
Ms Susan Eng  
Professor Jonathan Freedman  
Professor Vivek Goel  
Mr. Robin Goodfellow  
Dr. Gerald Halbert  
Professor Ellen Hodnett  
Professor Glen A. Jones  
Dr. Joel A. Kirsh  
Professor Louise Lemieux-Charles  
Mr. Joseph Mapa

Professor Michael R. Marrus  
Mr. Geoffrey Matus  
Ms Florence Minz  
Mr. George E. Myhal  
Mr. Richard Nunn  
Mr. Tim Reid  
Ms Marvi H. Ricker  
Professor Arthur S. Ripstein  
Professor Barbara Sherwood Lollar  
Mr. Stephen C. Smith  
Miss Maureen J. Somerville  
Ms B. Elizabeth Vosburgh  
Professor John Wedge  
Mr. Robert S. Weiss

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

**Secretariat:**

Mr. Henry Mulhall  
Ms Mae-Yu Tan

**Absent:**

Mr. John M. Badowski  
Mr. Terry Buckland  
The Honourable William G. Davis  
Dr. Shari Graham Fell  
Professor William Gough

Ms Jacqueline C. Orange  
Ms Estefania Toledo  
Ms Johanna L. Weststar  
Mr. W. David Wilson  
Mr. Patrick Wong

**In Attendance:**

Dr. John R. G. Challis, Vice-President, Research and Associate Provost  
Professor Angela Hildyard, Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity  
Ms Cathy Riggall, Vice-President, Business Affairs  
Ms Susan Addario, Director, Student Affairs  
Mr. Neil Dobbs, Deputy Secretary, Office of the Governing Council  
Ms Sheree Drummond, Assistant Provost  
Professor David Farrar, Deputy Provost and Vice-Provost, Students  
Professor Edith Hillan, Vice-Provost, Academic  
Professor Charlie Keil, Director, Cinema Studies Program  
Dr. Jeanne Li, Special Assistant to the Vice-President, Business Affairs  
Ms Bryn Macpherson-White, Director, Office of the President and University Events

**In Attendance** (cont'd)

Mr. Steve Moate, Senior Legal Counsel  
Ms Ruth Perkins, Executive Assistant, Graduate Students' Union  
Ms Elizabeth Sisam, Assistant Vice-President, Space and Facilities Planning  
Mr. Guillaume Thibault, Treasurer, Graduate Students' Union  
Ms Linda Vranic, Director, Operations, Office of the Vice-President, Research and Associate Provost  
Professor Catharine Whiteside, Vice-Provost, Relations with Healthcare Institutions, Dean, Faculty of Medicine  
Ms Mary-Ellen Yeomans, Assistant Dean, Administration and Chief Administrative Officer, Rotman School of Management  
Professor Safwat Zaky, Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget

IN ACCORDANCE WITH A DETERMINATION BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE PURSUANT TO SECTIONS 38 AND 40 OF BY-LAW NUMBER 2, ITEM 1 WAS CONSIDERED BY THE GOVERNING COUNCIL *IN CAMERA*.

The Chair announced that members had been provided with a revised agenda that had been sent electronically on January 29th. Copies had also been placed on the table.

**1. Senior Appointments**

**(a) Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget**

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was Resolved

THAT the term of Professor Safwat Zaky as Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget be extended for two years from July 1, 2007 to June 30, 2009.

**(b) Assistant Vice-President, Government, Institutional and Community Relations**

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was Resolved

(i) THAT the position of Assistant Vice-President, Government, Institutional and Community Relations be established.

(ii) THAT Mr. Daniel Atlin be appointed to the position of Assistant Vice-President, Government, Institutional and Community Relations, effective March 12, 2007 or as soon as possible thereafter.

The President briefed the Council on nominees who had declined honorary degrees.

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL MOVED INTO OPEN SESSION.

**2. Chair's Remarks**

**(a) Welcome**

The Chair welcomed members and guests to the meeting.

**2. Chair's Remarks (cont'd)****(b) Audio Web-cast**

The Chair reminded members that the meeting was being broadcast on the web, and that private conversations might be picked up and broadcast. She asked all members, senior administrators, and guests who were invited to speak during the meeting to use a microphone, so that their comments could be heard by those listening to the audio web-cast.

**(c) Resolutions Approved by Council During the *in camera* Session**

The Chair announced that during the *in camera* session at the beginning of the meeting, the Council had approved the recommendation that the term of Professor Safwat Zaky as Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget be extended for two years from July 1, 2007 to June 30, 2009. Professor Zaky was in attendance and was congratulated on his appointment.

**(d) Governing Council Election Candidates**

Mr. Charpentier reported that the elections for Governing Council and Academic Board positions were underway. Nominations had opened some time ago, and had recently closed. All of the candidates had been confirmed by the Chief Returning Officer. Two current governors had been acclaimed and would be returning to serve on Governing Council for another term – Professor Joel Kirsh and Ms Estefania Toledo. Professor Kirsh was in attendance and was congratulated.

**3. Minutes of the Previous Meeting of December 14, 2006**

The minutes of the meeting of December 14, 2006 were approved.

**4. Business Arising from the Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

There was no business arising from the previous meeting.

