

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL
**REPORT NUMBER 394 OF
THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

Thursday, March 9, 2006

To the Governing Council,
University of Toronto.

Your Committee reports that it held a meeting on Thursday, March 9, 2006 at 5:00 p.m. in the Boardroom, Simcoe Hall, with the following members present:

Ms Rose M. Patten (In the Chair)
Mr. John F. (Jack) Petch, Vice-Chair *
Professor C. David Naylor,
President

Ms Holly Andrews-Taylor
The Honourable William G. Davis

Ms Susan Eng

Dr. Shari Graham Fell

Mr. Ran Goel

Professor Michael R. Marrus

Mr. Timothy Reid

Professor Arthur S. Ripstein

Professor Barbara Sherwood Lollar

Non-Voting Member:

Mr. Louis R. Charpentier

Secretariat:

Mr. Henry Mulhall, Secretary

Ms Margaret McKone

* Participated by telephone.

Regrets:

Mr. P.C. Choo

Mr. Robert S. Weiss

In Attendance:

Professor Raymond Cummins, Chair, Academic Board and member of the Governing Council

Ms Jacqueline Orange, Chair, Business Board and member of the Governing Council

Professor Vivek Goel, Vice-President and Provost and member of the Governing Council

Ms Catherine Riggall, Vice-President, Business Affairs

Dr. Chris Cunningham, Special Advisor to the President

On motion duly moved and seconded,

IT WAS RESOLVED

THAT, pursuant to sections 28 (e) and 33 of *By-Law Number 2*, consideration of items 1 and 2 take place *in camera*, with the Board Chairs, Vice-Presidents and Special Advisor to the President admitted to facilitate the work of the Committee.

1. External Appointments

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

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

THAT the following individuals be approved and nominated as members and directors of the University of Toronto Asset Management Corporation for one year terms until the 2007 annual meeting of the Corporation and until their successors are appointed.

Ira Gluskin (Chair)
Joseph L. Rotman (Vice Chair)
Felix P. Chee (*ex officio*)
Catherine A. Delaney
William E. Hewitt
Eric F. Kirzner
Anthony R. Melman
Florence Minz (Member, Governing Council)
Robert W. Morrison
James J. Mossman
David Naylor (*ex officio*)
Catherine J. Riggall (*ex officio*)
Thomas H. Simpson

(b) Sunnybrook and Women's College Health Sciences Centre

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

THAT Dr. Doris Guyatt be appointed to the Board of Directors of Sunnybrook and Women's College Health Sciences Centre, for a term from March 9, 2006 to June 30, 2008.

THAT Ms Virginia McLaughlin be reappointed to the Board of Directors of Sunnybrook and Women's College Health Sciences Centre, for a term of one year from July 1, 2006 to June 30, 2007; and

THAT Ms Virginia McLaughlin be reappointed as Chair of the Board of Directors of Sunnybrook and Women's College Health Sciences Centre, for a term of one year from July 1, 2006 to June 30, 2007.

2. Office of the University Ombudsperson: Review

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

2. Office of the University Ombudsperson: Review (cont'd)

THE mandate and membership of the Committee to Review the Office of the University Ombudsperson, as outlined in the memorandum from the Chair of the Governing Council dated March 7, 2006, attached hereto as [Appendix "A"](#).

The Committee returned to closed session.

3. Report of the Previous Meeting

Report Number 393 of the Executive Committee meeting held on January 26, 2006 was approved.

4. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting

There was no business arising from the report of the previous meeting.

5. Minutes of the Governing Council Meeting

Members received for information the minutes of the Governing Council meeting held on February 9, 2006.

6. Business Arising from the Governing Council Meeting

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

7. Report of the President**(a) Chancellor Search**

The President reported that the College of Electors had completed its search for a new Chancellor for the University. On March 8, 2006, the College had elected the Honourable David R. Peterson as the University's 32nd Chancellor, to take office on July 1, 2006 for a three-year term. The announcement had been widely publicized, both inside and outside the University, and had received a very favourable response.

(b) External Relations

The President's Advisory Committee on External Relations (PACER) had continued to meet regularly, and the search to fill the new position of Vice-President, University Relations was progressing well. Interviews of candidates were underway, and the process was anticipated to be completed in April. In the discussion that followed, it was suggested that, prior to the Executive Committee and Governing Council meetings where senior appointments were to be considered, an *in camera* briefing be arranged to allow members of the Executive Committee to be given advance notice of proposed appointments.

