

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

REPORT NUMBER 323 OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

March 27, 2000

To the Governing Council,
University of Toronto.

Your Committee reports that it held a meeting on Monday, March 27, 2000 at 7:00 p.m. in the Board Room, Simcoe Hall, with the following members present:

Ms Wendy M. Cecil-Cockwell (In the Chair)	Ms Nancy L. Watson
Mrs. Mary Anne V. Chambers (Vice-Chair)	Dr. Alexander R. Waugh
Professor J. Robert S. Prichard, President	
Professor Jack Carr	Mr. Louis R. Charpentier
Dr. Robert J. Kyle	
Dr. John P. Nestor	Secretariat:
Professor Wendy Rolph	
Dr. Joseph L. Rotman	Ms Margaret McKone
Mrs. Susan M. Scace	

Regrets:

Ms Shruti Dev-Nayyar
Professor Brian Langille
Mr. John H. Tory

In Attendance:

Professor John T. Mayhall, Chair, Academic Board
Mr. Amir Shalaby, Chair, Business Board
Mr. Elan Ohayon, member, Governing Council
Ms Jacqueline C. Orange, member, Governing Council
Professor Adel S. Sedra, member, Governing Council, and Vice-President and Provost
Ms Wendy Talfourd-Jones, member, Governing Council
Professor Michael G. Finlayson, Vice-President, Administration and Human Resources
Mr. Kasi Rao, Director of the Office of the President and Director of Government Relations

1. Report of the Previous Meeting

Report Number 322 (January 24, 2000) was approved.

2. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting

There were no items of business arising from the report of the previous meeting.

3. Minutes of Governing Council Meeting held on February 10, 2000

Members had received the Minutes for information.

4. Academic Board Items for Confirmation

Professor Mayhall noted that the following items requiring the confirmation of the Executive Committee had passed with little discussion at the Academic Board meeting. Descriptions of each item were contained in the Board's Report.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE CONFIRMED

Item 5 - Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering, the Rotman School of Management and the School of Graduate Studies: The Jeffrey Skoll BAsC/MBA Program

THAT the proposal for a new combined Jeffrey Skoll BAsC/MBA program, as described in the submission from the School of Graduate Studies, dated January, 2000, be approved, effective July 1, 2000.

Item 7 - Faculty of Arts and Science: 2000-2001 Calendar Changes – 3-minor Combination for Honours Degrees: Discontinuation

THAT the proposal for the discontinuation of the three-minor program combination for Honours Degree fulfillment, as described in the Faculty of Arts and Science submission for 2000-2001, dated February 14, 2000, be approved, effective for the academic year 2000-2001.

Item 8 - Faculty of Arts and Science: 2000-2001 Calendar Changes – Woodsworth College – New Academic Bridging Program: Establishment

THAT the proposal for a new Academic Bridging Program at Woodsworth College, as described in the Faculty of Arts and Science submission for 2000-2001, dated February 14, 2000, be approved, effective for the academic year 2000-2001.

Item 14 - Faculty of Dentistry: Constitution – Amendments

THAT the constitution of the Faculty of Dentistry as amended be approved.

5. Academic Board Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council**(a) Item 4 – School of Graduate Studies and the Advanced Design Manufacturing Institute: Proposal for a New Joint Master of Engineering Degree Program in Design and Manufacturing (MEngDM)**

Professor Mayhall noted that the proposal concerned a collaborative effort among four universities to provide, in modular format, an integrated graduate program in engineering and management. It would be self-funded and, therefore, would have no resource implications for the operating budget. Professor Ron Venter had been congratulated for his leadership in establishing the new program.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED

to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation

THAT the proposal for the establishment of a Joint Master of Engineering Degree Program in Design and Manufacturing (MEngDM), effective July 1, 2000, as described in the submission from the School of Graduate Studies, dated September 1, 1999, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 99 of the Academic Board as Appendix “A”, be approved.

(b) Item 6 – Faculty of Arts and Science: 2000-2001 Calendar Changes – 15-Credit BA/BSc Degrees: Discontinuation

Professor Mayhall recalled that the proposal had enjoyed a great deal of spirited debate at the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs, the Planning and Budget Committee and the Academic Board. Several members, speaking in support of the proposal, had provided detailed accounts of how the Faculty of Arts and Science had arrived at the decision to recommend the discontinuation of the 15-credit degrees. Other members had spoken in favour of retaining the degrees, noting that many students, particularly part-time students, would be disadvantaged by the elimination of the programs. Professor Mayhall drew members' attention to the Report of the Academic Board meeting for the details of these interventions.