**5. Report of the President****(a) Report on Honorary Degrees**

The President was pleased to report that the following persons had accepted an offer to receive an honorary degree at convocation from the University of Toronto:

Bruce M. Alberts	Professor in the Department of Biochemistry & Biophysics at the University of California, San Francisco
Robert M. Bateman	Noted Canadian artist, naturalist and conservationist
David Campbell	Canadian entrepreneur, and generous supporter of the University of Toronto and a variety of community causes and institutions
Jane Goodall	Scientific authority on primate behaviour, conservationist and environmental activist
Tomson Highway	Renowned Canadian author and playwright; contributor to the development of Aboriginal theatre and literature
Michael Lee-Chin	Canadian entrepreneur; a bridge-builder between Canada and the Caribbean, and a generous supporter of community causes and public institutions in Canada, including the University of Toronto

**5. Report of the President (cont'd)****(a) Report on Honorary Degrees (cont'd)**

G. Wallace F. McCain	Leading Canadian industrialist and supporter of the University, the arts and academic healthcare
Judea Pearl	Professor of Computer Science at the University of California at Los Angeles and founder of the Daniel Pearl Foundation
Sandra Rotman	Outstanding volunteer to the University and the wider community
Lee S. Shulman	President of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching
Verna Huffman Splane	Advocate for enhancing nursing roles and nursing leadership
Bette M. Stephenson	Exceptional exemplar of female leadership in the fields of health care, education and public service
Barbara Sue Turnbull	Leading advocate for neuroscience research and the rights of the disabled

The President commented that each of the honorary degree nominees had valuable perspectives to share with the graduands and that he was looking forward to their convocation ceremonies.

**(b) Provincial Government Relations**

The President reported that the Provincial government was preparing for a fall election. It was also moving towards the fiscal year end and a spring budget. The Government was highlighting that revenues had softened. As such, stakeholders would likely have fewer expectations for receiving funds at year end or in the upcoming budget. At the same time, the University had learned that the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities had not allocated all of its funds, and thus there was some opportunity for both one-time and base commitments to be made that would enhance program quality. The University was encouraged by the fact that the Ministry had confirmed that funds previously earmarked for quality enhancement would not be redirected to meet accessibility demands created by unanticipated growth in undergraduate enrolments at institutions that had chosen to add undergraduate students beyond agreed financial envelopes. The preservation of funds for quality enhancement was helpful, as the University had managed its enrolments and had focused on academic standards and intake. It was possible, however, that pressure would continue to build on the Provincial government to relieve enrolment and access issues.

The availability of year-end and base unallocated funds afforded an opportunity for the University. The administration had spent much time determining which projects could be advanced to the Government as beneficial to the academic mission of the University and were working to advocate for those projects. The University remained very interested in learning what proportion of the Quality funding envelope would be available to the University as well as to other institutions. In general, the University's focal point for advocacy was on quality enhancement.

The Ministry for Research and Innovation (MRI) had released its draft strategic plan. Premier Dalton McGuinty was the Minister for Research and Innovation. The Ontario Council for University Research had developed a response to the strategic plan on behalf of the Council of Ontario Universities (COU), and the University was working actively on preparing its own institutional response. The University was encouraged that the MRI had focused on excellence as a key criterion in the allocation of funds for research. The University acknowledged and supported the need for additional efforts with respect to commercialization of research, and for knowledge translation for scholarship that had social purposes outside of the realm of investor-owned enterprise. The University also believed that there was merit in the identification of

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

strategic research priorities. The University was pleased at the prospect of new investment in research and innovation in the Provincial spring budget, as Ontario had less investment on a per capita basis than Quebec, British Columbia and Alberta. However, the University also planned to offer some advice to the Government about research allocations and the advancement of commercialization. Conflating investigator-initiated research and commercialization could lead to compromises of academic freedom and dilution of excellence and originality as the primary criteria for allocation of research funds. A related concern had to do with strategic initiatives that might be undertaken by the Government within the MRI funding framework. Strategic allocations could be easily politicized. It was the hope of the University that the allocation of funds by the Government within the strategic priorities would be made on the basis of objective criteria, and would be adjudicated by appropriately qualified experts.

**(c) Enrolment Reflections**

The President reported that there had been an increase of more than 10% in the number of Ontario university applications over a two-year period. It was expected that pressure would continue to be experienced by institutions over the next ten to fifteen years, as participation rates in post-secondary education were rising and the Echo generation (children of the Baby Boomers) was moving through the system. There was a need for greater clarity with respect to the appropriate combination of post-secondary institutions. It was unclear what the optimum range of percentage participation in skills training programs, colleges and universities should be. The University's "Vision 2030" exercise would be of benefit in clarifying the demographic context and the associated policy challenge so that the University would be in an optimum position for the future.

The Greater Toronto Area (GTA) was growing by approximately 100,000 persons per year and that posed a particular challenge for the University. Some northern institutions were exploring the option of establishing satellite campuses in response to limited enrolment growth in northern Ontario, and to capitalize on population growth in southern Ontario. The Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities was attuned to the GTA challenge. Discussions about responding to these enrolment pressures had begun among Ryerson University, York University, and the University of Toronto, and the COU was examining some of the available data. Once a new York University president was named, discussions could intensify. Meanwhile, the University's planning staff had been in communication with their counterparts across the institutions. Possible options for the University to address the enrolment challenge could include the development of a fourth campus, partnerships with other universities that had an undergraduate focus, or promoting and helping a college to take on an undergraduate degree-granting role. It would be important to decide on the University's strategic direction in the months ahead as part of the Vision 2030 exercise.

