

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

Thursday, April 10, 2008

MINUTES OF THE GOVERNING COUNCIL meeting held on Thursday, April 10, 2008 at 4:30 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, University of Toronto.

Present:

Mr. John F. (Jack) Petch (In the Chair)
Dr. Alice Dong, Vice-Chair
Professor C. David Naylor, President
Professor Varouj Aivazian
Ms Diana Alli
Mr. P.C. Choo
Professor Brian Corman
Dr. Claude S. Davis
Mr. Ken Davy
Miss Saswati Deb
Dr. Shari Graham Fell
Professor Vivek Goel
Ms Judith Goldring
Professor William Gough
Dr. Gerald Halbert
Professor Ellen Hodnett
Professor Glen A. Jones
Mr. Alex Kenjeev
Professor Ronald H. Kluger
Mr. Joseph Mapa
Professor Michael R. Marrus
Mr. Geoffrey Matus

Mr. George E. Myhal
Mr. Richard Nunn
Ms Jacqueline C. Orange
Mr. Alexandru Rascanu
Professor Doug W. Reeve
Mr. Timothy Reid
Professor Arthur S. Ripstein
Ms Lorenza Sisca
Mr. Stephen C. Smith
Miss Maureen J. Somerville
Ms B. Elizabeth Vosburgh
Mr. Robert S. Weiss
Mr. Yang Weng

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

Secretariat:

Mr. Matthew Lafond

Absent:

The Honourable David R. Peterson
The Honourable William G. Davis
Ms Susan Eng
Mr. Arya Ghadimi
Dr. Joel A. Kirsh
Dr. Stefan Mathias Larson
Professor Louise Lemieux-Charles

Ms Florence Minz
Mr. Gary P. Mooney
Professor Ian Orchard
Ms Estefania Toledo
Dr. Sarita Verma
Mr. Larry Wasser
Mr. W. David Wilson

In Attendance:

Mr. David Ford, Member-Elect of the Governing Council
Professor Angela Hildyard, Vice-President, Human Resources & Equity
Mr. David Palmer, Vice-President, Advancement
Ms Cathy Riggall, Vice-President, Business Affairs
Ms Judith Wolfson, Vice-President, University Relations
Ms Andréa Armbrorst, President, Students' Administrative Council (operating as the University of Toronto Students' Union)
Ms Megan Burnett, Assistant Director, Teaching Assistants' Training Program
Mr. Jim Delaney, Associate Director and Senior Policy Advisor, Student Affairs
Mr. Ray deSouza, Chief Administrative Officer, University of Toronto at Mississauga
Mr. Neil Dobbs, Deputy Secretary of the Governing Council
Ms Sheree Drummond, Assistant Provost
Professor Emeritus Jonathan Freedman, Vice-Provost, Student Life
Ms Sally Garner, Senior Planning and Budget Officer
Ms. Nora Gillespie, Legal Counsel, Office of the Vice-President and Provost
Ms Emily Gregor-Greenleaf, Graduate Student
Ms Sandy Hudson, Vice-President Equity, University of Toronto Students' Union
Mr. Naushad Ali Husein, The Varsity
Mr. Walied Khogali, President, University of Toronto at Mississauga Students' Union
Ms Anne Lewis, Manager, Student Accounts, Department of Financial Services
Mr. Sean Liliani, The Newspaper
Ms Bryn MacPherson-White, Director, Office of the President and University Events
Ms Mette Mai, Administrative Assistant, Office of the Governing Council
Dr. Tim McTiernan, Assistant Vice-President, Research
Professor Cheryl Misak, Deputy Provost
Mr. Steve Moate, Senior Legal Counsel
Mr. Henry Mulhall, Assistant Secretary of the Governing Council
Mr. Jeff Peters, Vice-President Internal, Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students.
Professor Susan Pfeiffer, Dean, School of Graduate Studies
Mr. Naraindra Prashad, Director of Operations and Finance, Office of the Governing Council
Professor Safwat Zaky, Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget
Ms Christina Sass-Kortsak, Assistant Vice-President, Human Resources
Mr. Robert Steiner, Assistant Vice-President, Strategic Communications
Ms Alyson Stone, Vice-President External, Graduate Students' Union
Ms Mae-Yu Tan, Assistant Secretary of the Governing Council

IN ACCORDANCE WITH A DETERMINATION BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE PURSUANT TO SECTION 38 OF BY-LAW NUMBER 2, ITEMS 10 AND 11 WERE CONSIDERED BY THE GOVERNING COUNCIL IN CAMERA.

1. Chair's Remarks**(a) Welcome**

The Chair welcomed members and guests to the meeting.

(b) Announcement of Vice-Chair

The Chair advised members that he was pleased to announce that Dr. Alice Dong had once again been acclaimed as Vice-Chair of the Governing Council, for the period July 1, 2008 to June 30, 2009.

