

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

Wednesday, May 21, 2008

MINUTES OF THE GOVERNING COUNCIL meeting held on Wednesday, May 21, 2008 at 4:30 p.m. in the Council Chamber, University of Toronto at Scarborough.

Present:

Mr. John F. (Jack) Petch (In the Chair)
The Honourable David R. Peterson, Chancellor
Professor C. David Naylor, President
Professor Varouj Aivazian
Mr. P.C. Choo
Dr. Claude S. Davis
Mr. Ken Davy
Dr. Shari Graham Fell
Professor Vivek Goel
Ms Judith Goldring
Professor William Gough
Dr. Gerald Halbert
Professor Ronald H. Kluger
Professor Michael R. Marrus
Professor Ian Orchard

Mr. Alexandru Rascanu
Mr. Timothy Reid
Mr. Stephen C. Smith
Miss Maureen J. Somerville
Dr. Sarita Verma
Ms B. Elizabeth Vosburgh
Mr. Robert S. Weiss
Mr. W. David Wilson

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

Secretariat:

Mr. Matthew Lafond

Absent:

Ms Diana Alli
Professor Brian Corman
The Honourable William G. Davis
Miss Saswati Deb
Dr. Alice Dong
Ms Susan Eng
Mr. Arya Ghadimi
Professor Ellen Hodnett
Professor Glen A. Jones
Mr. Alex Kenjeev
Dr. Joel A. Kirsh
Dr. Stefan Mathias Larson
Professor Louise Lemieux-Charles

Mr. Joseph Mapa
Mr. Geoffrey Matus
Ms Florence Minz
Mr. Gary P. Mooney
Mr. George E. Myhal
Mr. Richard Nunn
Ms Jacqueline C. Orange
Professor Doug W. Reeve
Professor Arthur S. Ripstein
Ms Lorenza Sisca
Ms Estefania Toledo
Mr. Larry Wasser
Mr. Yang Weng

In Attendance:

Dr. Robert Bennett, Past-Member 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
Professor Franco Vaccarino, Vice-President and Principal, University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC)
Ms Binish Ahmed, Vice-President University Affairs, Students' Administrative Council (operating as the University of Toronto Students' Union)
Mr. Andrew Arifuzzaman, Chief, Strategy and Planning, UTSC
Professor John Bassili, Chair, Department of Psychology, UTSC
Professor John Coleman, Vice-Principal, Research and Graduate Studies, UTSC
Mr. Jim Delaney, Associate Director and Senior Policy Advisor, Student Affairs
Mr. Neil Dobbs, Deputy Secretary of the Governing Council
Ms Sheree Drummond, Assistant Provost
Ms. Nora Gillespie, Legal Counsel, Office of the Vice-President and Provost
Dr. Anthony Gray, Special Advisor to the President
Ms Sandy Hudson, President, Students' Administrative Council (operating as the University of Toronto Students' Union)
Professor Michael Krashinsky, Chair, Department of Management, UTSC
Ms Lesley Lewis, Assistant Dean, UTSC
Mr. Don MacMillan, Registrar and Director of Enrollment Services, UTSC
Ms Kim McLean, Chief Administrative Officer, UTSC
Dr. Tim McTiernan, Assistant Vice-President, Research
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.
Ms Caroline Rabbat, Director, Campus Safety and Security, UTSC
Ms Angela Regnier, Executive Director, Students' Administrative Council (operating as the University of Toronto Students' Union)
Ms Kim Richard, Director, Human Resources, UTSC
Ms Amorell Saunders N'Daw, Director, Office of the Vice-President and Principal, UTSC
Mr. Robert Steiner, Assistant Vice-President, Strategic Communications
Ms Mae-Yu Tan, Assistant Secretary of the Governing Council
Professor Greg Vanlerberghe, Chair, Department of Biological Sciences, UTSC
Mr. Andre Vashist, Scarborough Campus Students' Union

IN ACCORDANCE WITH A DETERMINATION BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE PURSUANT TO SECTION 38 OF BY-LAW NUMBER 2, ITEM 12 WAS CONSIDERED BY THE GOVERNING COUNCIL IN CAMERA.

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

The Chair welcomed members and guests to the meeting at the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC) campus. He noted that it was always a pleasure to spend time at UTSC, particularly at this time of expansion and renewal.

