



UNIVERSITY OF
TORONTO

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

**REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE TO REVIEW THE UTM AND UTSC
CAMPUS COUNCILS (CRCC)**

**Approved by the CRCC November 17, 2014
Amended and Approved for Endorsement and Forwarding to Governing Council
by Executive Committee December 1, 2014**

CONTENTS

Summary: 3

Background: 6

Committee to Review the UTM and UTSC Campus Councils (CRCC): 8

 Composition of the CRCC: 9

 CRCC Work Plan: 10

CRCC Findings: 11

 The Governance Model: 11

 Academic Affairs Committees (AACs): 12

 Campus Affairs Committees (CACs): 13

 Membership: 15

 Orientation and Awareness of Members: 17

Recommendations: 18

COMMITTEE TO REVIEW THE UTM AND UTSC CAMPUS COUNCILS

FINAL REPORT

The following report and recommendations of the Committee to Review the UTM and UTSC Campus Councils (CRCC) are the result of consultations undertaken by the Committee during the period September 2014 to November 2014. The Committee was mandated to evaluate the efficacy of the model and to report its findings and recommendations to Governing Council in December 2014.

SUMMARY:

The CRCC's consultations affirmed that there is broad recognition that the model works and that its creation was a timely and positive response to the University of Toronto's flourishing tri-campus reality. There is general satisfaction with, and support for, the new governance model and an appreciation that the model is still very young (one year). Most of the issues and concerns raised during the CRCC's review can be addressed through improvements to existing practices and through enhanced communications – within governance bodies and more broadly within the campus community – in order to nourish a culture of engagement with governance structures, processes and business. Given that it has only been one year since the implementation of the model, the CRCC recommends that the Governing Council undertake a follow-up review in three years' time.

The Committee's recommendations include two recommendations for consideration by Governing Council, and several recommendations intended to enhance current practice at the Campus Council and Standing Committee levels.

Recommendations to Governing Council:

(a) Follow-up Review

The CRCC recommends that the Governing Council initiate a follow-up review of the governance model in three years' time, that is, in the 2017-18 academic year, by which time the new model will have matured further and more information will be available from experience.

(b) Membership

As part of a general review of the distribution of elected seats for the administrative staff, teaching staff, and student estate seats on the Governing Council, the CRCC recommends that the Elections Committee consider allocating one full-time undergraduate seat on the Governing Council for each of UTM and UTSC.

On the question of the Vice-Principal and Dean holding membership on the Campus Council, the CRCC found that an appropriate solution is to continue using Non-Voting Assessor appointments (which are discretionary) to address the need for specific portfolio representation or expertise where it is deemed appropriate, without enacting changes to the Terms of Reference. In addition, the Committee suggests considering the inclusion of the Vice-Principal, Research, on the Campus Affairs Committees as a Non-Voting Assessor, in addition to their membership on the Academic Affairs Committees as Voting Assessors.

Recommendations to Enhance Current Practice:

c) Increasing the amount of meaningful discourse

A key finding of this review was the desire to increase the amount of meaningful discourse in the Councils and their Committees. In this regard, we recommend that the Chairs, Assessors and Secretariat continue in their efforts to:

- Ensure that documentation and presentations on items focus on the governance “prisms” of mission or mandate oversight and financial oversight. The intent is to promote open and robust discussion of the matter(s) at hand while observing the separation of governance and operations.
- Use education sessions related to specific agenda items, and the committee’s particular responsibilities for those items. Planning should be done in the context of the Chair of the Governing Council’s ongoing efforts to enhance orientation and education across the Governing Council’s Boards and Committees.
- Invite additional expertise on an *ad hoc* basis to inform discussion related to items such as academic programs. The Committee heard that this is already the practice on some of the bodies under review, and encourages the replication of the practice where appropriate.
- Implement mechanisms which address the specific need for open and robust dialogue of academic matters with the participation of senior academic administrators.
- Provide members of governance bodies with greater clarity on expectations with regard to their individual role within a given governance body, for example the kinds of questions that are appropriate to the Terms of Reference, alongside existing efforts to familiarize members with the mandate, role and activities of the governance body as a whole.
- Provide information on proposals that are in planning and development stages and which may potentially come before the governance body at a later time. For some major items, it may be appropriate for the Assessor to provide draft preliminary documentation to the body for discussion and input. The Committee understands that this practice is already being observed in some cases.
- Proposals to establish Extra-Departmental Units (EDUs) could, as a matter of practice, be considered at the Academic Affairs Committees for review and

discussion prior to the Campus Affairs Committees' consideration and recommendation for approval.