(c) Audio Web-cast

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

(d) Documentation on the Table

The Chair noted that a revised copy of the agenda had been placed on the table. The order of items had been adjusted, such that the tuition fee items would now be considered before the Budget Report, and the numbering of items had been corrected. Also on the table were copies of the *University of Toronto 2008-09* guide, produced by the Office of Student Recruitment, the *Research at the University of Toronto, In Profile* information package, and a copy of the President's submission to the Minister of Finance regarding the 2008 Provincial Budget. He encouraged all members to review these important documents.

(e) Governing Council Election Results

The Chair congratulated the following current members, who had been re-elected to the Governing Council:

- Professor Varouj Aivazian
- Mr. Kenneth Davy
- Professor Michael Marrus
- Mr. Timothy Reid
- Professor Arthur Ripstein
- Ms Elizabeth Vosburgh

1. Chair's Remarks (cont'd)

(e) Governing Council Election Results (cont'd)

Furthermore, the following individuals had been newly elected as Governors:

- Mr. Ryan Campbell (Undergraduate student)
- Mr. David Ford (Graduate student)
- Mr. Grant Gonzales (Undergraduate student)
- Mr. Joseph Koo (Undergraduate student)
- Ms Anna Okorokov (Undergraduate student)
- Professor Elizabeth Smyth (Teaching Staff)
- Mr. Olivier Sorin (Graduate student)
- Mr. John Stewart (Alumni)

On behalf of the Governing Council, the Chair welcomed all members-elect and returning Governors.

(f) Co-opted Positions

The Chair invited the Secretary to provide an update on the call for applications for co-opted positions. Mr. Charpentier advised members that a memorandum had been distributed to the University community on March 19, 2008, to encourage applications for membership on the Boards and Committees of the Governing Council. The Striking Committee of each Board would review the applications received and recommend appointments to the Board in May. Mr. Charpentier asked for members' assistance in identifying individuals who were actively involved in the University community and in encouraging them to submit an application. The deadline for submissions had been extended to April 17, 2008, at 5:00 p.m. Further information regarding the co-opting process and the online application form was available from the Office of the Governing Council's website.

(g) Speaking Requests

The Chair advised that four speaking requests had been granted for the meeting. All guests had requested to speak on the issue of tuition fees (items 5(a) and (b) on the agenda). Guests would be invited to speak for a maximum of three minutes each. At the appropriate time, the Chair would call upon the following individuals to address the Council: Ms Alyson Stone, Vice-President External, Graduate Students' Union; Ms Sandy Hudson, Vice-President Equity, Students' Administrative Council (operating as the University of Toronto Students' Union); Mr. Walied Khogali, President, University of Toronto at Mississauga Students' Union; and Mr. Jeff Peters, Vice-President Internal, Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students.

2. Minutes of the Previous Meetings

The minutes of the meeting of March 4, 2008, were approved.

3. Business Arising from the Minutes of the Previous Meeting

There was no business arising from the previous meeting.

4. Report of the President

(a) Teaching Assistants' Training Program

The President began his report with a presentation by individuals engaged in enhancing the student experience, introducing Ms Megan Burnett, Assistant Director of the Teaching Assistants' Training Program (TATP), and Ms Emily Gregor-Greenleaf, a Ph.D. candidate in the Higher Education program at OISE/UT.

The TATP was a peer-training program for currently registered graduate students who would be working as teaching assistants. The program started as a student initiative to provide "survival skills" to newly-arrived graduate students. Over the years, it had expanded and evolved. It was now supported by the Provost's Office through the Office of Teaching Advancement, and it played an important role in enriching both the student life and academic experience of students.

Ms Burnett and Ms Gregor-Greenleaf reported that the TATP office, which was now 10 years old, provided pedagogical training, teaching support, and professional development opportunities to teaching assistants (TAs) from across all disciplines and all three campuses. Staffed by graduate student peer trainers, most of the programming was developed and delivered by graduate students, and for graduate students. A variety of means were used to learn about best practices in postsecondary teaching, including training workshops, seminars, a one-day conference, practice teaching sessions, in-class evaluations, and teaching dossiers. The University relied heavily on TAs to help deliver undergraduate courses, and they were often the first point of contact for students, especially in first and second year. Through the Program, TAs had shown that they were dedicated to improving their teaching, and therefore, the TATP was making an important contribution to the overall student experience at the University.

Members were invited to visit the TATP website.¹

(b) Awards and Honours

The President drew Governors' attention to the list of Awards and Honours that had been included in the agenda package. As always, this document highlighted the extraordinary milestones achieved by faculty, staff, and students at the University.

Focusing on particularly notable achievements, the President reported that University Professor John Polanyi, professor of Chemistry and Nobel Laureate, had been awarded the Gerhard Herzberg Canada Gold Medal for Science and Engineering, the country's most prestigious science prize. Professor Allan Borodin of Computer Science had won the CRM-Fields-PIMS prize, the top prize in mathematical sciences in Canada.