**(d) St. George Campus Student Commons**

A slideshow of recently constructed academic and student life facilities across all three campuses was shown during the President's report. The President informed governors that he thought it would be useful in the future to update them on some of the activities, investments and plans related to student experience and student life, as there were tremendous changes underway. While the activities taking place would not affect the relevant performance indicators in the short term, there would be a significant change in the physical space of the University in the years ahead. The President noted that the Deputy Provost and Vice-Provost, Students, Professor Farrar, had been chairing a project planning committee that had been deliberating on the potential for a new student commons on the downtown campus. The interim report that would outline space needs and a proposed site might be submitted to the Planning and Budget Committee in March at

**5. Report of the President (cont'd)****(d) St. George Campus Student Commons (cont'd)**

the earliest. At the time that the project planning report was submitted, it would be useful to hold a joint presentation on the Student Commons and the Varsity Centre. The President commented that although it was important to move forward on the projects in a timely manner, it was most important to ensure that the appropriate decisions were made, given the significant consequences and the limits on available space.

The President stated that the Student Commons Project Planning Committee, the Committee to Review Student Activity Space on the St. George Campus, and the administration had committed to a core element in the strategy for student space on the St. George campus; namely, that space should be multi-nodal and decentralized. Investment and development on a decentralized basis was core to the development on the downtown campus for the indefinite future. Central student activity and gathering spaces already existed on the downtown campus, such as the Athletic Centre and Hart House. Investments in study spaces had been made such as the Morrison Pavilion, and new investments in the Robarts Library were being explored. The Multifaith Centre was now available, and substantial new spaces for students had been added by faculties, colleges and departments. The President emphasized that if the University proceeded with a new Student Commons, it would complement rather than substitute for existing spaces.

One potential location for a Student Commons was on site 12. As a corollary, the President noted that there could be some economies of scale, whereby some elements of the Varsity development might be located on site 12, rather than to the south of the playing field as had previously been discussed. The administration was also exploring the possibility of adding a field house to the Varsity Centre.

All such concepts would need to be carefully considered. One of the related issues that would need to be determined was the financing and governance of the Student Commons. The University was prepared to make a capital commitment to matching a student levy with fifty cents per dollar, consistent with the practice of the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM) and University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC) student centres. However, consultation would need to be conducted and the level and type of student support would need to be determined. With respect to the Varsity Centre, the University had made an equivalent investment in the first phase and was looking to other sources, including philanthropy, to fund the remaining phases.

One continuing challenge would be determining how to fund the operation of student oriented spaces and facilities. The Council on Student Services was involved in decisions about compulsory, non-tuition related fees, and the process had become unproductive in recent years.

The President pointed to the development of the UTM Recreation, Athletics and Wellness Centre as an example of what the University should continue to do to develop great student spaces. Student use of the Centre had more than doubled in comparison with the former facility. The Centre included an eight-lane pool, an elevated three-lane running track, a double gym, and a variety of workout spaces. Some of those were visually open, others were sheltered to accommodate those who preferred more privacy. There were female-only classes and parts of the facility were appropriately accessible to those with special needs. The Centre was a very effective multi-purpose space. The athletics space had increased from 30,000 square feet to more than 100,000 square feet in the new facility. It had allowed a large expansion of intramural and campus recreational programs at UTM. Numerous instructional programs were offered. The Centre exemplified the type of progress necessary in moving students' lives forward in many ways.

**5. Report of the President (cont'd)****(e) St. George Varsity Centre**

The President stated that there had been varied responses to the Varsity site. When the site had originally been reopened, the University had received praise for the clear sight lines, the amount of new open space, and the preservation of the heritage wall on Bloor Street. Many in the community had been glad that large stands had not been built that would have crowded the site. However, with the construction of the bubble over the playing field, the site had been receiving some mixed reviews. The President referred to an article that had appeared in the *Globe and Mail* newspaper over the weekend. There had been a reference in the article to the long and challenging history of the redevelopment of the Varsity site, the compromises that were required to reach an effective solution for the current generation, and the multiple sports that were enabled in the winter months with the dome. However, in an article that had appeared that day in the *Toronto Star* newspaper, architecture critic, Christopher Hume had stated that he believed the site was wrong for an arena and that he disliked the bubble which he felt only sheltered a driving range. Mr. Hume had also expressed concern about the size of the seating in the Centre. The President informed governors that thousands of people made use of the arena in any given month, that the bubble was already allowing for multiple sporting events in the field facility, and that there was the capacity to expand the seating well beyond 5,000 seats for special events. The student population had doubled on the St. George campus and there was a pressing need for such a facility.