d) Awareness of and Participation in the Governance Process

The Committee recognizes the need for ongoing efforts to raise awareness of the importance of governance and the value of participating in its processes. In that regard, we also encourage Chairs, Vice-Chairs, Assessors, the Secretariat, and members to continue to identify and recruit interested prospective governance members. The impact of such efforts to increase awareness and participation could be enhanced by:

- Stating that an expectation of membership in a governing body is to communicate news of the business of governance to members of their estates.
- Augmenting the use of existing communications mechanisms on each campus to ensure information is distributed within Departments.
- Department Chairs and Academic Directors specifically encouraging and supporting faculty and staff to run for election to governance bodies.

The Committee also recommends that the Chairs of the Campus Councils report to Executive Committee on progress-to-date in one year's time with regard to the above-noted recommendations aimed at enhancing discourse, awareness and participation.

BACKGROUND:

As part of the University's [Towards 2030](#) planning exercise, a [Task Force on Governance](#) was established in 2007. During the first phase of its work, the Task Force was charged with identification of problems in order to clarify what worked well in governance and what did not. The Task Force concluded that there was no compelling reason to move away from the University's unicameral system of governance and that representation of the five key estates (administrative staff, alumni, students, teaching staff and Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council appointees) should be preserved.

A core belief articulated by the Task Force was that the essential role of governance is to provide guidance on the University's long-term strategic directions and to provide active oversight of the University's management and that its role is not to duplicate that of the University's administration. Among many principles of good governance, the University's model needed to be compatible with the University's mission and it needed to be multi-dimensional, given the various and complex characteristics of the University. Following from this, a key outcome of the first phase was the conclusion that the University's governance must address the complexity of decision-making and improve governance oversight of all three campuses.

During the second phase, the Task Force focused on determining solutions to concerns identified previously, along with other enhancements to governance. Among the recommendations emerging from phase two of the Task Force on Governance, one spoke explicitly to the creation of governance bodies, as part of the Governing Council structure, related to matters specific to the UTM and UTSC campuses. Specifically, the Task Force recommended "the establishment of campus affairs committees for each of the three campuses to focus on campus, staff and student life matters specific to those campuses" (Recommendation 20).

The Task Force completed its Report on June 22, 2010. Following a full discussion, and addresses by representatives of two of the four Representative Student Committees,¹ the Report was approved in principle, and an Implementation Committee was established by the Governing Council on [October 28, 2010](#).² The mandate of the Implementation Committee included oversight and coordination of the implementation of a number of the Task Force's recommendations, including the recommendation for the establishment of campus affairs committees as outlined above.

¹ The Representative Student Committees are the Students' Administrative Council (operating as the University of Toronto Students Union, UTSU), the Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students (APUS), the Graduate Students' Union (GSU), and the Scarborough Campus Students' Union (SCSU). For the purposes of the Review, the Erindale College Student Union (operating as the University of Toronto Mississauga Students' Union, UTMSU) is treated as if it is a Representative Student Committee.

² See: http://uoft.me/GOVERNING_COUNCIL2010Oct28

Report of the Task Force on Governance (June 2010):

Recommendation 20 – Re-assign Selected Responsibilities to Academic Board, Business Board, Executive Committee and Campus Affairs Committees

THAT the Governing Council Secretariat, in consultation with relevant Board Chairs and Vice-Chairs, Presidential Assessors and Vice-Presidential designates from the UTM and UTSC campuses, develop a proposal for the Executive Committee’s consideration regarding

- *the establishment of campus affairs committees for each of the three campuses to focus on campus, staff and student life matters specific to those campuses;*
- *assignment of current human resources, investment and security responsibilities of the University Affairs Board to the Academic and Business Boards; and*
- *assignment of elections oversight responsibilities to the Executive Committee, with the Elections Committee reporting to the Governing Council through the Executive Committee.*

The Implementation Committee formed an *ad hoc* Working Group on Tri-Campus Matters which was charged with exploring in detail the manner in which Recommendation 20 could be realized.³ The Working Group advanced the idea that the structures and processes developed for the UTM and UTSC campuses should be expected to enhance campus-based decision-making and ensure accountability with respect to that responsibility. It also emphasized that, in future, the governance structure should also be responsive or easily adapted to changes to the institution’s administrative organization.