Discussion ensued on the following aspects of the proposal.

Recognition of 15 credits completed by students entering professional programs.

A member commented that in considering whether proposals should be endorsed and forwarded to the Governing Council, the Executive Committee's role was to ensure that proposals were sound, that background documentation was clear and sufficient, and that they had been properly considered by the relevant boards and committees. He noted that the proposal before members was premised on two elements: to improve the academic experience for students and to eliminate the potential for confusion on the part of other institutions as to the status of the 15-credit and 20-credit baccalaureates. The member

5. Academic Board Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council (cont'd)**(b) Item 6 – Faculty of Arts and Science: 2000-2001 Calendar Changes – 15-Credit BA/BSc Degrees: Discontinuation** (cont'd)

agreed that a 20-credit degree would provide better training for students wishing to pursue a research-oriented graduate program; however, he believed that students who chose to pursue a professional degree program following three years of full-time study (i.e. 15-credits) should have the option of receiving recognition for this work. The documentation referred to support of the proposal from the Dean of the School of Graduate Studies; however, it made no mention of support from the Deans of professional faculties.

A member asked about the trends in numbers of students who wished to complete a 15-credit degree prior to enrolling in professional programs. He wondered if the proposal would have an impact on these students and on other institutions offering professional programs. In the member's view, this information was necessary to the Committee's deliberation.

Need for broader consultation with the student body. A member acknowledged the participation of Arts and Science students within the Faculty's various Committees in which the proposal had been formulated and ultimately endorsed. However, the proposal signified a fundamental change in the degree program offerings at the University and, as such, warranted more widespread consultation with students. The supporting documentation did not appear to address this issue. The member would have preferred greater student endorsement of the proposal prior to its consideration by the Governing Council. Given this and the above-noted concern with respect to professional degree programs, the member did not believe that the supporting documentation was sufficient.

A member added that he, too, was uncomfortable with the student input in the consultation process. While the Report of the Academic Board noted that the Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students (APUS) was not in support of the proposal, there was no mention of the position taken by the Students' Administrative Council (SAC), which represented full-time undergraduate students.

A member noted that she had a number of reservations about the proposal; however, she was primarily concerned with the apparent haste in which approval of the proposal was being sought. The proposal signified an unprecedented level of change in the University's curriculum and, therefore, it was important to seek additional student input for the reasons outlined previously.

Need to offer degree programs consistently across the three campuses. A member noted that the proposal pertained only to the 15-credit BA/BSc degree programs offered on the St. George and Mississauga Campuses. The Scarborough Campus was a separate Arts and Science division, and it had not yet determined whether it wished to discontinue the 15-credit degree. The member suggested that if the University wished to eliminate the 15-credit degree, it should do so universally across the three campuses, especially given the argument

that the proposal was to improve students' academic experience. As well, differentiation among the three campuses would lead to confusion in the recruitment of students.

5. Academic Board Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council (cont'd)**(b) Item 6 – Faculty of Arts and Science: 2000-2001 Calendar Changes – 15-Credit BA/BSc Degrees: Discontinuation** (cont'd)

Another member who advocated across-the-board credentials on all three campuses later echoed the concern that the proposal did not also pertain to the Scarborough Campus.

Need to implement improvements for part-time students prior to the adoption of the proposal. A member noted that in recommending the proposal at this time it appeared the administration was “placing the cart before the horse”. He explained that the proposal was premised in part on improving the part-time student experience (e.g. offering three full semesters, as well as increased course offerings). However, these initiatives had not yet been implemented and there was no guarantee as to when they would be implemented. The absence of these initiatives would greatly diminish the part-time student experience should the proposal be approved. While the member was not opposed to the philosophy of the proposal, he was concerned that the right mechanisms for its successful implementation were not yet in place and consequently there might be an adverse effect on accessibility for part-time students.

Impact of proposal on part-time students. A member spoke against the proposal noting that it did not enjoy the support of the APUS, the constituency that represented part-time students. It was important that the Governing Council acknowledge and consider the basis for this dissent. The member continued that the introduction of a three-semester system would not necessarily benefit part-time students, as was being suggested, because many part-time students did not have control over their schedules and might not be able to take advantage of a greater number of summer course offerings. As well, the schedules of part-time students were not always conducive to taking courses throughout the year. While it would be advantageous to do so from a financial point of view, part-time students might not have the mental and physical energy to sustain their education for twelve continuous months each year. The member said that this and other issues raised at tonight’s meeting required a great deal more attention prior to the Governing Council’s consideration of the proposal.