(b) Comments Regarding the Memorandum to Governors re: Open Meetings and Meeting Disruptions

The Chair wished to take a few minutes to speak about the memorandum that had been sent to Governors on the topic of Open Meetings and Meeting Disruptions. He advised that it had been posted to the main page of the Governing Council website.¹

The Chair explained that he had written the memorandum in light of recent demonstrations on the St. George campus, and the disruption of the previous Governing Council meeting. There had been some critical comments about the Governing Council and how it worked, arising out of those events. The purpose of the memorandum had been to clarify:

- The Governing Council's responsibilities regarding open meetings; and
- The statutory and policy framework within which meetings were conducted.

The Chair indicated that he hoped that the document had clarified how he intended to conduct the business of the Council and to enable members to fulfill their responsibilities collectively and individually, and welcomed feedback on those issues.

(c) Speaking Requests

One speaking request had been granted for the meeting. At the appropriate time, the Chair would call upon Ms Binish Ahmed, Vice-President University Affairs of the Students' Administrative Council (operating as the University of Toronto Students' Union), to speak to agenda item 7.

2. Principal's Remarks

The Chair introduced Professor Franco Vaccarino, Vice-President and Principal of the University of Toronto at Scarborough, and thanked him for hosting the Governing Council meeting.

Professor Vaccarino gave a PowerPoint presentation entitled "A Look at UTSC", attached hereto as [Appendix "A"](#).

¹ <http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/AssetFactory.aspx?did=5224>

2. Principal's Remarks (cont'd)

Highlights of Professor Vaccarino's presentation included the following:

- UTSC was founded in 1964. At the time, it was home to 16 faculty members and 500 students.
- Currently, UTSC has over 10,000 students and 600 faculty and staff; half of this growth had occurred in the last seven years.
- UTSC was the exclusive "co-op" campus at the University of Toronto, and currently offered 83 co-op programs, including the University's only co-op Bachelor of Business Administration degree.
- A key planning goal, in a context of increasing competition in the field of higher education, and in order to maximize value for the entire University, was a focus on diversification with some campus differentiation.
- Priorities for UTSC in the coming years included:
 - Vision and Identity: A more targeted approach with an eye towards differentiation and tri-campus coordination.
 - Internal and External Relations: A community presence and University of Toronto identity in east Toronto, the Greater Toronto Area, and surrounding regions.
 - Sustained focus on strategy and planning.
 - Increasing partnerships and campus profile.
- UTSC was planning for a strategic expansion of onsite graduate training, increasing to approximately 10 percent of the total student population by 2030.
- At the undergraduate level, UTSC would be responsive to student demand and interest, focusing on differentiated programs with an emphasis on interdisciplinary and discipline-based learning elements.
- UTSC would become an international hub for learning and partnership within the University of Toronto system, with possible expansion of programs such as "Green Path", which currently offered pre-admission to top students in high schools in China.
- Projections suggested UTSC had the capacity to grow to approximately 15,000 students. A major focus would be to address the full capital, faculty and staff requirements needed to sustain current and future student numbers.

The Chair thanked Professor Vaccarino for his thorough and highly informative presentation and invited members to comment.

A member remarked that she had been one of the first students enrolled at UTSC. She noted that while it had been exciting to be on the campus in its early days, the excitement had grown as the campus had itself continued to grow and develop.

3. Minutes of the Previous Meetings

The Chair noted that members had received copies of the Minutes of the April 10, 2008 meeting of the Governing Council with their agenda packages.

The Secretariat had recently received notice of a proposal to make certain amendments to the Minutes. The Chair suggested that, in the interest of properly reviewing the proposed changes, the approval of the Minutes be deferred to the June 23, 2008 meeting of the Governing Council. There was general agreement with this suggestion.

A member identified himself as the individual who had provided the Chair with the proposed amendments to the Minutes of the meeting of April 10, 2008, and indicated that he wished to address the Council. First, he offered his apologies if he had made individual members uncomfortable while making his comments on the Tuition Fees item at that meeting, but assured members that his comments were made in good faith. In addition to the amendments proposed in his written document, he wished to highlight the following instances where he felt the Governing Council had not followed the University's policies:

- On page 12, paragraph 1 of the Minutes, it was noted that the Chair declared a recess pursuant to section 47 of *By-law Number 2*. The member stated that the *By-law* refers to removing people from the room for unruly conduct; not to declaring a recess.²
- On page 12, paragraph 3, the Minutes indicated that a member questioned whether the meeting was being conducted in an open manner. The Chair had responded that he was satisfied that the relevant obligations under the *University of Toronto Act, 1971*, had been fulfilled under the circumstances. The member stated his view that the *Act* had been violated – he maintained that only for inappropriate conduct could individuals be removed from the room; however, other students, who had not been directly involved in causing the disruption, had also been excluded.
- On page 12, paragraph 4, it was reported that the President stated that the course of action taken with respect to calling the recess had been consistent with the *Policy on the Disruption of Meetings*.³ The member suggested that this was incorrect; although the first step suggested by the *Policy* had been followed, the Chair had not necessarily complied with steps 2, 3, 4, and 5.

The Chair thanked the member for his remarks, and indicated that they would be taken into account in considering possible revisions to the Minutes. He reminded members that, clearly, there were different viewpoints about what had transpired at the meeting, and reiterated that the Minutes of the meeting of April 10, 2008 would be included on the agenda of the next regular meeting for approval.

² Section 47 of *By-law Number 2* states:

At all meetings of the Governing Council, the Presiding Officer shall, in addition to his or her duties as a member of the Council, maintain order and decorum, exercise the authority under *The University of Toronto Act, 1971*, as amended, to exclude or cause to be removed from the meeting any persons whose improper conduct impedes the orderly transaction of business of the Council, and conduct the meeting in conformity with the By-laws of the Council.

³ <http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/policies/disrupt.htm>

4. Business Arising from the Minutes of the Previous Meeting

There was no business arising from the previous meeting.

5. Report of the President

The President indicated that in the interest of time – and in light of Professor Vaccarino’s special presentation – he would depart from the practice of commencing his remarks with a presentation from a group focused on the student experience. However, he wished to touch on the following subjects.

(a) Awards and Honours

The President reminded members that a list of awards and honours was included in the agenda package. Once again, it highlighted extraordinary accomplishments at the University. The President urged Governors to review the inspiring list of achievements by faculty, staff, and students.

(b) University Business in China and Israel

The President briefed Governors on two recent University visits, to China two weeks ago, and to Israel last week.

(i) China

On invitation from Beijing University, the President joined other presidents of top universities from China, Japan, Australia, Scotland, Korea and Russia in celebration of Peking University’s 110th anniversary.

The event included an informative roundtable discussion on the role of universities in sustainable development. It also provided opportunities for informative discussions with university leaders from around Asia. The President commented that it was striking that the issues confronting universities around the world were very similar.

(ii) Israel

Accompanied by Vice-President Judith Wolfson, the President flew to Israel, where they had productive visits to that nation’s top three research institutions – the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, the Technion in Haifa, and the Weissman Institute of Science in Rehovot. These institutions were much younger than the University of Toronto, and the base funding situation for both the Technion and Hebrew University had been very difficult, owing to government constraints. However, in the midst of one of the world’s zones of ongoing and intense conflict, all three institutions had already made a major mark in education and in multiple spheres of scholarship. The President remarked that it had been a privilege to spend time with colleagues at these fine institutions.

5. **Report of the President** (cont'd)
- (b) **University Business in China and Israel** (cont'd)
- (ii) **Israel** (cont'd)

For part of the week, the President and Ms Wolfson had travelled with the President and Vice-President, Research of the University of British Columbia, and the President of the Canada Foundation for Innovation, in a shared effort to understand why Israel's universities had been so successful in the commercialization of their scientific discoveries, even as they had maintained excellence in basic research. The President advised that he would be happy to brief interested Governors on the policies, strategies, and structures that they had viewed as contributing to the success of these institutions.

Furthermore, the President was pleased to report that President Menachem Magidor joined him in renewing the Memorandum of Understanding between the University of Toronto and Hebrew University in Jerusalem.

The President expressed his thanks to Dr. Ralph Halbert and Mr. Gary Goldberg, both distinguished alumni and supporters of the University, who had assisted in organizing many visits, and accompanied the delegation for some sessions.

(c) **Events of March 20, 2008**

The President next wished to address some misinformation which had been circulated about the events which occurred in Simcoe Hall on March 20, 2008.