Independently, governance review committees were established at UTM and UTSC, which provided significant and essential input to the Working Group in the formulation of its recommendations.

Ultimately, the proposed structure included a Campus Council and three Standing Committees on each campus: an Academic Affairs Committee; a Campus Affairs Committee; and a formal agenda setting body for each Campus Council (the Agenda Committee, which, with expanded membership, would also serve as a Nominating Committee).

The Working Group consulted widely, and especially within the UTM and UTSC campus communities, regarding the mandates and design of the governance bodies that would have

³ Note: The Implementation Committee concluded that with respect to the St. George Campus, the campus-specific duties should be included in the Terms of Reference of the University Affairs Board along with the University-wide responsibilities for policy and oversight it would continue to have as recommended by the Task Force.

responsibilities with respect to these two campuses. A summary of the consultation activities and the outcome of these are summarized in the documentation provided to members of the Governing Council for its meeting held on [June 25, 2012](#).⁴ This memorandum, which also summarized the proposed Terms of Reference of the Campus Councils (revised as a result of the consultation process), included the following:

“As with any change process, implementation will highlight the need to refine and re-calibrate – and sometimes re-think – particular elements of a new model or process. Given the scope and importance of the proposed approach, the introduction of Campus Councils will merit a careful review. In this context, we would recommend that there be a review undertaken by the Governing Council after the first full year of operation.”

At this meeting, the Governing Council approved the Terms of Reference of the Campus Councils and Standing Committees, a requirement that quorum provisions be reconsidered, and the following:

*“THAT, following the first year of operation, the Governing Council conduct a review of the new model to determine its effectiveness and any changes that might be necessary.”*⁵

The Campus Councils and their Standing Committees came into effect on July 1, 2013, and each of the bodies held their first meetings in the fall of 2013.

COMMITTEE TO REVIEW THE UTM AND UTSC CAMPUS COUNCILS (CRCC):

The CRCC was established to fulfill the Governing Council’s June 25, 2014 resolution to conduct a review of the manner in which the Campus Councils and their Standing Committees operated in the 2013-14 academic year. Specifically, the tasks of the CRCC were to: evaluate the efficacy of the model and the manner in which it had been implemented, report its findings, and recommend refinements that would enhance the ability of the Campus Councils and their Committees to execute their respective mandates. The CRCC was mandated to report to Governing Council in December 2014.

The CRCC’s [Terms of Reference](#)⁶ defined the areas of inquiry for the review process, including review of: the overall efficacy of the governance model, aspects of the Terms of Reference of the Academic Affairs Committees (AACs) and the Campus Affairs Committees (CACs) and ways to improve these Terms of Reference, membership issues, namely the identification, recruitment, election, selection of members, as well as the orientation, awareness, and on-going education of members.

⁴ <http://uoft.me/CCsProposedQuorum>

⁵ <http://uoft.me/GC2012Jun25>

⁶ <http://uoft.me/CRCC>

The CRCC's Terms of Reference also summarized consultation activities to be undertaken by the committee, including the issuing of a broad call for submissions to the University of Toronto community, and targeted communications to UTM and UTSC faculty, staff, and students, the relevant bodies and student societies on the UTM and UTSC campuses, and University-wide associations and Representative Student Committees, as well as consideration of in-person consultations.

Composition of the CRCC:

The Terms of Reference required that the CRCC's membership comprise twelve members, in addition to the Chair, drawn from the Governing Council and from the UTM and UTSC Campus Councils. To ensure that all views were equitably represented, the committee membership attempted to balance among the estates, the two campuses, Governors and Campus Council members.

Specifically, two members were drawn from each of the three internal estates having served in the 2013-14 academic year, or serving in the 2014-15 year. For the purposes of the Review Committee, Alumni, Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council (LGIC) appointees to the Governing Council, and individuals from the broader community appointed to the Campus Councils were considered members of the same estate, and four members were drawn from this group. The Vice-President and Principal of each campus could serve, or designate a Presidential Assessor from one of the Campus Councils' Standing Committees to serve as members of the Committee on their behalf.