The President stated that he welcomed Mr. Hume's concern about the need for the University to think about the frontage on Bloor Street in the longer term and how intensification might proceed around the precinct. Members of the administration had continued to question which options would benefit future generations without sacrificing a playing field that was essential for the well-being of the students. As he had already indicated, there might be strategic advantages to locating the proposed Centre for High Performance Sport that was slated for the south side of the Varsity field to site 12 alongside the potential Student Commons space. If that occurred, it would ensure that the field would not be fenced in by development to the south. On the other hand, the site remained very constrained and the University had to be realistic about the prospects of intensification on the Bloor Street frontage. The President invited governors to attend the Varsity Centre open house events that would take place on Friday, February 2<sup>nd</sup>, 11:30 a.m. – 1:00 p.m., and Saturday, February 3<sup>rd</sup>, 10:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.

**(f) Communications**

The President announced that the University *Bulletin* had won a gold award in the recent 2007 Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE) District II Accolade Awards competition, surpassing every university in Canada, and scores of American colleges and universities on the eastern seaboard. The President praised the accomplishments of the *Bulletin* staff under the leadership of editor Elaine Smith. He also acknowledged the progress being made in communications under the direction of new Assistant Vice-President, Strategic Communications, Robert Steiner. The President commented on the important role the communications division was playing in clarifying the visual identity of the University. He noted that other Canadian universities had a uniform, visual presence, whereas the University had a range of visual representations, even including variations of its crest.

The President informed governors of the *U Life* project that had been featured in *The Varsity* newspaper that day. The *U Life* website<sup>1</sup> provided students with a comprehensive database of clubs, sports, jobs, research opportunities, arts and extracurricular activities. Mr. Steiner, the Director of Student Affairs, Susan Addario, and the Provost's Office had developed the concept, and many people had worked to implement it. The team had been lead by Sarah Keogh, Director,

---

<sup>1</sup> [www.ulife.utoronto.ca](http://www.ulife.utoronto.ca)

**5. Report of the President (cont'd)****(f) Communications (cont'd)**

Advancement Marketing. The project had involved student input through surveys, extensive web design and a great deal of research on campus events. The website would be formally launched on February 5<sup>th</sup>, but it was already online and active. *U Life* was available to all three campuses and would help to bring students together and allow them to capitalize on the breadth of opportunities on campus. The President noted that updating the website would pose a challenge; one solution might be to permit individual groups to carry out their own updates with some central screening functions. *U Life* was one small example of how elements of the administration were collaborating to enhance the student experience.

**(g) Performance Indicators for Governance**

The President reminded governors that an offline information session on the performance indicators for governance would be held on Thursday, February 8<sup>th</sup> from 9:30 to 11:30 a.m. in the Council Chamber. All governors were welcome to attend. The measurement of performance indicators for governance was an important part of the University's accountability responsibility. The offline session would enable a much more detailed and interactive discussion than was possible that day due to time constraints. The President expressed his regret at being unable to attend the session due to a prior commitment.

**(h) Budget Pressures and Prospects**

The President reported that the University continued to face budgetary challenges. The main reason was due to the funding per student that the Province offered and the research-intensive mission of the University; the two were misaligned. As well, while the University possessed many wonderful, old buildings, there was also a backlog of deferred maintenance that needed to be addressed. Meanwhile new buildings presented new operating costs. The President commented that there were 22 unions at the University, and their leadership would understandably negotiate to improve salaries and circumstances for their members. The University was committed to not lowering its standard to recruit the best and brightest faculty to a city with rather expensive housing, but that meant that tenure-stream salaries on average had been consistently more than 10% higher than the Ontario average.

Over the last year, the President had been working with the Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity, and the Provost, and in consultation with the Senior Salary Committee, to explore methods of containing some of the absolute growth in salaries of senior academic and non-academic administrators. While the University would continue to pursue those issues, those measures would have an absolute impact that was extremely modest for an institution with a core budget of \$1.3 billion per year. There was a need to focus on larger items that would have a greater impact on the budget. For that reason, it was important to understand the University's long-term commitments to the existing pension plan. The University's pension situation was being reviewed by one of Canada's leading pension experts, as were the structure and functions of the University of Toronto Asset Management Corporation (UTAM), and potential related liabilities would also be explored. At present, the cumulative deficit had mounted, and there was a need to reduce it over a multi-year period. The Provost had been deeply engaged in working on that issue. There was also an ongoing concern regarding revenue sources and how they might be expanded to sustain the quality of education at the University in the years ahead. The University had surmounted such challenges many times in the past, and the President was confident it would continue to overcome them for the indefinite future.



**6. Items for Governing Council Approval****(a) *Statement on Research Partnerships***

Professor Marrus reported that the statement had been considered by the Research Advisory Board, by Principals, Deans, Academic Directors and Chairs (PDAD&C), by the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs (AP&P) and by the Academic Board, and had received the support of both governance bodies. The *Statement on Research Partnerships* was a clear and simple affirmation of the University's commitment to freedom of academic enquiry. Professor Marrus referred to page 4 of the Academic Board minutes (Report Number 147) that stated that there would be no limitations on research partnerships that were conducted within legal limits, conformed to University policies including the *Policy on Ethical Conduct in Research* and the *Policy on Research Involving Human Subjects*, and that passed the usual reviews for such matters as the use of animals and of biohazardous materials. The *Statement* had received unanimous approval of the Academic Board.