Implications for the University’s enrolment growth plans. A member of the Governing Council in attendance noted that it was difficult to decouple this proposal from the *Framework for Enrolment Expansion at the University of Toronto*, which the Committee was to consider later in the meeting. Given that the 15-credit degree would be eliminated, more students would stay at the University for a fourth year and, therefore, fewer students would be admitted to first year to maintain the same overall enrolment. This proposal could, therefore, adversely impact the University’s ability to accommodate the anticipated increase in demand arising from demographic growth and from the double cohort bulge. The individual suggested that further analysis of this issue was required prior to the Governing Council’s consideration of the proposal.

5. Academic Board Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council (cont'd)**(b) Item 6 – Faculty of Arts and Science: 2000-2001 Calendar Changes – 15-Credit BA/BSc Degrees: Discontinuation** (cont'd)

The Chairman invited the Provost to respond to the concerns raised.

Professor Sedra prefaced his response by inviting Professor Wendy Rolph also to respond to members' concerns in her capacity as Chair, Committee on Academic Policy and Programs, Vice-Dean, Faculty of Arts and Science, and Chair of the Faculty's Curriculum Renewal Committee.

Professor Sedra explained the rationale for the proposal. It arose from a thorough examination of the curriculum within the Faculty of Arts and Science. Central to the recommendation was the Faculty's commitment to a broad liberal arts education with a greatly improved and enriched academic experience for all its undergraduate students. There were seventeen universities in Ontario, three of which were located in the greater Toronto area. York University and Ryerson Polytechnic University would continue to offer a 15-credit degree. There would, therefore, be ample opportunities for students to obtain a 15-credit degree. The University of Toronto had long advocated differentiation of roles among Ontario's universities. This was all the more necessary now given the recent provincial government's funding announcement. The Faculty of Arts and Science's Curriculum Renewal Committee (CRC) had for some time been considering various improvements to the curriculum in the areas of writing proficiency, scientific literacy, computer competency, and experiential learning. The conclusion of that Committee had been that the 20-credit degree was necessary for incorporating these components.

In response to the suggestion that the proposal was being rushed, Professor Sedra assured members that this was not the case. The matter had been thoroughly and properly vetted in various fora, both in the Faculty of Arts and Science and in governance. He added that during the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs' consideration of the proposal, no dissenting votes had been cast. He recalled that at the meeting of the Academic Board, whose membership totaled 120, only a handful of members had voted against the proposal. Professor Sedra continued that the proposal would not affect those students who wished to apply to professional programs (e.g. Law, Medicine, and Dentistry). The academic requirements for these programs included the completion of 15 credits, not a 15-credit degree. Professor Sedra disagreed with the concern over the possibility that the Scarborough Campus might choose to continue to offer a 15-credit degree. An advantage of having three campuses was that the University could offer a variety of different programs on each campus. Indeed, this diversification was a significant component of the *Framework for Enrolment Expansion at the University of Toronto*, which recommended that the Scarborough Campus become co-op intensive. In any event, Scarborough's decision on the issue of the 15-credit degree would be decided later on and was not part of this recommendation. In response to members' comments regarding possible adverse effects on part-time students, Professor Sedra acknowledged that the administration was conscious of these concerns. Accordingly, the University would enhance financial aid packages for part-time students. As well, while he understood a member's earlier point that not all students would benefit from an augmented summer

5. Academic Board Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council (cont'd)**(b) Item 6 – Faculty of Arts and Science: 2000-2001 Calendar Changes – 15-Credit BA/BSc Degrees: Discontinuation** (cont'd)

program, he believed it would be of benefit to many students, because it would provide flexibility and offer a greater selection of courses. The administration was very much committed to the move to a three-semester system. He clarified that the *Framework for Enrolment Expansion at the University of Toronto* was not predicated on the elimination of the 15-credit degree program. Rather, it took into account the elimination of the 15-credit degree on overall enrolment. The *Framework* could stand on its own should the proposal not be approved. In response to concerns regarding a perceived lack of student consultation, Professor Sedra countered that students had in fact been consulted. In addition to APUS, the Faculty had consulted with the Arts and Science Students' Union (ASSU). Representatives of both groups had been involved in the deliberation process from the beginning. It was Professor Sedra's understanding that ASSU was in support of the proposal. He clarified that student participation in the academic planning process was not through referenda but rightly through involvement in Faculty committees and University governance.