The membership of the CRCC was as follows:

Ms Shirley Hoy (LGIC Governor, Vice-Chair of the Governing Council) – Chair

Ms Sara Allain (Administrative Staff Member, UTSC Campus Council; Special Collections Librarian, UTSC)⁷

Mr. Andrew Arifuzzaman (Chief Administrative Officer, UTSC; Assessor, UTSC Campus Affairs Committee)

Ms Melissa Berger (Administrative Staff Member, UTM Campus Council; Coordinator for Community Outreach and Experiential Education, UTM)

Mr. Simon Gilmartin (Community Member, UTM Campus Council)

Professor William Gough (Teaching Staff Governor; Chair, UTSC Campus Council; Vice-Dean, Graduate Education, UTSC)

Ms Sue Graham-Nutter (Community Member, UTSC Campus Council; Chair, UTSC Campus Affairs Committee)

⁷ Ms Sara Allain was no longer with the University of Toronto when the CRCC began its work and, given the short timeframe for the committee to conclude its work, Ms Allain's seat on the committee remained vacant.

Report of the Committee to Review the UTM and UTSC Campus Councils (CRCC)

Ms Nancy Lee (Alumni Governor; Member, UTSC Campus Council)

Ms Alice Li (Undergraduate Student Member, UTM Campus Council)

Mr. Hussain Masoom (Graduate Student Member, UTSC Campus Council)

Ms Judith Poë (Teaching Staff Member, UTM Campus Council; Chair, UTM Academic Affairs Committee)

Professor Deep Saini (Presidential Appointee Governor; Vice-President and Principal, UTM)

Mr. John Switzer (Alumni Governor; Chair, UTM Campus Council)

The Secretary of the Governing Council, Mr. Louis Charpentier, served as Secretary of the Committee, assisted by Mr. Lee Hamilton, Acting Assistant Secretary of the Governing Council.

CRCC Work Plan:

Between September and November 2014, the CRCC held six regular meetings, issued a broad Call For Submissions online, and held two open Report-Back sessions, one each at UTM and UTSC. During this time it also met with the Chairs of all governance bodies encompassed within the review, as well as senior administrators and Voting Assessors for UTM and UTSC, and with each of the estates from both campuses.

At its first meeting (September 17, 2014) the Committee reviewed its Terms of Reference, approved its Work Plan and Call for Submissions, and reviewed relevant background information and data from the 2013-14 academic year, including the 2013-14 year-end survey of Campus Council and Standing Committee members (which gathered input from 88 respondents), the attendance records, and activity summaries for each of the bodies being reviewed. At this time the Committee also met with senior administrators and Voting Assessors from UTSC (the Interim Vice-President & Principal; the Dean & Vice-Principal (Academic); the Vice-Principal, Research; and the Dean of Student Affairs), and received an update on consideration of budget matters by the Campus Councils and the CACs.⁸

The online Call For Submissions was issued on September 19, 2014, and notice was broadly disseminated to all estates of the UTM and UTSC campuses, with a closing date of October 10, 2014. Twelve responses were received by the closing date.

At its second meeting (September 22, 2014), the Committee met with the Chair of the UTM CAC (one of two committee chairs not represented on the CRCC or included in other consultation sessions), and also with senior administrators and Voting Assessors from UTM (the Vice-Principal Academic and Dean; the Vice-Principal, Research; the Chief Administrative Officer; and the Dean of Student Affairs). The Committee subsequently issued invitations to

⁸ This update on budget matters was also provided to Governing Council at its September 11, 2014 meeting. See: <http://uoft.me/BudgetMatters>

members of each estate to meet with the Committee in succession on the morning (UTSC) and afternoon (UTM) of October 20, 2014. Invitations to these sessions were also sent to Campus Council and Standing Committee members representing each estate within those governance bodies, as well as to the heads of the student governments, societies and clubs. Combined, these meetings with Voting Assessors, senior administrators, a committee chair, and members of estates gathered input from twenty-five participants.