¹ <http://www.utoronto.ca/tatp>

4. Report of the President (cont'd)**(b) Awards and Honours (cont'd)**

Ms Rose Patten, former Chair of the Governing Council, had been awarded a 2008 YWCA *Women of Distinction* Award. Finally, Ms Diana Alli, a current Governor, had been voted the winner of the David Eberle Award by the graduating class in the Faculty of Medicine, for her outstanding contributions to the undergraduate student experience.

The President congratulated all the outstanding members of the University community whose accomplishments continued to bring honour and energy to the institution.

(c) Events of March 20, 2008

Turning next to the matter of student protests, the President reported that he had issued a statement on the events of March 20, 2008, that took place in Simcoe Hall. He wished to highlight the following points for Governors:

- First, the University is proceeding precisely as indicated in the statement. A report had been made to the Toronto Police Service by the University of Toronto Campus Community Police. The Toronto Police Service, in conjunction with the Crown Attorney's Office, would make their own assessment of whether charges should be laid. Relevant division heads had reviewed the alleged conduct of identified participants in light of the *Code of Student Conduct*, to determine whether, and in what manner, to proceed with an investigation. The President advised that it was his understanding that some students had already been notified that an investigation would be commencing. Non-students would be cautioned in writing, with clear warnings regarding the potential for trespass orders.
- Second, the response from the general University community, including students, had been very clear. Student groups would continue to express their opposition to increases in fees and charges. However, the vast majority of students had distanced themselves from the tactics used by the group that entered Simcoe Hall on March 20. The President again emphasized that no one in the administration misread that commentary as support for increases in tuition or residence fees. However, it was encouraging that students, by and large, seem to be very impatient with disruptive tactics, the issuing of threats, and diffuse demands on a range of national and international issues which the administration of the University simply could not address.
- Third, the University has a fundamental belief in the rights of freedom of expression and peaceful assembly. There was a long-standing tradition of protests on campus, which was evident in the activity outside Simcoe Hall today. The University expects, in turn, that protestors will respect the law and University policies.

4. Report of the President (cont'd)**(c) Events of March 20, 2008 (cont'd)**

- Finally, the President emphasized that the University would continue to engage students broadly in its administration and governance. Students are engaged in a variety of day-to-day activities, ranging from search committees and curriculum reviews, to divisional and University-wide governance mechanisms. Those channels remained open, and they would not be short-circuited simply because an aggressive minority believed that they should have privileged access to express their views. Some of the recent challenges had been exacerbated by internal divisions and factionalism within student groups. While these were not new challenges, the University administration would continue to work with and support recognized, legitimate, and representative student groups and their leaders.

(d) Provincial Budget, 2008

The President reminded members that the provincial Budget had recently been announced. The University's expectations were realistic, given the faltering Ontario economy and mixed signals regarding additional support for higher education and research. However, the Budget did deliver some very useful additional support, including:

- \$200 million for maintenance and renewal of university facilities, with the University of Toronto's share totaling approximately \$38 million. This was in addition to the \$200 million campus renewal fund announced in January.
- \$300 million to strengthen the Environment for Innovation, including \$250 million for the Ontario Research Fund.
- A new \$385 million Textbook and Technology Grant, equating to \$300 per student. Unfortunately, this payment is based on enrolment alone, rather than preferentially directed to bursaries and other needs-based support.
- \$17 million to support research internships for graduate students.
- \$16 million to expand programs for at-risk youth (in addition to \$2.9 million in funding previously announced).
- \$7 million over three years to attract international students to Ontario.
- \$1 million over three years to help Ontario students study abroad.
- Furthermore, there were a number of important year-end funding announcements:
 - \$14.4 million of undergraduate funding support (\$3.8 million share for the University of Toronto).
 - One-time-only graduate student funding envelope of \$55 million (\$10.6 million directed to the University of Toronto).
 - \$3.9 million in funding for clinical education.
 - \$25 million funding for the Munk Centre to help support its leading-edge work in International Studies.
 - The Ministry of Health had also allocated \$2 million for facilities and services for high-performance sport in Ontario.

4. Report of the President (cont'd)**(d) Provincial Budget, 2008 (cont'd)**

The President noted that given these announcements, the University did well in garnering additional needed funding, and indicated that the relationship with the provincial government was strong. However, one message was not getting through – the government had still not invested in adequate per-student university funding. Unless that basic issue was addressed, the current increases in tuition fees would not be sufficient to prevent ongoing increases in student-faculty and student-staff ratios.

(e) *Towards 2030*

Turning finally to a brief update on the *Towards 2030* strategic planning initiative, the President reminded members that the initiative was now ending its second phase. Many Governors had served on Task Forces, four of which had been chaired by current members. The President reported that he was working on a final synthesis document which would draw on the themes arising from the various Task Forces. He anticipated bringing this summary forward to the Executive Committee, and ideally to the Governing Council, before the summer break.