(c) Provincial Government Relations

The President reported that the Provincial Government had announced its new tuition fee framework and student assistance plans on March 8, 2006. Under the new multi-year framework, the overall institutional average increase in tuition fees was to be limited to 5% in any year. Fee increases of up to 4.5% would be allowed for first-year students in most programs, and up to 8% in the first year of professional and graduate programs. For students already enrolled in their programs, annual increases would be limited to 4%. Given the preponderance of continuing students at the University, it was unlikely that the institutional

7. Report of the President (cont'd)**(c) Provincial Government Relations (cont'd)**

average increase in fees would reach the 5% maximum that was allowed. This was a very different framework from the previous one which had deregulated fees for professional programs while capping tuition increases for first-entry programs at 2% *per annum*. The University was already in the process of developing a tuition schedule to reflect the Government's new policy. It would be presented to the Business Board, from which it would proceed to the Governing Council.

As expected, the Government's announcement had produced a variety of reactions, ranging from those who had considered it a missed opportunity to institute full tuition fee deregulation, to those, including some student groups, who had argued for a continuation of the tuition freeze. The University considered the framework to be a reasoned compromise which allowed limited tuition increases coupled with improvements to the student aid system and a strong commitment by the Government to accessibility in post-secondary education. The University's existing policies with respect to accessibility would serve it well in ensuring compliance with the new regulations, and had frequently been cited as models for other institutions to emulate.

On a related matter, the President confirmed that the Provincial Government had accepted the University's position concerning a calculation error with respect to unfunded Basic Income Units (BIUs). The result would be the restoration of \$3.5 million of base funding which had been previously anticipated.

(d) Federal Government Relations

At the federal level, the University was making good progress in establishing dialogue and developing relationships with federal ministers, their staffs and members of the civil service. One of the key topics of discussion continued to be increased funding to cover a greater percentage of the indirect costs of research.

During discussion, a member asked if the Provincial Government's tuition fee announcement had addressed any of the long-term issues, such as funding for capital projects, raised in the Rae Report (*Ontario – A Leader in Learning*). The President responded that the framework represented a cautious response to the Report, and had also not addressed issues such as deferred maintenance or the introduction of an income-contingent loan repayment system.

A member asked if the University would set aside a particular percentage of additional revenues arising from tuition increases to enhance internal student bursaries, as had been the case for a number of years prior to 2004 when a 30% 'set aside' had been required. The Provost responded that the new tuition framework required universities to make guarantees with respect to student access. Whereas previously, the emphasis had been on process and a 30% 'set aside', the new system would focus on outcomes and accountability. In any case, the University's existing commitments to maintain accessibility would likely require it to continue to spend a similar amount on student aid as in recent years. What had changed was that the Government had made significant enhancements to the provincial student aid system, in particular by providing more support for students from middle-income families. This could assist the University in maintaining accessibility.

A member asked if the University's policies would have to be revised in light of the Government's plan to require universities to make guarantees with respect to student access. The Provost responded that nothing in the University's current policies was inconsistent with

7. Report of the President (cont'd)**(d) Federal Government Relations (cont'd)**

the new requirements, and that these policies were likely to serve as a model for other universities to follow. A member commented that it would be important to communicate effectively the University's ongoing commitment to accessibility and the provision of student aid, when announcements were made concerning tuition increases.

A member asked if the 8% cap on tuition increases in the first year of professional programs would constrain the plans of the University's professional faculties for future growth. The Provost responded that these faculties would have to operate within the cap, and that those which had anticipated larger tuition increases would have to revise their plans accordingly. He added that the University would not be increasing tuition by the maximum 8% for all graduate and professional programs.

A member asked if increased tuition revenues would allow the University to mitigate the effects of the budget cuts planned for upcoming years. The Provost responded that the effect would be minimal in the first year, but perhaps more significant in subsequent years.

A member asked if the new tuition framework provided an accountability mechanism to ensure that increases in tuition would bring about an improved quality of education and not restrict accessibility. The President responded that the Government intended to address the quality of education by establishing a higher education quality council, and by requiring multi-year accountability agreements with universities. Unfortunately, the total amount of new funding that would flow from the 'Reaching Higher' commitments and the tuition framework would have only a limited impact on key determinants of quality, such as the student-to-faculty ratio. Within the University, as had been the previous practice, divisions that sought to increase tuition by more than 5% would have to propose appropriate uses of the funds that would enhance quality. Similarly, outcomes-based accountability agreements would be required of universities with respect to accessibility. The Government and universities were in the process of determining what metrics should be used to ensure that accessibility guarantees were being met. These would likely include participation rates, levels of indebtedness, and socio-economic profiles, but such metrics were even more difficult to establish than those used to measure quality. A member asked if the Government would require the establishment of specific targets with respect to accessibility, and the President responded that such a task would be very complex, requiring analysis of the entire pool of potential incoming students on the basis of such factors as household income, individual qualifications, and individual aspirations.