At this time the Committee met with senior administrators and the Chair of UTSC's AAC. The Committee also reviewed input received from the Call For Submissions, and discussed the upcoming campus Report-Back sessions scheduled for November 4 (UTSC) and 5 (UTM).

On November 4 and 5, 2014, the Committee held two open Report-Back sessions, one each at UTSC and UTM. Campus-wide invitations were issued to all estates at both campuses and, as result, approximately twenty people attended the Report-Back sessions in total. At these Report-Back sessions, the Committee outlined its mandate and work, provided a summary of input received to date, and invited questions, comments, additional input, and requests for clarification.

CRCC FINDINGS:

The consultations undertaken by the CRCC were guided by its Terms of Reference, which informed the areas of inquiry for the review. The following is a summary of input received.

The Governance Model:

CRCC Terms of Reference:

1. The Efficacy of the Governance Model

a) The CRCC is to provide its assessment of the effectiveness of the UTM and UTSC Campus Council and Standing Committee structure in the context of the overall Governing Council system. To the extent possible with one year of experience upon which to base a finding, the CRCC is asked to comment on the degree to which these bodies, with responsibility for specific campus matters, have been and are understood to be effectively integrated into institutional governance.

- Overall, the CRCC consistently heard that there is satisfaction with and support for the new governance model. It is viewed as an evolutionary step in meeting the needs of the University's growing tri-campus reality. There was general acknowledgment that the model had only been in place for a year and that, in light of the limited experience, the CRCC

agreed that there should be a full review in three years' time, in order to allow the model and governance practices to mature and develop further.

Academic Affairs Committees (AACs):

CRCC Terms of Reference:

2. Terms of Reference of the Academic Affairs Committees (AACs)

- a) *In consideration of the Academic Affairs Committees' (AACs) assigned responsibilities previously in the purview of the Erindale College Council (UTM) and the Council of UTSC, to what extent has this transition been successful? Those responsibilities include curricular matters and academic regulations, as well as responsibilities pursuant to the University of Toronto Quality Assurance Process.² Since few matters considered by the AACs proceed to the Campus Councils, how might the links between the AACs and their respective Campus Councils be refined and strengthened?*
- b) *The AACs' Terms of Reference also include provisions related to research, the consideration of academic plans, academic priorities for fundraising, and academic reviews. The CRCC is asked to advise on the execution of these responsibilities and the appropriate governance paths for such matters.*

- The CRCC heard from some members that they had a sense that the vetting duties of the AAC at times seemed *pro forma*. Some AAC members who spoke with the CRCC commented that there were frequent occasions when the work of the committee felt like “rubber stamping”. Factors that contributed to this sense were the limited time required to review materials in advance of a vote, a reluctance to delay needed projects by voting against them, and confidence in the due diligence that occurs among administrators during a project’s planning stage (prior to reaching governance).
- The CRCC heard that the divisional Curriculum Committees continue to work well, and that the proposals considered by these Committees flowed seamlessly to the AACs.
- Some respondents expressed the view that the presence of Deans on the AAC may contribute to a reluctance to challenge or oppose proposals and motions in the meetings.
- On the role of Voting Assessors on governance bodies, the CRCC heard a number of observations. These included: a lack of awareness by members of Committees of the availability of Assessors to consult on Committee business outside of meetings, a concern about the appropriate alignment of Assessors’ areas of expertise with the appropriate governance bodies, and the inclusion of the Vice-Principal, Research as a Non-Voting Assessor on the CACs.

- It was observed that various education sessions were worthwhile and that members benefitted from hearing from subject matter experts in areas related to the Councils' or Committees' Terms of Reference. In keeping with this approach, the Chair of UTM's AAC, in consultation with the Dean, invited individuals from academic departments specifically involved in development of curriculum proposals to present proposals brought forward by the Dean. This approach enriched the Committee's consideration of the proposals and the CRCC supports the extension of this practice across governance bodies at the discretion of the Chairs and with the agreement of the relevant Assessors.
- Some members who spoke to the CRCC observed that the new model had added a level of formality that was helpful in providing structure to proceedings and decision-making but that seemed at times to inhibit discussion; they also noted that members of the campus community seemed less engaged than previously.