The Chair invited members to ask questions arising from the President's Report. A member indicated that he wished to address the issue of the March 20, 2008 protest. He alleged that the President's statement had positioned the administration as a "victim" of the incident. He further suggested that it had come to his attention that, contrary to the University's report that staff members had been prevented from leaving an office by the protestors, there was a back exit in the office through which they could have exited. The President confirmed that there was no other exit from the office in question. The Chair indicated that as the matter was currently under investigation, questions should be held until the appropriate time.

A member indicated that he had watched the video of the incident which had been posted on the Internet, and as a student, he was ashamed of the manner in which the protestors had conducted themselves. He believed that the facts surrounding the event had been distorted by those involved in the protest, and stated that it was his opinion that the police action was entirely reasonable under the circumstances.

Another student member suggested that a better approach would have been for students to engage in reasoned negotiation with the administration; the tactics employed by the protestors had been too drastic, and therefore counterproductive.

5. Items for Governing Council Approval

(a) Tuition Fee Schedule for Publicly Funded Programs, 2008-09

Mr. Nunn advised that the Business Board had recommended the approval of the tuition fee schedule for the coming year. First, the Board was convinced that the increases were necessary, given the University's financial circumstances. Forgoing any increase would have a severe impact on the quality of the University's teaching, research, and student services. Second, the Board was satisfied that the proposed increases would not have a negative effect on enrolment. The Board reviewed the Enrolment Report which showed that enrolment at the University of Toronto was strong, and continued to grow. The fees at the University of Toronto remained in the middle of the range of Canadian universities. Third, the Board was convinced that the proposed tuition fee schedule was consistent with the University's *Tuition Fee Policy*, and would not jeopardize accessibility. The *Policy* required the University to make every effort to secure adequate public funding. Thereafter, it required that the University supplement public funding with sufficient revenue from tuition fees to offer students a first-class educational experience. The Business Board was advised that for more than 75% of domestic students, the cost of the fee increase would be \$250 or less. A further 15% would pay increases between \$251 and \$350.

The Chair reminded members that several speaking requests had been granted. He reiterated that speakers' comments should be limited to three minutes.

The Chair first invited Ms Alyson Stone, Vice-President External, Graduate Students' Union, to speak. Ms Stone commented that high tuition fees limited accessibility to postsecondary education, especially for students from low-income families and international students. She noted that graduate students were enrolled in their programs year-round, and that their tuition fees were generally higher, despite the fact that many graduate students completed course work within two years, and thenceforth utilized few resources at the University. She pointed out that many graduate students did not receive funding packages covering their tuition. Ms Stone suggested that students should be better represented on the University's governing bodies. She concluded by emphasizing to members that the tuition fee increase, while fiscally responsible for the University, was not fiscally appropriate for its students.

The Chair next invited Ms Sandy Hudson, Vice-President Equity, Students' Administrative Council (operating as the University of Toronto Students' Union), to address the Council. Ms Hudson stated that tuition fee increases were unnecessary, and that the vote, over which students had little influence, was unethical. She alleged that rising tuition fees did not contribute to quality education, and were instead an indication of severe government under-funding. Furthermore, students from lower income backgrounds, students of colour, students with disabilities and women would be particularly adversely affected by the proposed increases. She commented that the majority of Governors, who were not students, were in a position of tremendous privilege, and as such, could not comprehend the burden of debt faced by students at the University. In conclusion, she asked members to reject the tuition fee increase.

5. Items for Governing Council Approval (cont'd)**(a) Tuition Fee Schedule for Publicly Funded Programs, 2008-09 (cont'd)**

Next, the Chair called on Mr. Walied Khogali, President, University of Toronto at Mississauga Students' Union. Mr. Khogali indicated that he wished to convey his personal story to Governors. He noted that he was a member of an immigrant family, and was one of seven children, four of whom were University of Toronto students. He noted that his debt load and that of his siblings would total over \$150,000. He reminded Governors that they should consider the interests not only of the University as presented by the administration, but also of its students. He indicated that students were frustrated by the lack of political discourse between students, the administration, and the government, and that if the Council supported the proposal, it would fail to send a message that the government's position on post-secondary funding was unacceptable.

Finally, the Chair called on Mr. Jeff Peters, Vice-President Internal, Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students. The Chair indicated that Mr. Peters would be allowed to address the Council for five minutes, rather than the usual three, in light of his need for additional time. The Chair asked Governors to make an effort to understand Mr. Peters as he spoke, in the hope that in the near future, Mr. Peters could then address the Council without having someone repeat his comments. Mr. Peters expressed his disappointment with what he interpreted as an environment of racism and ableism at the University of Toronto. He suggested that in the past, the main student unions were permitted to speak at Governing Council meetings without making a specific request. Now, he stated, they had to contest with police presence at meetings. Mr. Peters alleged that the President's response to the events of March 20, 2008 was inappropriate, and that any potential disciplinary action against student protestors would further marginalize vulnerable individuals. The Chair thanked Mr. Peters for his comments, and suggested that it would be helpful if he could, in the future, provide a written version of his comments in advance, which could be distributed to members.