Professor Rolph underscored Professor Sedra's comments regarding the long process of deliberation and consultation. Initial impetus for revisiting the curriculum had come with the appointment of the current Dean of the Faculty, who had been charged to seek ways to enhance the undergraduate academic experience. The Curriculum Renewal Committee (CRC) had been created in April 1998 and had met regularly through to June 1999 at which time it had made the recommendation currently before the Executive Committee. During the course of the CRC's deliberations, as chair, she had reported on its progress at each meeting of the General Committee of Faculty Council, which met approximately five times per year. The composition of the CRC had included representation from APUS and ASSU. Consistent with practice in the Faculty, one of the responsibilities of those student members of CRC was to keep their constituencies informed and to provide the CRC with feedback. As the CRC had progressed in its work, it had come to the realization that the introduction across the curriculum of new priorities including writing proficiency, scientific literacy, computer competency, and experiential learning (for example: international experience - studying abroad for a period during a student's undergraduate career) should not compromise the disciplinary and programmatic strengths on which much of the Faculty's reputation for excellence was based. To ensure appropriate balance between depth and breadth, a critical mass of course offerings was required. The Committee had concluded that the only viable model for incorporating these components effectively into the undergraduate curriculum was the 20-credit degree. The Faculty wished to ensure that the degrees which it awarded would continue to prepare all students well for whatever future career or educational choices they subsequently chose to pursue. She noted that in addition to the student members on the CRC, there had also been broad student representation on the Faculty's General Committee. To her recollection, no student member of the General Committee had spoken against the proposal during the three meetings at which it had been discussed and debated. The proposal had enjoyed the resounding support of the General Committee.

5. Academic Board Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council (cont'd)**(b) Item 6 – Faculty of Arts and Science: 2000-2001 Calendar Changes – 15-Credit BA/BSc Degrees: Discontinuation** (cont'd)

Need for greater consultation. A member commented that he had he did not believe his concerns had been addressed. The premise behind the proposal was that better training of undergraduate students made better graduate students. He agreed with this philosophy; however, he believed that students enrolled in 15-credit degree programs for a variety of reasons (e.g. for employment purposes and to enter professional programs). He did not think the voices of these students had been heard and he urged that more sides of the issue be examined.

University-wide impact of proposal. A member restated his concern with the proposal. He agreed that there had been a good process of consultation within the Faculty of Arts and Science. However, there was a larger impact to consider and he disagreed that it was strictly an academic matter. For example there could be ramifications for recruitment and marketing. Some students might have chosen to attend the University of Toronto because of the 15-credit degree offering. There could also be ramifications for enrolment levels. He was not sure that the Faculty of Arts and Science had specifically engaged the issue of effects on overall enrolment. As well, the increase in demand for professional programs could have an effect on the need for 15-credit degree programs. The Governing Council had to be aware of all these ramifications when it considered the proposal.

The President noted his strong support for the proposal, which he believed to be central to the academic mission and direction of the University. The debate of the proposal by the Academic Board had focused on the depth of the University's commitment to a genuinely liberal education. He believed the University's many constituencies advocated that the University should reaffirm and deepen its commitment to and be a beacon within Ontario and Canada for liberal education. The proposal before members did just that. He believed the quality of the debate of the proposal by the Academic Board, which had included a discussion of the University's academic mission, to be unprecedented in quality during his years as President. He noted that the Deans of the University's divisions, including the professional faculties, were all members of the Board and had voted in favour of the proposal. He drew attention to the Report of the Board's meeting which contained an account of many persuasive interventions that had taken place. The University's many constituencies were represented on the Academic Board and the proposal had enjoyed a full discussion in that forum, as it had within the Faculty of Arts and Science. In conclusion, he noted that the proposal would help the University to exploit fully its many distinctive strengths. Given the proposal had been well engaged by governance and enjoyed the overwhelming support of the Academic Board, he believed the Executive Committee should endorse and forward it to the Governing Council for consideration. He added that Professor Angela Hildyard, Principal of Woodsworth College, had been appointed to chair a task force to oversee the implementation of the proposal and would consider issues relating to financial aid, ancillary fees and summer and evening programs.

5. Academic Board Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council (cont'd)**(b) Item 6 – Faculty of Arts and Science: 2000-2001 Calendar Changes – 15-Credit BA/BSc Degrees: Discontinuation** (cont'd)

A member commented that there was an acknowledgement within many professional programs that students entering these programs required more preparation (writing skills and problem-solving techniques) and a wider breadth of knowledge. Statistics indicated the majority of students enrolled in professional programs at the University of Toronto had 20-credit degrees or more. Students who completed a 20-credit degree at the University would have better credentials for applying to professional programs, which were very competitive. He therefore viewed this as a positive step for students wishing to apply to professional faculties.