Campus Affairs Committees (CACs):

CRCC Terms of Reference:

3. Terms of Reference of the Campus Affairs Committees (CACs)

a) ...The CRCC is to provide advice on any clarification or adjustments to the Terms of Reference that might be necessary to define the appropriate role of this body in budget-related matters.

b) In addition to their roles in the campus operating budget in 3.a) above, the CACs' Terms of Reference include responsibilities related to consideration of establishment of Extra-Departmental Units (EDUs).[†] Based on one year's experience, more specific language on this element of the Committee's mandate may be helpful. The CRCC is also asked to review other matters brought to the CACs to advise on whether other clarifications should also be considered.

c) In consideration of the CACs' roles and responsibilities, the number of teaching staff, student, and administrative staff members of the Committees was determined by reviewing the composition of the University Affairs Board (UAB) and the Planning and Budget Committee (PB). UAB includes a large proportion of students and a relatively small number of teaching staff, while the reverse is true for PB ... does the current balance among the internal (academic; non-academic) groups appropriately reflect the responsibilities assigned to the CACs?

- To the extent the CRCC received commentary on this area of the review process, the feedback focused on increasing the representation of various estates on the committee. The CRCC had sought input on changes to the CACs' Terms of Reference to define the appropriate role of the CACs in consideration of academic matters such as the establishment of Extra-Departmental Units (EDUs), as well as input on the appropriate composition of the CACs, and whether the current balance among the internal (academic; non-academic) groups appropriately reflect the responsibilities assigned to the CACs.
- The challenge for the Task Force on Governance in developing the CACs' Terms of Reference was to define membership that has no one precise parallel in the current Governing Council structure. The CAC has two "parent" references: the Planning and Budget Committee and the University Affairs Board. Both require a majority of internal members but a somewhat different balance among the estates. The former has a majority of faculty among its internal members, the latter a majority of students. The CACs have nine faculty and seven students among their internal members.
- Some respondents suggested that establishment of [Extra-Departmental Units](#) or EDUs – particularly "A" and "B"⁹ – should be considered by the AACs, as well as by the CACs, in order to ensure that both the academic and budgetary dimensions are given full consideration. To address this concern, proposals to establish EDUs could, as a matter of practice, be considered at the AACs for review and discussion prior to the CACs' consideration and recommendation for approval.
- Section 5.7 of the CACs' Terms of Reference provides that the "*annual budget is considered by the Committee for recommendation to the [UTM/UTSC] Council for inclusion in the University's annual operating budget.*" Appendix A of the Terms notes that this responsibility is executed as part of the campus' budget planning process. The Terms were not intended to assign approval responsibility and the process being implemented this year is a step toward clarifying the most apt role for the bodies and the manner in which the provision might be fulfilled (See: [Consideration of Budget Matters by UTM and UTSC Campus Councils and Campus Affairs Committees](#)¹⁰). The approach received positive responses at meetings of the CACs and Campus Councils during the first two cycles of the 2014-15 academic year.

⁹ An EDU:A has a well-established and defined area of scholarship as a focus. The unit has attained a critical mass of interdisciplinary scholarship at the University that allows for the unit to engage in the appointment of teaching staff, admission of students to a program of graduate or undergraduate study, and engage in interdisciplinary research. EDU:As differ from departments in that departments generally offer a full range of undergraduate and graduate programs and research. It is expected that the total number of EDU:As at any given time will be small. An EDU:B has a defined area of scholarship as a focus and also admits students to interdisciplinary programs and engages in interdisciplinary research. However, teaching staff appointments are made in established academic units with teaching staff crossappointed to the EDU:B.

¹⁰ <http://uoft.me/BudgetMatters>

Membership:

CRCC Terms of Reference:

...how might the processes related to the identification, recruitment, election and selection of Campus Council and Standing Committee members be enhanced – for example, with respect to expanding and fostering the pools of interested and eligible candidates?