On motion duly moved and seconded

It was RESOLVED

THAT the proposed *Statement on Research Partnerships* be approved.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 147 of the Academic Board as Appendix "A".

**(b) *Statement on Conflict of Interest and Conflict of Commitment***

Professor Marrus informed the Council that the *Statement on Conflict of Interest and Conflict of Commitment* was a complementary one to the *Statement on Research Partnerships*. Having asserted the importance of academic freedom, the University then had a responsibility to avoid conflicts of interest. The *Statement on Conflict of Interest and Conflict of Commitment* had also been considered by AP&P and by the Academic Board, and had received the support of both governance bodies.

On motion duly moved and seconded

It was RESOLVED

THAT the proposed *Statement on Conflict of Interest and Conflict of Commitment* be approved.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 147 of the Academic Board as Appendix "B".

**(c) *Policy on Information Technology***

Professor Marrus reported that the *Policy on Information Technology* had been considered by the Planning and Budget Committee (P&B) and by the Academic Board, and had received the support of both governance bodies. The proposed policy replaced two older policies. It was a high-level policy statement; logistics and operational concerns would be addressed by the Information Technology (IT) committees and related working groups. A member of the Academic Board had asked what governance body would be responsible for oversight of Information Technology. The Provost replied that the administration would establish a committee structure to oversee information technologies and bring forward appropriate reports to governance.

**6. Items for Governing Council Approval (cont'd)**

**(c) Policy on Information Technology (cont'd)**

On motion duly moved and seconded

It was RESOLVED

THAT the proposed *Policy on Information Technology* be approved, replacing the *Policy on the Use and Development of Computing Facilities* (April 16, 1984) and the *Computing Services Financial Policy and Accounting Practice in Respect of Major Computer Mainframe Acquisitions* (December 21, 1978).

Documentation is attached to Report Number 147 of the Academic Board as Appendix "C".

**(d) Policy on Interdisciplinary Education and Research Planning**

Professor Marrus informed the Council that the *Policy on Interdisciplinary Education and Research Planning* has been considered by P&B and the Academic Board, and had received the support of both governance bodies. The *Policy*, which would replace the Marsden Report, reaffirmed the importance of excellent interdisciplinary and disciplinary teaching, learning and research at the University. The administrative structure would facilitate interdisciplinary education and research planning. The *Guidelines* that were provided for information would allow for the creation of extra-departmental units appropriate to the needs of the University.

On motion duly moved and seconded

It was RESOLVED

THAT the *Policy on Interdisciplinary Education and Research Planning* be approved, replacing the *Report of the Provostial Committee on Centres and Institutes*, approved by Governing Council in 1984.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 147 of the Academic Board as Appendix "D".

**(e) Cinema Studies Institute: Establishment**

Professor Marrus noted that the University had a very lively program in Cinema Studies that served several hundred students. The program provided a vehicle by which links could be made with the wider community, particularly since the City was such an important place for cinema. Professor Marrus commented that the leadership, energy and student support behind the move to establish the Institute was very positive, and the proposal had received the full endorsement of both P&B and the Academic Board.

On motion duly moved and seconded

It was RESOLVED

THAT the Cinema Studies Institute be established within the Faculty of Arts and Science, and,

THAT the Cinema Studies Institute be established as an EDU:B unit, subject to the approval of the *Policy on Interdisciplinary Education and Research Planning*.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 147 of the Academic Board as Appendix "E".

**6. Items for Governing Council Approval (cont'd)****(f) Restructuring of Life Sciences at the University of Toronto at Scarborough**

Professor Marrus informed the Council that the proposal had received the support of both P&B and the Academic Board. The University of Toronto at Scarborough had proposed to disestablish the Department of Life Sciences and to create two departments – the Department of Psychology and the Department of Biological Sciences. The proposal had been unanimously supported by faculty members of the Department of Life Sciences, and had been approved by the UTSC Council.

On motion duly moved and seconded

It was RESOLVED

THAT the Department of Life Sciences at the University of Toronto at Scarborough be disestablished coincident with the establishment of the new Department of Biological Sciences and the new Department of Psychology, effective July 1, 2007.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 147 of the Academic Board as Appendix “F”.

**(g) Template for Full Affiliation Agreements between the University of Toronto and the Member Hospitals of the Toronto Academic Health Science Network**

Professor Marrus reported that the proposed Template for Full Affiliation Agreements between the University of Toronto and the Member Hospitals of the Toronto Academic Health Science Network was the product of a great deal of work that had occurred at a number of levels – academic, administrative, and legal. Lengthy discussions had taken place over a number of years, and steps to overcome numerous challenges had been led by two Deans of the Faculty of Medicine. The proposed template had received the support of both P&B and the Academic Board. Much discussion of the item had taken place at the Academic Board. One member of the Board had submitted a list of five questions to the Provost prior to the Academic Board meeting on January 11, 2007. A list of the questions and replies was on page 10 of Report Number 147 of the Academic Board that had been included in the agenda package.

On motion duly moved and seconded

It was RESOLVED

- (a) THAT the template for full affiliation agreements between the University of Toronto and the current full member hospitals of the Toronto Academic Health Science Network be approved, effective immediately;
- (b) THAT the President, or designate, be authorized to sign such agreements on behalf of the Governing Council, provided that the agreements conform to the approved template; and
- (c) THAT the agreements signed under the provisions of this resolution be filed with the Secretary of Governing Council.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 147 of the Academic Board as Appendix “G”.