Increased time required for part-time students to obtain a degree. A member thanked Professor Sedra for the University's commitment to increased funding for part-time students. However, the real issue for many part-time students was the time required to complete their degree programs. This would be further exacerbated with the elimination of the 15 credit-degree and many students would choose not to attend the University of Toronto as a consequence. While ASSU had been represented within the Faculty's consultation process, she emphasized that it did not represent the interests of part-time students. A petition from part-time students would soon be delivered to members of the Governing Council asking them not to support the proposal. The University's objective to create a special niche was laudable; however, it would serve to disenfranchise the part-time student constituency. Currently there was tremendous value added to the combination of full- and part-time students in evening classes. This culture would be lost when part-time student enrolment declined as a result of the proposal.

The President interjected that the thrust of the proposal was in fact to strengthen offerings for part-time students and to make the University more accessible for this constituency (e.g. more financial aid and restructuring to enable continuous course offerings). APUS had long advocated these types of changes. The President believed that these changes would significantly enhance access for part-time students to the most highly valued degree in the Province, which was also comparable to the offerings of the strongest liberal arts institutions in North America.

The member countered that those students currently seeking a 15-credit degree believed this degree to be superlative compared to those offered at other universities. Two part-time students with whom she had consulted had indicated that they would not have enrolled at the University in the absence of the offering of a 15-credit degree given the length of time it would take to complete a 20-credit degree. She continued that the University of Toronto had historically been renowned among part-time students for the quality and accessibility of the education and services offered. She believed the proposal was not a positive step for part-time students.

The Chairman responded to an indication from a member of the Governing Council who wished to address the Committee. She clarified that such requests should be made in advance of the meeting; however, she would permit the member to comment.

5. Academic Board Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council (cont'd)**(b) Item 6 – Faculty of Arts and Science: 2000-2001 Calendar Changes – 15-Credit BA/BSc Degrees: Discontinuation** (cont'd)

The member of the Governing Council noted that the Students' Administrative Council and the Graduate Students' Union (GSU) had not been properly engaged in the consultation processes. The GSU was opposing the proposal because it affected the community of students with whom graduate students interacted. The Women's Centre was also opposed to the proposal because many part-time students were single parents who would not have the time or resources to complete a 20-credit degree. The member supported the need for a well-rounded liberal arts education; however, in practice many students had benefited from 15-credit degrees awarded by the University of Toronto. In conclusion, the individual agreed that there were many negative consequences of the proposal, as had been outlined by other members.

A member indicated his strong support for the proposal. Proper process had been followed in bringing the proposal forward and it enjoyed the strong support of the committees within the Faculty of Arts and Science and in the Academic Board and its two committees. For these reasons the proposal should be endorsed by the Executive Committee and placed on the agenda of the Governing Council so that debate of its merits could properly take place in that forum.

The Chairman echoed the member's comments. She noted that she had received and granted a request from Ms Manon LePaven, President, APUS, to address the Governing Council on this agenda item.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED

to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation

THAT the proposal for the discontinuation of the 15-credit BA and BSc degrees, as described in the Faculty of Arts and Science submission, dated February 14, 2000, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 99 of the Academic Board as Appendix "B", be approved, effective for students first registering in the Faculty of Arts and Science on the St. George Campus in the academic year 2001-2002 and at the University of Toronto at Mississauga at a time to be determined by the Vice-President and Provost and the Principal.

5. Academic Board Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council (cont'd)**(c) Item 9 - Academic Units: Disestablishment in the School of Graduate Studies and Re-establishment in the Faculty of Arts and Science**

Professor Mayhall explained the proposal that two centres move their organizational home from the School of Graduate Studies to the Faculty of Arts and Science. There were no budget implications since the budgets for the Centres would move with them. Students' registration and status would remain unchanged.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED

to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation

THAT the Centre for Comparative Literature be disestablished as an academic unit in the School of Graduate Studies and reestablished as the Centre for Comparative Literature in the Faculty of Arts and Science, effective May 1, 2000.

THAT the Centre for Medieval Studies be disestablished as an academic unit in the School of Graduate Studies and reestablished as the Centre for Medieval Studies in the Faculty of Arts and Science, effective May 1, 2000.