The Chair indicated that the motion was now open for discussion. Several members objected to Mr. Peters' characterization of the President's response to the incidents of March 20, 2008 as inappropriate. A member spoke to draw Governors' attention to three important points. First, he noted, the Governing Council did not have influence over provincial funding, and its choices were constrained by the reality of the budget shortfall that the University of Toronto inherited from the government. The choice, therefore, was either to freeze tuition fees, which would surely put the University in a deficit position, or to raise fees as suggested in the proposal. The member's second point was that accessibility was only valuable when accompanied by excellence. He noted that there was no point in ensuring equal access to a low quality education, which would result from shrinking revenues. The goal should be accessibility to a world-class research university. Finally, he noted, there could be other avenues to ensure accessibility. He was not convinced that it was equitable that those students who had access to significant resources should be granted low-cost tuition. Instead, there should be careful monitoring of accessibility, and consideration of alternatives such as back-end debt relief. However, those were separate issues, not before the Governing Council today. The member reminded the Council that in voting on the

5. Items for Governing Council Approval (cont'd)

(a) Tuition Fee Schedule for Publicly Funded Programs, 2008-09 (cont'd)

motion, members would be deciding between fulfilling their fiduciary duty to the long-term interests of the University, or alternatively, the certain creation of a budget shortfall.

A member stated his view that there was only token student representation on the Governing Council, and that many members were appointed by the administration, rather than elected.² He indicated that many students accrued significant debt and coped with their burden by taking full-time or part-time jobs. He commented that voting in favour of the motion would be deplorable. He then produced a petition which he claimed had garnered approximately 3000 signatures in opposition to the proposed increase, and began to read comments from the document. The Chair noted that the member had been speaking for five minutes,³ and asked the member to wrap up his comments, adding that written material could be distributed to members if necessary.

A non-member sitting in the body of the Council Chamber rose, and began to read further comments from the petition. The Chair indicated that the Council had heard the concerns expressed in those comments from the previous speaker. Pursuant to the *Policy on the Disruption of Meetings*, he advised the individual that she was interfering with the Council's orderly debate of the issue. The individual continued to speak out, and the Chair again asked the individual to desist.

The Chair asked Governors to continue the debate in spite of the unruly behaviour. A member noted that while the University of Toronto's domestic tuition fees were similar to those of some other Ontario institutions, the value of a University of Toronto education was, in many cases, superior. He indicated that the increase being proposed for domestic students was acceptable, because it would help to preserve the high quality of education for which the University was known.

While the member made his comments, non-members in the Council Chamber continued to speak loudly, preventing the members of Council from speaking. Accordingly, the Chair once again asked the disruptive guests to desist, reiterating that they were interfering with the meeting. He stated that if the individuals failed to respect his call to order, they would be asked to leave the Council Chamber. However, the non-members continued to obstruct the meeting by speaking out, so that members could not be heard.

² Secretary's Note: The Governing Council is composed of 50 members. Sixteen Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council members of the Governing Council are appointed by the provincial government. The President and Chancellor are *ex officio* members. In addition, two members are appointed by the President. All other members of the Governing Council (30 in total), are elected by their constituencies, either directly, or in the case of Alumni Governors, through a representative body (*i.e.*, the College of Electors).

³ Members' speeches are limited to a maximum of five minutes, pursuant to section 58 of *By-Law Number 2*:
No member or other person invited to address the Council shall speak for more than five minutes at one time, except by leave of the majority of the members present and voting, which leave shall be granted or refused without debate, or with the permission of the Presiding Officer.

5. Items for Governing Council Approval (cont'd)**(a) Tuition Fee Schedule for Publicly Funded Programs, 2008-09 (cont'd)**

In view of the recent events in Simcoe Hall and at the University Affairs Board meeting on March 25, 2008, the apparent difficulty in removing the unruly individuals, and with concern for members' ability to conduct business with a reasonable expectation of order and security, the Chair concluded that open debate amongst Governors had clearly become impossible. He therefore declared a recess consistent with his authority under section 47 of By-Law Number 2. He indicated that members would receive further instructions from the Secretariat.

The recess was called at approximately 5:45 p.m.

The meeting reconvened in the Michael E. Charles Council Chamber, Galbraith Building, at approximately 5:55 p.m.

The Chair called the meeting to order and thanked members for their understanding under the difficult circumstances of the meeting disruption.