**6. Items for Governing Council Approval (cont'd)****(h) Faculty of Music: Graduate Program Restructuring**

Professor Marrus noted that the Faculty of Music was proposing to restructure its graduate programs in order to maintain its position as one of the leading university music faculties in North America. Two program groups were being proposed to bring the structure of the Faculty's programs into line with other leading university programs in Music in North America. The academic program group would focus on research and lead to the M.A. and Ph.D. degrees. The professional program group would focus on performance, composition and professional training, and would lead to the Master of Music degree and a Doctor of Musical Arts degree. Discussion at the Academic Board had focused on the need to ensure appropriate financial support to programs, particularly those in the humanities, recognizing their unique characteristics. The proposal had received the support of AP&P, P&B and the Academic Board.

On motion duly moved and seconded

It was RESOLVED

THAT the proposal from the Faculty of Music for restructuring of graduate programs be approved, effective September 2007; and

THAT the proposal for a Master of Music (Mus.M.) degree and a Doctor of Musical Arts (D.M.A.) degree in the Music Performance Program be approved, effective September 2007.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 147 of the Academic Board as Appendix "H".

**(i) Capital Project: Interim Project Planning Report: Expansion of the Rotman School of Management Facilities**

Professor Marrus explained that the academic plan of the Rotman School proposed a significant increase in the scale and scope of all the School's activities, and was in line with the University's objective of expanding graduate enrolments and research focus. The recommendation of the interim project planning report was to approve in principle the assignment of site 11 (located south of School's current position) to accommodate the activities and functions of the Rotman School, which would allow the School to pursue fundraising opportunities to finance the expansion. There was a great deal of optimism and momentum surrounding the proposal. Discussion at the Academic Board had focused on the degree to which environmental considerations had been considered by the Project Planning Committee, and the impact of the proposed expansion on the surrounding neighbourhood. Professor Marrus informed the Council that the proposal had received the support of both P&B and the Academic Board.

On motion duly moved and seconded

It was RESOLVED

Subject to approval by the Governing Council of a completed Project Planning Report,

THAT the Interim Project Planning Report for the Rotman School of Management be approved in principle to accommodate the activities and functions described for the expansion of the School's programs on 91-97 St. George Street (site 11).

Documentation is attached to Report Number 147 of the Academic Board as Appendix "I".

**6. Items for Governing Council Approval (cont'd)****(j) Assistant Vice-President Positions****(i) Renaming of Position**

The President reported that the recommendation being made was for the renaming of the currently vacant position of Chief Capital Projects Officer to that of Assistant Vice-President, Real Estate and Construction. The name would more accurately describe the two important functions of the position, that is, managing real estate assets and managing capital projects. As well, it would support the execution of the University's Real Estate Strategy.

On motion duly moved and seconded

It was RESOLVED

THAT the renaming of the position of Chief Capital Projects Officer to Assistant Vice-President, Real Estate and Construction, be approved.

**(ii) Establishment**

The President explained that the recommendation being made was for the creation of the position of Assistant Vice-President (AVP), Student Life. The rationale for the position had been outlined in detail in the memorandum from the Vice-President and Provost that had been distributed, as well as the accompanying documentation. The new AVP position would function as the senior student affairs officer on the St. George campus and would report directly to the Vice-Provost, Students. The AVP, Student Life would have operational responsibility for student services on the St. George campus, while the Office of the Vice-Provost, Students would have University-wide policy responsibilities. Much discussion about the creation of the position had taken place, and the level of the position was commensurate with the responsibilities involved.

On motion duly moved and seconded

It was RESOLVED

THAT the position of Assistant Vice-President, Student Life be established.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 402 of the Executive Committee as Appendix "B".

**7. Performance Indicators for Governance: Measuring UP (2006)**

The Chair stated that the annual performance indicators document was a major element of the University's accountability exercises, and that it consisted of a series of metrics of institutional performance across a wide variety of indicators. This was the eighth annual report, and there had been a continual evolution over the years. The document, in its present form, represented an important advance in the manner in which this kind of reporting was done. A summary document for the report had also been distributed. The Chair commented on the excellent quality of the report and commended the administration on the very fine job they had done in preparing it. The report was being presented for information and discussion.

**Presentation**

Professor Goel encouraged governors to carefully examine the report. If they were unable to attend the offline session on February 8<sup>th</sup>, they were welcome to contact his Office if they had additional questions. This year, two versions of the report had been prepared – the main report and an overview. The performance indicators was only one of more than 70 annual

**7. Performance Indicators for Governance: Measuring UP (2006) (cont'd)****Presentation (cont'd)**

accountability reports that were prepared by the University's administration for governance; approximately 100 other reports were submitted to external agencies.