- On identification, recruitment, election and selection of Campus Council and Standing Committee members, the Committee received a number of comments reflecting individuals' various views in this regard, including:
 - The need to examine ways to establish incentives to encourage greater participation in governance by the various estates, for example in the case of Administrative Staff through the recognition by superiors or in annual performance evaluations.
 - Some student respondents raised the issue of elections and appointment of student members; an online respondent noted that the current model is ambiguous, produces uncertainty and leads to unnecessary waiting prior to the outcome. However, the Committee also heard that the process was clearly communicated.
 - During in-person consultations with UTM students, the CRCC heard concerns about student representation on the UTM Campus Council and the perception that an elected student had been “bumped” from a Campus Council seat in favour of an appointed student who was a Governor. The CRCC was able to clarify the source of this perception, namely that it arose from the fact that the Campus Councils are composed of Governor and non-Governor members, and that in June 2014 changes proposed by the Elections Committee were adopted, setting the number of elected and appointed seats for the other estates (Teaching Staff, Administrative Staff, Community Members) while leaving the existing arrangements for student representation in place, i.e.:
 - Continuing to have 0 or 1 Governing Council student members (appointed) and 4 or 3 non- Governing Council student members (elected) on the Campus Council, each serving a one-year term with the possibility of re-appointment/re-election.
 - This would continue to give student governors the option of serving on the Campus Councils if they wanted. To put this in context, in the 2013 elections, Mr. Adrian De Leon, registered as a student at UTSC, was elected as a full-time undergraduate governor (Constituency I – for the Faculty of Arts and Science, UTM and UTSC). Mr. De Leon was appointed by the Governing Council to serve

on the UTSC Campus Council and the AAC. Similarly, in the 2014 elections, Mr. Nabil Arif, registered at UTM, was elected as full-time undergraduate governor (Constituency I). Mr. Arif was appointed by the Governing Council to serve on the UTM Campus Council in 2014-15. Despite the perception that elected students had been displaced from their Campus Council seats by student members of Governing Council, it is important to note that these student members of Governing Council were elected in their own right by their peers (as are those elected directly to the Campus Councils), and that the provision enabling them to sit on the Campus Councils is clearly articulated.

- If the option to serve on the Campus Councils was removed for student governors, then these elected student governors registered at UTM and UTSC would be denied the opportunity to serve on governance bodies suited to their interests, and the Governing Council would not be able to benefit from the experience and insight that such elected student governors would bring as a result of also participating in local governance bodies. As part of the planned general review of the distribution of elected seats for the administrative staff, teaching staff, and student estate seats on the Governing Council, the Elections Committee could in future recommend allocating one full-time undergraduate seat for each of UTM and UTSC. At that time, should it be considered desirable, the Terms of Reference for the Campus Councils could be revised to allow for one appointed student Governor to sit on the Campus Councils, removing the uncertainty occasioned by the existing formula for student representation.
- There is at least one elected teaching staff seat for each of UTM and UTSC on the Governing Council. In June 2014, the Governing Council approved recommendations that allowed for the number of elected teaching staff governors appointed to the Campus Council to be 1, instead of 1 or 2. In this instance, the elected teaching staff members of the Governing Council from UTM and UTSC can be appointed to their respective Campus Councils, allowing for the other five teaching staff members on those Campus Councils to be elected locally.
- In the June 2014 recommendations, the option of the administrative staff governors to serve on the Campus Councils was removed to allow for greater local participation, with one of the two seats for elected administrative staff being made available to a librarian.
- The CRCC received differing views on the inclusion of the Vice-Principal and Dean as an *ex officio* member of Campus Council – some felt such inclusion might be analogous to the current practice of including the Provost on Governing Council (where the Vice-President and Provost sits as a presidential appointee), whereas others felt the presence of the Dean might inhibit discussion.

Orientation and Awareness of Members:

CRCC Terms of Reference:

5. Orientation, Awareness, and On-Going Education of Members

- a) *The CRCC is asked to provide advice on refinements to initial orientation offered to members of the UTM and UTSC Campus Councils and their Standing Committees. Such advice will inform and be integrated with the Governing Council's ongoing efforts to enrich and strengthen orientation and education across all of its bodies.*
- b) *In order to continue to assist members and Assessors in fulfilling their roles and to raise awareness of the Campus Councils and their work, what advice might the Committee provide with respect to:*
- *ongoing education on particular topics for members, and*
 - *ongoing communication with the campus communities with respect to the role and function of the Campus Councils?*