A member expressed his appreciation to the President and senior administration for the exemplary manner in which the University had handled the occurrence of a number of controversial student-sponsored events on campus in recent weeks.

8. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to Governing Council***(a) Arising from Report Number 141 of the Academic Board (February 16, 2006)******Item 5 – Faculty of Medicine and University of Toronto at Mississauga: New Medical Academy***

Professor Cummins reported that this proposal to establish a new clinical home for 36 medical students at the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM) had been developed as part of the

8. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to Governing Council (cont'd)***(a) Arising from Report Number 141 of the Academic Board (February 16, 2006)***
*(cont'd)**Item 5 – Faculty of Medicine and University of Toronto at Mississauga: New Medical Academy(cont'd)*

planned expansion of the M.D. program by a total of 104 students. The particular focus of the new UTM Academy would be community-based medicine, and it would operate in partnership with the Mississauga community-affiliated hospitals. It would assist particularly in training students planning to enter family practice and community-focused specialty practices, and would complement the existing Academies based at the more specialized teaching hospitals in Toronto. The recommendation had had the strong support of both the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs and the Planning and Budget Committee, and had been approved overwhelmingly by the Academic Board.

A member asked what the source of the capital funding for this project would be, and what effect it would have on the University's borrowing capacity for its capital program. The Provost responded that there had been an allocation of \$14 million of capital funding from the Provincial Government, provided in the form of a stream of payments over a 20-year period. The Vice-President, Business Affairs was assessing the impact on borrowing. Another member asked whether the Academy would accommodate new student spaces, or rather spaces reassigned from existing Academies. The Provost responded that the new Academy would house 30 new and 6 reassigned spaces. It had been determined that a minimum of 36 spaces was required to allow the Academy to function effectively, thus necessitating the reassignment of a small number of spaces from other Academies. It was expected that the new Academy could eventually be expanded, provided the Provincial Government decided to provide funding for new spaces in the M.D. program in coming years.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

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

THAT a new Academy of the Faculty of Medicine, based at the University of Toronto at Mississauga, in partnership with the Mississauga community-affiliated hospitals, be approved as submitted.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 141 of the Academic Board as Appendix "A".

Item 6 – School of Graduate Studies: Department of Health Policy, Management and Evaluation: Master of Management of Innovation Program

Professor Cummins reported that this was a proposal for a new, twelve-month, professional master's program in management that would focus on the innovation process in the health care sector. The program would be housed at UTM with academic oversight provided by the Graduate Department of Health Policy, Management and Evaluation. The Planning and Budget Committee had been satisfied that the proposed program was consistent with UTM's academic plan which emphasized the establishment of new professional master's degree programs. While intended to train managers for innovative health-related companies, it would

8. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to Governing Council (cont'd)***(a) Arising from Report Number 141 of the Academic Board (February 16, 2006)***
*(cont'd)**Item 6 – School of Graduate Studies: Department of Health Policy, Management and Evaluation: Master of Management of Innovation Program (cont'd)*

include many broad courses in the management of innovation, be widely applicable, and could be expanded in scope over time.

A member asked whether the Joseph L. Rotman School of Management would be involved with this program, and was informed by the Provost that faculty appointed to the School would have a teaching role. A member expressed concern about the dispersal of graduate programs to the east and west campuses, arguing that intensification on the St. George campus was preferable. A long-term plan was needed that would address issues related to the University's tri-campus structure, including the appropriate location for the proposed expansion of graduate studies. A member responded that the east and west campuses had already established a number of highly successful professional master's degree programs, and that faculty on those campuses preferred to be able to be conduct their teaching in graduate programs without commuting to the St. George campus. The existence of on-campus graduate programs would also enhance the University's ability to recruit new faculty members to positions based at the UTM and UTSC campuses. Another member commented that the aspirations of the east and west campuses to house graduate programs should be taken into consideration, given that they were now comparable in size to a number of the Province's freestanding universities. The President responded that positive discussions about tri-campus strategic planning were underway, and that working groups had been established to consider both academic and administrative issues. The tri-campus implications of the proposed expansion of graduate studies would be a very significant topic for consideration, and part of the discussion of the larger issue of differentiation within and between universities.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

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

THAT the Master of Management of Innovation Program, to be offered through the Department of Health Policy, Management and Evaluation, be approved, effective September 2006.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 141 of the Academic Board as Appendix "B".