Professor Goel noted that the University's vision statement was to be "...a leader among the world's best public universities in the discovery, preservation and sharing of knowledge through its teaching and research and its commitment to excellence and equity." The University was entering into a new vision exercise, Vision 2030, and although the wording of the vision statement might ultimately be modified somewhat, it was unlikely that there would be a significant deviation from the main ambition to rank among the leading public universities in the world. It was important to know how the University was performing in terms of that vision. To that end, many methods of assessment were used, such as external peer review of grants, books, articles, and other publications, assessment of teaching through classroom visits and evaluations by students, and reviews of programs, faculties and divisions which usually occurred every five years. Each year, governors received a compendium of faculty and departmental reviews that had been submitted to the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs; those reviews provided very qualitative assessments. Quantitative measures such as those in the performance indicators report were also available to complement those assessments.

During the performance indicators information session that would be held in the following week, there would also be a focus on the results from the 2006 National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). Some of the material that had been presented to the University Affairs Board at its meeting of January 16, 2007, would be included. Various benchmark measures from NSSE that had been based on many years of scholarship had been outlined in the performance indicators report. Attributes that had led to student success had been examined, and the relevant survey items had been grouped into select scales.

**Student Experience**

The level of academic challenge was one benchmark that had been measured. The University's scores for two years (2004 and 2006) had been compared with that of the 2006 aggregate of its Canadian peers for both first-year and senior-year students. The results showed that the University of Toronto's performance had been similar to that of its Canadian peers. With respect to overall enriching educational experiences, both in and out of the classroom, the University had performed somewhat less well than its Canadian peers. With respect to student-faculty interaction, the University had a slightly lower score than its peers; this was likely largely due to the University's higher student-faculty ratios. On the measure of supportive campus environment, the University had also performed less well than its peers. The University's 2006 scores for both first-year and senior-year students had decreased slightly from those in 2004. It was noted that several new initiatives to enhance the student experience had been undertaken since 2004, but that it would take some time for significant changes resulting from those initiatives to become apparent in the NSSE measures.

The first-year retention rate at the University in 2005 had been compared with those of other American, public institutions with varying admission standards. It had been found that the University's retention rate was as good as or better than all categories of institutions, including those that were highly selective in their admissions standards.

**Research Output and Faculty Honours**

Professor Goel reported that the University also performed well on measures of research output. The University had ranked first among public Association of American Universities (AAU) and its Canadian peer institutions for the fourth consecutive year on publication counts in the science fields, as tracked by the Institute for Scientific Information (ISI). When the private institutions had been included, only Harvard University had surpassed the University of Toronto. The University had wanted to develop reliable initiatives to assess scholarly activities for the

**7. Performance Indicators for Governance: Measuring UP (2006) (cont'd)**Research Output and Faculty Honours (cont'd)

humanities fields. Last year, a working group had proposed some measures that could be used by the University. A pilot project was underway, and it was possible that the results from some of those measures would be included in the 2007 performance indicators report.

With respect to faculty honours, the University's faculty represented approximately 8% of Canadian university faculty members, but had received a disproportionately high percentage of faculty honours from Canadian and international sources. Professor Goel reported that over a three-year period (2001-02, 2002-03 and 2003-04), the total number of new research licenses at the University had exceeded that of its Canadian peers, and was within range of that at some American institutions.

Community Outreach

Professor Goel stated that community outreach was an important University goal and activity. One of the projects supported by the Academic Initiatives Fund had been the establishment of the Centre for Community Partnership in 2005. The Centre facilitated University-Community activities and a variety of projects, providing relevant training for students engaging in community activities. It had been found that community-based curricular (teaching) and co-curricular (service) opportunities for students coordinated through the Centre had increased over the previous year.

Equity and Diversity

Equity and diversity were an important part of the University plan, and those factors had been examined. The Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity, Professor Hildyard, had reported to the University Affairs Board on equity and access matters at its meeting of January 16, 2007. The University had measured the proportion of first-entry, professional and doctoral-stream students of visible minority backgrounds over three years (2003, 2004 and 2005). The results had demonstrated sustained increases in the proportions over time.

Revenue per Student

Professor Goel commented that revenue continued to pose a challenge for the University. Comparisons had been conducted with AAU peers of the total of all revenue (in American funds) per full-time equivalent (FTE) student. It had been shown that the University's funding was less than half of the median of other public, research-intensive institutions. Despite the substantial disparity in funding, the University had to compete with that peer group for recruitment of high quality faculty and students.

**Discussion**Methodological Issues

The Chair commended Professor Goel on the report and noted that the governors would likely be interested in learning more about some of the areas that he had highlighted. Questions about the methodology that had been used in developing the report were raised by a few members during the discussion. Specifically, one member commented that responses to the NSSE and the Graduate and Professional Survey (GPSS) could not necessarily be correlated with specific types of programs. Caution in the evaluation of the aggregate data would be needed when considering policy interventions based on the report. The member noted that some reviewers might express concern about the survey participation rates, such as the student response rates on the NSSE. Lastly, the member suggested that there may have been an assumption that the underlying student population was fairly homogeneous, but some self-selection among the survey participants might have occurred. Professor Goel acknowledged that the points raised were important, and would be addressed more fully at the offline information session. He stated that the GPSS had been distributed at the program level of each graduate unit, and that faculties would be provided with

**7. Performance Indicators for Governance: Measuring UP (2006) (cont'd)**Methodological Issues (cont'd)

their own disaggregated NSSE data for their examination. Over time, the University would continue to improve on its analysis of NSSE data.