A copy of the documentation is attached to Report Number 99 of the Academic Board as Appendix "C"

(d) Item 10 - *A Framework for Enrolment Expansion at the University of Toronto*

Professor Mayhall noted that with the expected increase in demand for places at universities and colleges because of demographics and the double cohort, it was important that the University plan for future enrolment growth in a coherent manner, looking at the size and shape of the University, campus by campus. The document provided a framework for considering plans for enrolment growth. At the Academic Board meeting, the President had presented a brief overview of the *Framework* document, which had been followed by an extensive debate.

Members agreed that the administration should provide a brief Power Point presentation of the *Framework's* highlights at the Governing Council meeting. They also offered advice to the Chairman on the ordering of the Governing Council agenda.

5. Academic Board Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council (cont'd)**(d) Item 10 - *A Framework for Enrolment Expansion at the University of Toronto***

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED

to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation

THAT *A Framework for Enrolment Expansion at the University of Toronto*, dated March 2000, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 99 of the Academic Board as Appendix "E", be endorsed.

(e) Item 11 - Capital Plan: Update, 1997-2002

Professor Mayhall noted that recent positive announcements about the availability of capital funding had provided an opportunity, and indeed a need, to update the University's Capital Plan. The SuperBuild Growth Fund announcement had ensured that a number of projects in the Plan could go forward. These included the Centre for Information Technology, Phase I of the Health Sciences Complex, the proposed School of Communication, Culture and Information Technology at the University of Toronto at Mississauga and the Academic Resource Centre the University of Toronto at Scarborough. Additional details were contained in the Board's Report and in the appended Plan.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED

to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation

THAT the updated Capital Plan for 1997-2002, as described in Professor McCammond's schedule and memorandum, dated January 24, 2000, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 99 of the Academic Board as Appendix "F", be approved.

(f) Item 12 - Capital Project: King's College Road/Circle Precinct: Users' Committee Report

Professor Mayhall noted that one of the demonstration sites in the open space plan, *Investing in the Landscape*, involved King's College Road/Circle, Convocation Hall Plaza, Galbraith Road and Simcoe Hall. A Users' Committee had been struck for this project and it was proposed at this time that the Report of the Committee be approved in principle. Phase I of the project was the development of designs and working drawings. Phase II would be the construction of the project. The funding for the design and for part of the costs of the project would come from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund. Phase II would depend on the receipt of \$1.5 million of outside funding.

5. **Academic Board Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council** (cont'd)

(f) Item 12 - Capital Project: King's College Road/Circle Precinct: Users' Committee Report
(cont'd)

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED

to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation

THAT the Report of the King's College Circle Precinct Users' Committee, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 99 of the Academic Board as Appendix "G", be approved in principle;

THAT \$200,000 immediately be allocated from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund for Phase 1 of the project;

THAT \$2,500,000 be allocated from the UIIF for Phase 2 when outside funding of \$1,500,000 is obtained

(g) Item 13 - Academic Priorities Fund: Allocation - Joseph L. Rotman School of Management

Professor Mayhall noted that the Provost had proposed two one-time-only allocations in support of program quality enhancements and new academic appointments. The School was in an unusual position in that it did not have an approved academic plan. This was the result of a recent change in the School's leadership. In the normal course of events, the Provost would have brought forward recommendations for allocations from the Academic Priorities Fund in support of the division's academic plan. In this case he was proposing two one-time-only allocations. On-going base allocations for the division would be brought forward in conjunction with a new academic plan.

In response to a member's query, Professor Sedra clarified that the allocations to the School for faculty appointments were one-time-only. He would bring forward a recommendation for base-budget support when the School's academic and budget plan was completed.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED

to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation

THAT the following allocations be made from the Academic Priorities Fund to the Rotman School of Management:

- \$767,410 OTO in support of program quality enhancements
- \$413,563 OTO in support of new academic appointments.

6. External Appointments

(a) OISE/UT Advisory Board

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

THAT Suzanne Herbert be appointed to the OISE/UT Advisory Board until June 30, 2002.

(b) University of Toronto Investment Management Corporation

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

THAT the following be approved and nominated as members and directors of the new corporation to manage the University of Toronto's investments, for terms continuing to the next annual meeting of the voting members of the Corporation, and as provided in the draft By-Law Number 1 of the Corporation, and until their successors are appointed:

Robert W. Korthals (Senior Advisor to the President of the University,
Chair of the Board)

Jalynn H. Bennett

Robert J. Birgeneau (*ex officio*, from July 1, 2000)

H. Garfield Emerson (Member of the Business Board)

Russell J. Hiscock

Gordon J. Homer

Eric Kirzner (Professor, Rotman School of Management)

Anthony R. Melman

James J. Mossman

J. Robert S. Prichard (*ex officio*, until June 30, 2000)

Andrea Rosen

Joseph L. Rotman (Member of the Governing Council)

Robert G. White (*ex officio*)

7. Part-time Undergraduate Student Governor – Extended Term

The Chairman noted that members had received a memorandum from the Chair of the Elections Committee, Ms Wendy Talfourd-Jones, and the Secretary of the Governing Council concerning this matter.