9. Creation of the Position of Assistant Vice-President, Strategic Communications

The President reported that his recommendation for the creation of the new position of Assistant Vice-President, Strategic Communications followed from an external review of communications and public affairs in late 2004, a review of the Division of University Advancement in early 2005, and extensive internal consultation. The new position would be associated with the restructuring of the communications functions within the Division of University Advancement, and the primary reporting line would be to the new Vice President, University Relations when s/he was recruited. In addition, the position would have a 'dotted-line' relationship with the President, so as to be able to communicate directly with the President, and to ensure that strategic communications inside and outside the University reflected Presidential priorities.

9. Creation of the Position of Assistant Vice-President, Strategic Communications
(cont'd)

A discussion followed concerning the merits of the use of the word 'branding' in the position description provided to members. Some members felt that such an exercise was more appropriate to a corporate setting rather than a university environment, and might not be positively received by some members of the University community. Others felt that branding should be an essential function for the University in order to differentiate itself in an increasingly competitive international market. The President closed the discussion by commenting that the wording in the documentation could readily be revised, but that branding or social marketing would need to be among the functions of this portfolio.

A member asked if the University had specific targets with respect to the recruitment of international students. The Provost responded that the *Stepping UP* academic plan had called for a doubling of international student enrolment from 6% to 12% of the total student body, and he expected that this target would likely be achieved by 2010.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

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

THAT the creation of the position of Assistant Vice-President, Strategic Communications, be approved.

In Camera Briefing

The Committee moved *in camera* pursuant to Section 28 (e) and (f) of the Governing Council *By-Law Number 2*.

The President briefed the Committee on a confidential personnel matter.

The Committee returned to closed session.

10. Executive Committee and Governing Council Meeting Date Changes

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

THAT the Executive Committee meeting scheduled for Wednesday, April 12, 2006 at 12:00 p.m. be re-scheduled for Friday, April 21, 2006 at 12:00 p.m., and,

THAT the Governing Council meeting scheduled for Thursday, April 27, 2006 at 4:30 p.m. be re-scheduled for Monday, May 1, 2006 at 4:30 p.m.

11. Reports for Information

Members received five reports for information.

- (a) Report Number 139 of the Academic Board (December 8, 2005)
- (b) Report Number 140 of the Academic Board (January 12, 2006)
- (c) Report Number 141 of the Academic Board (February 16, 2006)

11. Reports for Information (cont'd)

- (d) Report Number 146 of the Business Board (January 16, 2006)
- (e) Report Number 132 of the University Affairs Board (January 17, 2006)

12. Date of the Next Meeting

Members were reminded that the next regular meeting of the Executive Committee was scheduled for Friday, April 21, 2006 at 12:00 p.m.

13. Other Business**(a) Restructuring of Biological Sciences Departments**

A member asked for an update on a question asked at the Executive Committee meeting of January 26, 2006 regarding the effects on administrative and support staff levels of the disestablishment of the Departments of Botany and Zoology, and the creation of the Departments of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, and Cell and Systems Biology. The Provost responded that the reorganization of these departments had not resulted in a reduction in the number of staff positions, and that the number might well increase once the process was completed. An organizational review had been carried out, chaired by the Director of Human Resources in the Faculty of Arts and Science. As a result, 18 staff members had received reorganization notices, 5 of whom held positions that were being eliminated. These 5 positions would be replaced with new positions, and some of the 5 individuals would be eligible for the new positions. Local 1998 of the United Steel Workers of America had been fully involved in the process, and all relevant collective agreement provisions had been followed.

(b) Chair's Activities

The Chair reported that she would be the keynote speaker at the annual conference of the National Association of University Board Chairs and Secretaries (NAUBCS) to be held in Edmonton from April 27- 29, 2006. Her address would focus on principles of good governance, including best practice in corporate and academic settings. She had also been invited to become Chair, in June 2006, of the Council of Chairs of Ontario Universities (CCOU). This Council was intended to provide a high-level forum for university board chairs to discuss such issues as governance and accountability in the use of public funds. In addition, it would seek to communicate the needs of the provincial university system as a whole to the Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities, and the Premier, in a manner that was not possible for university presidents.

There was no other business.

The meeting adjourned at 6:40 p.m.

Secretary
March 15, 2006

Chair