A member questioned whether the meeting was being conducted in an open manner, given that access to the new location had been limited. The Chair indicated that he was satisfied that the relevant obligations under the *University of Toronto Act, 1971* had been fulfilled, given the extenuating circumstances.

The President added that every effort was made to preserve the openness of meetings; however, the actions of others could not be allowed to impede proper discourse amongst Governors. He indicated that the course of action taken was consistent with the *Policy on the Disruption of Meetings*.

A member reminded the Council that section 47 of *By-Law Number 2* directs the Chair to exercise his authority under the *University of Toronto Act, 1971* to exclude from the meeting persons whose conduct impedes the orderly transaction of business. She indicated that the decision to recess the meeting was preferable to attempting to continue under what had become impossible circumstances.

Returning to the debate of the proposal, a member commented that over the years, he has seen tuition steadily rise. However, he has also noted the caring support of the administration, faculties, and colleges. He suggested that students who are struggling do find ways to access financial aid.

A member noted that the financial situation of the University was serious, and that it would be selfish not to consider the future of the University and its students. The current tuition fee increases would only just sustain the University, and rejecting the proposal would result in budget cuts which would adversely impact the student experience.

5. Items for Governing Council Approval (cont'd)**(a) Tuition Fee Schedule for Publicly Funded Programs, 2008-09 (cont'd)**

A member agreed that the increases were necessary, however, she noted it was important to ensure that accessibility was the foremost concern. To this end, the availability of scholarships and bursaries must be maximized. The message that the University should be sending was that it was a good institution that cared about students.

Professor Goel added that it was never easy to bring forward a tuition schedule. He highlighted the following points in response to comments that had been made by members and guests:

- The costs of graduate education were spread out over the entire time that students are registered, and the University incurred costs even when students were not on campus. He noted that there were also opportunities for assistance in the form of post-program bursaries.
- International students were not currently covered by the general funding guarantee, however, these cases were dealt with on an individual basis. He noted that some extra costs incurred by international students, such as the UHIP health plan, were beyond the University's control.
- The University of Toronto was proud of its level of accessibility, and in fact, comparisons had shown that it is more accessible than many other Ontario institutions. Research had suggested that keeping tuition low actually reduced participation rates – accessibility was diminished when institutions were not properly funded.
- Some professional faculties had programs to address accessibility in alternative ways, for example, back-end debt relief programs. However, expansion of such programs would require collaboration with the government. Ultimately, this was a more logical route to take in addressing those concerns.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

THAT the Tuition-Fee Schedule For Publicly Funded Programs in 2008-09, as described in Professor Goel's February 20, 2008 report to the Business Board, and the tuition fees in 2008-09 and 2009-10 for the special programs identified in Tables B2 and C2 of Appendices B and C of the report, be approved.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 165 of the Business Board as Appendix "A".

5. Items for Governing Council Approval (cont'd)

(b) Tuition Fee Schedule for Self-Funded Programs, 2008-09

Mr. Nunn advised members that the self-funded programs received no government funding; therefore, their fees were set to recover their costs.

The Chair asked members to limit debate to issues not discussed under the previous item. There were no further questions.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

THAT the tuition-fee schedule for self-funded programs for 2008-09, a copy of which is attached to Professor Goel's February 20, 2008 memorandum to the Business Board as Table 1, be approved.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 165 of the Business Board as Appendix "B".

(c) Budget Report, 2008-09

Professor Marrus reported that Professor Goel had provided the Academic Board with a detailed overview of the proposed budget, and the Board had discussed several points. A member had inquired about the sufficiency of funds allocated to student aid. Professor Goel responded that sufficient funds would be allocated as needed, and that the assumptions in the Budget Report were for planning purposes – the University would continue to honour its access guarantee. Next, a member had asked whether the new budget model would allow for differences in funding between academic divisions to be addressed, if it were found that the historical Reference Level was incorrect. Professor Goel stated that the information from the new budget model could be used to inform future allocation decisions for the University Fund, as well as the allocation of other special funds. However, he noted that it would take time to make distributional changes, since allocations to other units would be affected. Finally, a member had wondered what prompted the decision to reduce the accumulated deficit to 0% in such a short timeframe. Professor Goel replied that the decision had been made one year ago, under the previous six-year plan. Therefore, reducing the deficit to zero within five years was a continuation of this process.

Mr. Nunn indicated that the Business Board had two responsibilities concerning the Budget Report. First, it was responsible for recommending the "ground rules" for the financial operation of the University. A long-standing rule had limited the cumulative deficit to 1.5% of operating revenue. The Governing Council's interpretation of that rule had been that the University would have a long-term budget plan, and the cumulative deficit could, in the course of that plan, exceed 1.5%. There had been two conditions, both applying the final year of the plan. First, the budget must be balanced in the final year. Second, the accumulated deficit must be reduced to the 1.5% limit at the end of the plan.