7. **Part-time Undergraduate Student Governor – Extended Term** (cont'd)

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

THAT the individual elected in the current part-time undergraduate student election serve on Governing Council immediately upon election and until June 30, 2001.

8. **Governing Council: Committee Assignment, 1999-2000**

The Chairman drew members' attention to a revised recommendation that had been placed on the table.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

THAT Mr. Vilko Zbogar be appointed a member of the Elections Committee for the remainder of the 1999-2000 academic year.

THAT the individual elected in the current part-time undergraduate student election be assigned to the Academic Board and the University Affairs Board for the remainder of the 1999-2000 academic year.

9. **Reports for Information**

Members had received the following reports for information.

Report Number 99 of the Academic Board
Report Number 103 of the Business Board
Report Number 90 of the University Affairs Board

10. **Report of the President**

(a) **Reappointment of the Chancellor**

The President noted that he was very pleased to report the reappointment by the College of Electors of the Honourable Henry N. R. Jackman as Chancellor of the University for a second three-year term.

(b) **Occupation of the President's Office**

The President consulted with members *in camera* on occupations of his Office.

10. Report of the President (cont'd)**(c) Licensing and the University of Toronto Logo**

The President noted that the administration continued to make good progress in its drafting of a code that would address the issue of conditions for workers producing apparel bearing the University of Toronto name. Consultations had been superb and he credited Professor Brian Langille for suggesting a public symposium on the issue. The President continued that at present the administration was very close to having a final policy statement which could be forwarded to the University Affairs Board and, if endorsed in that forum, to the Governing Council. At dispute was the inclusion in the code of a requirement for a "living wage". The University was not aware of a sufficiently well-defined and commonly accepted notion of a living wage and was, therefore, reluctant to include a requirement in its code for licensees that could not be clearly articulated and/or enforced. However, the administration was committed to continued discussion of this matter. He expected that the issue would be addressed appropriately when the code was brought forward to governance.

(d) Consultants' Report on the Execution of the Graduate House and Munk Centre Projects

The President noted that Professor Michael Finlayson had briefed members of the Business Board on this matter in closed session at its meeting earlier in the day.

(e) Investment Management Corporation: Appointment of CEO

The President was pleased to report that following an international search the University had hired the first Chief Executive Officer for the newly created investment management corporation. The President had briefed members of the Business Board in closed session on this appointment and on the proposed members of the Board of Directors for the corporation.

(f) Hospital for Sick Children / Dr. Gideon Koren

The President had briefed members on this matter at the previous meeting and now reported that the Hospital and the University were in the final stages of reaching closure on this matter.

(g) Dr. Chun

The President recalled his commitment to provide members of the Governing Council with briefing books concerning Dr. Chun's dispute against the University. Vice-Provost David Cook was currently preparing this documentation, which would be sent to governors the following week. The President indicated that it was not yet known whether the University would be permitted to make public and, therefore, include in this documentation its response to the Ontario Human Rights Commission. In the event the Commission preferred that the document not be made public, the President would consult with the Chairman on how

10. Report of the President (cont'd)

to proceed. The President added that the University's submission to the Commission would refute the charges made by Dr. Chun and the Commission's investigator and reiterate the superiority of Professor Yip's investigation and report.

(h) Personnel Matter

The President drew members' attention to an article that had appeared in a Toronto newspaper citing the concerns of a former employee, Ms Helen Simson, who had served as Convenor, Equity Issues Advisory Group, and Coordinator, *DISABILITY* Services for Students, with her apparent lack of access to the senior administration. This was the first time that the President had been made aware of this concern and it was his view that on no occasion had such a concern been expressed to him by Ms Simson in person or in writing.

(i) Federal Budget

The President briefed the Committee on the recently announced federal budget, which he characterized as very welcome, both for the University of Toronto and for university research across Canada. The new announcement had included a significant reinvestment in the Canada Foundation for Innovation. The CFI had been extended by three years to 2005 and would have an additional \$900 million for research infrastructure needs.