Professor Goel noted that some corrections for the student characteristics and program types necessary when making comparisons across institutions. The University had chosen to compare results with those from various Ontario, Canadian, and select American universities. The peer group was selected to be comparable to the University on characteristics such as having a large student population, being in an urban area, and having a full range of graduate and professional programs. Professor Goel also pointed out that he believed that the NSSE benchmarks tended to reflect the experiences of small, liberal arts colleges, rather than large, public, urban universities. With respect to the issue of response rates, there was variance across institutions. It was unlikely that higher response rates for surveys conducted by the University could be obtained<sup>2</sup>. The University's response rates were reasonable, and the demographic profiles of the respondents reflected that of the student population. While it was possible to hold many debates about the methodology used, all of the data from many different surveys provided a fairly consistent message on students' opinions. There was clearly a need for the University to take account of the results even if the methodology of the surveys was not perfect.

President Naylor echoed Professor Goel's comments about the methodology in the report. Challenges did exist and should be addressed. While it was important to be optimistic about the likelihood of the NSSE results moving in a more positive direction, such changes had not yet occurred. NSSE was not designed to rapidly reflect shifts in directions of responses. However, the University still wanted to move forward on the identified issues and chosen initiatives to improve the student experience. Instruments that were more responsive than NSSE might exist, and the University would explore their use.

Revenue per Student

With respect to the slide that had been presented on the total revenue per student, a member commented that it had been quite compelling in highlighting the low levels of funding available to the University. The member questioned whether much change in the performance indicators on student performance could be expected without an increase in funding. Professor Goel responded that many of the University's Canadian peers (especially those in Ontario) received similar funding to the University, yet had been able to obtain better results on student experience. The University would need to examine what could be accomplished with the available resources. A reorganization of service delivery to students might be needed, with a shift to a more student-centered model. Many things could be achieved without a significant level of investment. President Naylor added that the University community should be proud of the level of scholarship that had been achieved, given the funding levels. As changes were made, there would be an effort to ensure that the standard of scholarship was not compromised.

A member agreed with the President's statement that excellence should be maintained, but expressed concern about the financial accessibility of the University. With such low funding per student in comparison with its peers, areas of pressure might be on tuition fees and other sources. Yet the University's chosen measures demonstrated that the percentage of students from lower income families had decreased over the last year. If the results had been affected by a slight change of methodology, i.e. the use of online measures, then what other measures were being selected that might demonstrate that the University was improving on the matter of accessibility? Professor Goel responded that a number of other measures on accessibility had been used and had been included in the report on student financial support and accessibility that would be submitted to AP&P. The data that had been used for the performance indicators report had been a year old,

---

<sup>2</sup> The University's response rate on the NSSE for 2006 was 39%.



**7. Performance Indicators for Governance: Measuring UP (2006) (cont'd)**Revenue per Student (cont'd)

and more recent data would become available in a few weeks. Data on income distribution would be available.

Professor Goel cautioned that there were methodological challenges when studying household income. The survey responses for the parental income data had appeared to be less reliable than those for other questions. It would be better to examine the direction of the results over a period of time. Professor Goel reminded governors that the proportion of students who had identified themselves as members of visible minority groups had increased.

Student Experience

A member congratulated Professor Goel on the improved format of the report and commented that new student experience initiatives that might not have been reflected through the use of quantitative data alone could now be highlighted. For example, the Department of Chemistry at the University had become the first department to extend maternity leave to eight weeks for all of its female graduate students. That type of initiative could not yet be captured with statistics, but could be highlighted in the document produced by the University, and demonstrated the attempts the University was making to enhance the student experience in very personal ways.

One member commented that the global perspective had not been included in the report. Consideration for the student experience was not a focus in many other parts of the world; it was a relatively new phenomenon that had emerged in the second half of the twentieth century. Other leading institutions focused only on academic standards and research. While the University had set a standard that fit with the North American model, it would not be possible for the University to achieve great outcomes in all areas of assessment, so it should not continue to blame itself for not having an excellent level of student experience.

A member noted that many students had other responsibilities in addition to their academic commitments and did not seem to have the experience of extra-curricular/co-curricular activities. Some had to work part-time or assist with family obligations. Had the quality of student life been considered in the NSSE data? Professor Goel explained that the NSSE datasets were very rich, and such issues had been examined. Participants had responded to questions about the amount of time spent working, studying, and on different activities. It had been found that work was not a predictor of student involvement on campus. The proportion of University of Toronto students who worked was actually less than that at other institutions.

**8. Reports for Information**

Members received the following reports for information.

- (a) Report Number 147 of the Academic Board (January 11, 2007) ;
- (b) Report Number 401 of the Executive Committee (December 14, 2006);
- (c) Report Number 402 of the Executive Committee (January 18, 2007).

**9. Date of the Next Meeting**

The Chair reminded members that the next regular meeting of the Governing Council was scheduled for Thursday, March 29, 2007 at 4:30 p.m.

**10. Question Period**

Governors had no questions for members of the senior administration.

**11. Other Business**

There was no other business.

The meeting adjourned at 6:15 p.m.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Secretary

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chair

February 23, 2007