5. Items for Governing Council Approval (cont'd)**(c) Budget Report, 2008-09 (cont'd)**

The administration now proposed a fundamental change to these rules, which the Business Board endorsed. The fixed budget windows would be replaced by rolling plans presented every year, with budget projections extending out five years. Each plan must end with no cumulative deficit – eliminating any temptation to incur deficits in the early years of a fixed plan. The administration would have to show each year how any deficit would be eliminated within five years. The new arrangement would, at the same time, provide the flexibility to deal with financial uncertainty – for example, sudden government funding cuts or problems in the financial markets. Normally, these would be accounted for within one or two years. However, where there was no alternative, they could be dealt with over the five years of a plan.

Mr. Nunn noted that the second responsibility of the Business Board was to advise the Governing Council on the financial prudence of the budget plan. The Board received a full and careful presentation by Professor Goel. It also received a detailed statement from the President. The Board was satisfied that the assumptions about revenues and expenses were reasonable and prudent, and that the risk involved was being managed effectively.

A member commented that it was laudable that the University was proposing a balanced budget on an annual basis, but given the significance of the change, wondered whether it would be a sustainable process and whether it would have an impact on the University's financial ratings. Professor Goel replied that although he did not anticipate much of an impact on the University's ratings, the significance of the change should not be underestimated. He explained that previously, it had been common to ratchet deficits cycle-over-cycle, but that continuing with budget deficits this way was unsustainable. The essential shortfall that inevitably existed as a result of the greater increase in costs relative to revenues had been masked in the past as a result of enrolment growth; however, this was no longer an option – revenues would have to be increased. In recent years, new programs, such as the Canada Research Chairs, had helped the University get by. However, there have not been substantial changes in base revenue, and this would make budgeting more difficult on an ongoing basis.

The President agreed that the lack of base funding was a pressing issue for universities nationwide, but particularly in Ontario, where many universities were struggling with balancing their budgets.

A member drew the Council's attention to page 50 of the Budget Report, which addressed assumptions regarding compensation for administrative staff. He pointed out that for the years 2004 through 2006, it was noted that assumptions were "for modeling purposes only" and did not represent a strategy for salary negotiations. He inquired whether this premise applied to the current assumptions. Professor Goel confirmed that there was no change in the assumptions for 2007 and 2008, and that the same premise applied.

5. Items for Governing Council Approval (cont'd)

(c) Budget Report, 2008-09 (cont'd)

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

1. THAT a rolling five-year budget planning window, ending with the accumulated deficit reduced to zero by the end of any five-year planning period, be approved, replacing:
 - (a) the 1977 Governing Council policy limiting the annual surplus/deficit to 1.5%, and
 - (b) the current arrangement of fixed multi-year budget cycles ending in a balanced annual budget in the final year and an accumulated deficit not to exceed 1.5% of revenue;
2. THAT the 2008-09 Budget be approved; and
3. THAT the Long Range Budget Guidelines for 2008-2013 and the Planning Assumptions for 2008-2013 be approved in principle.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 155 of the Academic Board as Appendix “D”.

(d) Research Policies: *Collections Policy*

Professor Marrus stated that the proposed *Policy* set out general principles about how the University would acquire, manage, and, where appropriate, dispose of collections. Under the terms of the *Policy*, collections must be specifically named or accessioned and inventoried. The *Policy* also stipulated that an administrator, usually the head of the academic unit, must be designated for each collection. That administrator would then be required to name a specific monitor for each collection. At the Academic Board, a member expressed surprise at learning that there was currently no requirement to analyze the financial implication of maintaining a collection. Professor Goel explained that the proposed *Collections Policy* would ensure that the administrator of a collection was identified before the collection was accepted – a Principal or Dean would assign responsibility for a collection, and also support it.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

THAT the proposed *Collections Policy* be approved.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 155 of the Academic Board as Appendix “A”.

5. Items for Governing Council Approval (cont'd)

(e) School of Public Health – Extra-Departmental Unit A (EDU:A) – Establishment

Professor Marrus reported that the proposed School would support academic public health activity at the University, coordinated across several units. As an EDU:A, the School would have its own budget, authority to administer research grants, offer academic programs, enrol students, and make primary faculty appointments. The existing Department of Public Health Sciences would provide the core faculty membership, education, research programs, and administrative structure, and the Director of the School would report to the Vice-President and Provost or designate. All revenues and costs associated with the School would be included in the budget of the Faculty of Medicine, and all administrative staff matters would be dealt with through the Faculty's human resources functions.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

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

Documentation is attached to Report Number 155 of the Academic Board as Appendix "B".