Among the key initiatives in the announcement was the federal government's commitment to funding 2,000 chairs through its Canada Research Chairs program. Announced in last October's Throne Speech, the program was originally to support 1,200 chairs with another 800 to be funded at a later date. The government would commit \$900 million over five years for the full 2,000 chairs.

(j) Provincial Government: Funding Announcement

The President briefed members on the provincial government's announcement with respect to operating funding for 2000-2001. Beyond re-announcing the flow-through funding for ATOP, there were four important components.

1. An increase of 1% (\$16.5 million for the university system) for growth funding.
2. An increase of 1% (\$16.5 million for the system) for performance funding.
3. Removing the existing pay equity funding from the current special pay equity envelope and folding it into the basic operating grants.
4. Limiting tuition increases for regulated programs to 2% per year for each of the next five years.

10. Report of the President (cont'd)**(j) Provincial Government: Funding Announcement** (cont'd)

The President noted that growth funding would be allocated to universities based on their proportional share of increased undergraduate BIUs from a base of 1999-2000. However in order to participate in this fund at all, there was a threshold condition of admitting at least as many first year undergraduates in September 2000 as the University had in September 1999. This was very problematic for the University given that last September it had over-shot its enrolment goal, particularly in Arts and Science by over 1000 students. Furthermore, even if the University met the threshold condition, the growth funds would be allocated to those institutions that had grown the most and the growth funding per student would be but a fraction of full average cost funding.

The performance funding would be based in equal part on three criteria: employment rates six months after graduation, employment rates twenty-four months after graduation and graduation rates. The data supporting these measures were problematic and the results might well be capricious.

The President continued that reallocation of pay equity funding was very hurtful to the University of Toronto. The University had been a full participant in the pay equity program when it had been created in 1990 and had made the appropriate base salary adjustments at that time. Some other universities had not participated to the same extent. As a result, the University's share of the pay equity funding was significantly greater than its share of the basic operating grants. The effect, therefore, of folding the pay equity money into the base operating grants was to disadvantage the University by approximately 0.5% of the operating budget. The University would experience this as a net reduction in its provincial operating grant of 0.5%. The University had strongly advocated against this change but the government had ignored the advice to the University's detriment.

The Province had also announced a new tuition fee policy for regulated programs. In simplest terms, it had announced that tuition might increase by only 2% a year for each of the next five years for a total of 10% over five years. This had radically reduced institutional flexibility with respect to tuition fee revenue and would prevent individual universities from developing differentiated strategies based on tuition fees. The University's deregulated programs (graduate and professional) were unaffected by this announcement.

The Province had made no announcement about its plans for growth funding beyond the 1% for 2000-2001.

The President noted that the total effect of these various announcements was clearly extremely negative for the University of Toronto. The increase in funding was clearly inadequate to meet the challenge of growth; the absence of any funds for quality enhancement was very disappointing; the allocation of the "performance funding" was

based on questionable and incomplete criteria and the amount available did not even cover the cost of inflation; the reallocation of pay equity was very hurtful to the

10. Report of the President (cont'd)**(j) Provincial Government: Funding Announcement** (cont'd)

University; and the lack of tuition flexibility was a very unwelcome constraint for the University and the university system as a whole; and the net effect of all of this was that the University would receive new base operating funds at only .33%, an amount much less than other institutions and much less than was needed. This meant that an immediate and substantial budget cut was required for the University.

The President noted that in the absence of a serious commitment to new funds commensurate with the growth and demand for places, it was inevitable that access would be sacrificed and quality would be eroded. Furthermore, the impending double cohort in 2003 underlined the fundamental need for a planned and fully funded expansion of places for first-year students.

The Chairman, joined by her counterparts at York University and Ryerson Polytechnic University, had met with the Minister to restate the problems faced if funding for Ontario universities continued to lag behind the demand for admission. The President and other university presidents would be meeting with the Minister shortly.

The Committee had a lengthy discussion of the consequences to the University's budget of this announcement.

11. Date of Next Meeting

The Chairman reminded members of the next meeting scheduled for Monday, May 1, at 7 p.m.

12. Other Business**(a) Governing Council Meeting: Location**

The Chairman reminded members that the April 6 meeting of the Governing Council was scheduled to be held at the University of Toronto at Mississauga and would be followed by a reception in the Principal's residence.

Members noted that a number of scheduling conflicts, including the Public Policy Forum, which would involve several members, would make it difficult for members to travel to and from the Mississauga campus for this meeting and still participate in the Forum. The Chairman undertook to reconsider the location for the next meeting in light of the concerns raised.

The meeting adjourned at 9:55 p.m.

Secretary

Chairman

March 29, 2000