- Concerns about timely communication and information flow within governance and about governance within the campus community were recurring themes of the input the CRCC received.
- Some respondents highlighted the steep learning curve that greeted new members of the Campus Councils and Standing Committees. Most regarded the orientation sessions as useful and necessary, but some felt it was too much information to assimilate at one time; others felt the sessions were redundant for returning members. Suggestions for building on orientation and ongoing communication included the use of retreats, the redistribution of some orientation information throughout the governance year as business arose, and the creation of opportunities for committee members to meet and interact outside of the official committee proceedings.
- On the issue of engagement, some noted the generally low awareness across the campuses of the roles, activities, and business of the Campus Councils and Standing Committees. One reason suggested was that these are not aspects of the University that students, staff and faculty typically encounter as part of their day to day activities on the campuses.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The deliberative work and consultations undertaken by the CRCC, guided by its Terms of Reference, led to two recommendations for consideration by Governing Council, and a number of recommendations for the enhancement of current practice.

Recommendations to Governing Council:

a) Follow-up Review

The CRCC recommends that the Governing Council initiate a follow-up review of the governance model in three years' time, that is, in the 2017-18 academic year, by which time the new model will have matured further and more information will be available from experience.

b) Membership

As part of a general review of the distribution of elected seats for the administrative staff, teaching staff, and student estate seats on the Governing Council, the CRCC recommends that the Elections Committee consider allocating one full-time undergraduate seat on the Governing Council for each of UTM and UTSC.

On the question of the Vice-Principal and Dean holding membership on the Campus Council, the CRCC found that an appropriate solution is to continue using Non-Voting Assessor appointments (which are discretionary) to address the need for specific portfolio representation or expertise where it is deemed appropriate, without enacting changes to the Terms of Reference. In addition, the Committee suggests considering the inclusion of the Vice-Principal, Research, on the Campus Affairs Committees as a Non-Voting Assessor, in addition to their membership on the Academic Affairs Committees as Voting Assessors.

Recommendations to Enhance Current Practice:

c) Increasing the amount of meaningful discourse

A key finding of this review was the desire to increase the amount of meaningful discourse in the Councils and their Committees. In this regard, we recommend that the Chairs, Assessors and Secretariat continue in their efforts to:

- Ensure that documentation and presentations on items focus on the governance “prisms” of mission or mandate oversight and financial oversight. The intent is to promote open and robust discussion of the matter(s) at hand while observing the separation of governance and operations.
- Use education sessions related to specific agenda items, and the committee’s particular responsibilities for those items. Planning should be done in the context of

- the Chair of the Governing Council's ongoing efforts to enhance orientation and education across the Governing Council's Boards and Committees.
- Invite additional expertise on an *ad hoc* basis to inform discussion related to items such as academic programs. The Committee heard that this is already the practice on some of the bodies under review, and encourages the replication of the practice where appropriate.
 - Implement mechanisms which address the specific need for open and robust dialogue of academic matters with the participation of senior academic administrators.
 - Provide members of governance bodies with greater clarity on expectations with regard to their individual role within a given governance body, for example the kinds of questions that are appropriate to the Terms of Reference, alongside existing efforts to familiarize members with the mandate, role and activities of the governance body as a whole.
 - Provide information on proposals that are in planning and development stages and which may potentially come before the governance body at a later time. For some major items, it may be appropriate for the Assessor to provide draft preliminary documentation to the body for discussion and input. The Committee understands that this practice is already being observed in some cases.
 - Proposals to establish Extra-Departmental Units (EDUs) could, as a matter of practice, be considered at the Academic Affairs Committees for review and discussion prior to the Campus Affairs Committees' consideration and recommendation for approval.

d) Awareness of and Participation in the Governance Process

The Committee recognizes the need for ongoing efforts to raise awareness of the importance of governance and the value of participating in its processes. In that regard, we also encourage Chairs, Vice-Chairs, Assessors, the Secretariat, and members to continue to identify and recruit interested prospective governance members. The impact of such efforts to increase awareness and participation could be enhanced by:

- Stating that an expectation of membership in a governing body is to communicate news of the business of governance to members of their estates.
- Augmenting the use of existing communications mechanisms on each campus to ensure information is distributed within Departments.
- Department Chairs and Academic Directors specifically encouraging and supporting faculty and staff to run for election to governance bodies.

The Committee also recommends that the Chairs of the Campus Councils report to Executive Committee on progress-to-date in one year's time with regard to the above-noted recommendations aimed at enhancing discourse, awareness and participation.