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

Professor Marrus noted that enrolment at UTM had increased significantly since 2000-2001, creating pressure on campus infrastructure. The South Building was the busiest pedestrian area on campus, and its use had been greatly impacted by the construction of a number of new buildings on the UTM campus. The proposal, which would proceed in phases, would allow the consolidation and expansion of UTM's student services, the creation of a Student Plaza, and additional space necessary for academic and administrative departments. Phase One of the proposal, for which approval was being sought, had an estimated total project cost of \$10.057 million, with \$3.5 million in a cash contribution from the UTM operating budget, and \$6.557 million through borrowing to be repaid from the UTM operating budget. Additional Phases would be brought forward to governance for further approval as required.

Mr. Nunn reported that the Business Board had considered the execution and financing of the first Phase of the proposal, and had approved the execution of Phase One, subject to Governing Council approval.

A member noted that recent capital projects appeared to be focused on the St. George and Mississauga campuses. He inquired whether fewer resources were being directed towards development of the Scarborough campus. Another member replied that, in fact, the Scarborough campus is treated equally; however, expansion at each campus tends to happen in phases. Professor Goel reiterated that resources were distributed in a fair manner, and that several years ago, a number of proposals were approved for the University of Toronto at Scarborough.

5. Items for Governing Council Approval (cont'd)

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

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

1. THAT the Project Planning Report for the South Building Master Plan be approved in principle.
2. THAT Phase One of the South Building Master Plan, approximately 1,906 net assignable square metres (3,270 gross square metres), having a total estimated project cost of \$10,057,000 be approved.
3. THAT the \$10,057,000 funding required for Phase One of the South Building Master Plan comprise:
 - (a) \$3,500,000 cash contribution from the University of Toronto at Mississauga operating budget; and
 - (b) \$6,557,000 through borrowing paid from the University of Toronto at Mississauga operating budget.
4. THAT the interim planning report for Phases Two and Three and the Completion of the Student Plaza be approved in principle.
5. THAT the component parts of Phases Two and Three and the Completion of the Student Plaza be brought forward for further approvals through the Accommodations and Facilities Directorate for components valued at less than \$2 million, and to the Governing Council for those exceeding \$2 million, in accordance with the Policy on Capital Planning and Capital Projects.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 155 of the Academic Board as Appendix “C”.

6. Reports for Information

Members received the following reports for information:

- (a) Report Number 155 of the Academic Board (March 6, 2008)
- (b) Report Number 165 of the Business Board (March 5, 2008)
- (c) Report Number 413 of the Executive Committee (March 31, 2008)

The Chair noted that members would receive Report Number 146 of the University Affairs Board (March 25, 2008) for information, at the next regular meeting of the Governing Council.

There were no questions arising from the Reports.

7. Date of the Next Meeting

The Chair reminded members that the next regular meeting of the Governing Council was scheduled for Wednesday, May 21, 2008, at 4:30 p.m. The Chair noted that it has been the tradition to hold one meeting each year at one of the other two campuses of the University of Toronto. This year, the Council will be meeting on May 21, 2008, at the University of Toronto at Scarborough.

8. Question Period

A member thanked the administration and the Secretariat for their efforts in ensuring that the meeting was conducted in as open and fair a manner as possible under the difficult circumstances occasioned by the disruption.

A member suggested that the Varsity football team at the University was currently under-funded. The President responded that the team had an endowment of approximately \$1 million, and that fundraising was on-going. He noted, however, that given the academic priorities of the University, it was difficult to reallocate academic funding to Varsity sports. Professor Goel added that a policy decision approximately 15 years ago to fund men's and women's sports equally also had an impact on funding for individual teams. He indicated that the funding approach for athletics at the University would be re-examined over the coming years, with broad consultation within the University community.

9. Other Business

There were no items of Other Business.

IN ACCORDANCE WITH A DETERMINATION BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE PURSUANT TO SECTION 38 OF BY-LAW NUMBER 2, ITEMS 10 AND 11 WERE CONSIDERED BY THE GOVERNING COUNCIL IN CAMERA.

10. Judicial Affairs Matter: Recommendation for the Cancellation of Degrees

(a) First Recommendation for Degree Cancellation

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

THAT the President's first recommendation for the cancellation of a degree, as outlined in the memorandum and supporting documentation from the Secretary of the Governing Council, dated April 10, 2008, be confirmed.

10. Judicial Affairs Matter: Recommendation for the Cancellation of Degrees (cont'd)

(b) Second Recommendation for Degree Cancellation

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

THAT the President's second recommendation for the cancellation of a degree, as outlined in the memorandum and supporting documentation from the Secretary of the Governing Council, dated April 10, 2008, be confirmed.

(c) Third Recommendation for Degree Cancellation

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

THAT the President's third recommendation for the cancellation of a degree, as outlined in the memorandum and supporting documentation from the Secretary of the Governing Council, dated April 10, 2008, be confirmed.

11. Senior Appointment

Vice-President, Human Resources & Equity

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

THAT Professor Angela Hildyard be re-appointed Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity, for a second term, effective July 1, 2008 and continuing to June 30, 2011.

The meeting adjourned at 6:45 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

April 27, 2008