- First, he indicated that he continued to read characterizations of the event as a peaceful sit-in. However, first-hand accounts from staff had indicated that it was an aggressive, chaotic, and ultimately violent protest. Staff in the halls had been verbally harassed and intimidated. Ultimately, six staff (four women and two men) had been confined in the Provost's office. They had eventually been able to leave only because a blocked door had been cleared by campus police. As they left, one woman was knocked to her hands and knees by the protesters, while others were grabbed and pushed. The President commented that this conduct stood in disappointing contrast to the tradition of peaceful protest and dissent which had been respected for years on all three campuses.
- Second, contrary to continued assertions, the University did not press criminal charges against some or all of the protesters. The President reminded members that the University had no authority to withdraw charges which it did not lay. Because of the nature of the conduct – and consistent with University policy which contemplated that issues which were potentially criminal in nature were ordinarily dealt with by the appropriate criminal court – information regarding the occurrence had been referred to the Toronto Police by the University's special constables. The Toronto Police, and the Office of the Crown Attorney, after their own investigation and consideration, chose to lay criminal charges against a number of individuals.

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

This alone underscored that in the view of those who were responsible for assessing, in the public good, the bounds of acceptable behaviour, the conduct at issue crossed the line.

(d) Fundraising

The President observed that it had been a remarkable year for fundraising. The most recent example had been the establishment of the Dalla Lana School of Public Health. The President thanked Governors for their timely response in approving the naming of the School. The appointment of the School's inaugural Director, Professor Jack Mandel, was announced concurrently with the generous \$20 million gift from Mr. Paul Dalla Lana and the University's decision to name the School in his honour.

The President noted that next week, there would be another major announcement, and yet another two weeks thereafter. In light of this positive trajectory, the President congratulated the entire Advancement Team, especially Vice-President David Palmer, who had achieved remarkable success since joining the University in the fall.

(e) *Towards 2030*

Turning to a brief update on the *Towards 2030* strategic planning initiative, the President noted that he was delighted that Ms Rose Patten, past Chair of the Governing Council and Chair of the Task Force on Governance, would be at the meeting to present that Task Force's Final Report.

The President remarked that he had been very impressed by the quality of all the Task Force final reports, and that each had approached their work with extraordinary dedication and diligence. Because of a shift in the original deadlines to allow the Task Forces to explore topics more thoroughly, coupled with a number of travel commitments, the President noted that there was a strong possibility that the final written submission would need to be deferred to the early summer. However, he hoped to bring forward a synthesis of key findings for Governors' consideration at the final Council meeting in June.

(f) Convocation

The President concluded his remarks by pointing ahead to the official opening of the Convocation season. The first of this spring's Convocation ceremonies would take place on June 4, 2008, when the University would celebrate the graduates of the Faculty of Medicine, and an honorary degree would be conferred on Nobel Laureate Oliver Smithies, who did some of his seminal work here at the Connaught Laboratories and who collaborated with President Emeritus George Connell.

The President reminded Governors that they were invited to participate in any of the ceremonies and to join the academic procession.

5. Report of the President (cont'd)

(f) Convocation (cont'd)

Finally, on behalf of the University, the President expressed his gratitude to Chancellor David Peterson for his tireless participation in the many Convocation events that take place at this time of year.

6. Items for Governing Council Approval

(a) Faculty of Arts and Science: Dunlap Institute for Astronomy and Astrophysics Extra-Departmental Unit B (EDU:B)

Professor Marrus explained that the proposed institute would achieve a leadership position in research, teaching, advanced training, and public outreach in the field of astronomy and astrophysics. Its mission was consistent with the original objectives of the gift to the University and with an agreement reached with the Dunlap family. The Institute would have a critical mass of interdisciplinary activities to allow it to admit students to a program of study and to cross-appoint faculty. There were no immediate resource implications beyond those committed from the Faculty of Arts and Science. With the completion of the sale of the Dunlap lands, which were declared surplus to University requirements by the Governing Council in October, 2007, the proceeds would be deposited in an endowment to support the Institute.

A member inquired how many of the staff which were being laid off with the closure of the Dunlap Observatory would be rehired by the University. Professor Goel advised that it was not yet known precisely what accommodations would be required or possible; however, he would update the member as appropriate.

The Chair asked for an update on the status of the sale of the Dunlap lands. Ms Riggall replied that it was expected that the deal would close at the end of July. She confirmed that an agreement had been reached, and that it was currently in the “due diligence” phase.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

THAT the Dunlap Institute for Astronomy and Astrophysics be established as an Extra-Departmental Unit B (EDU:B) within the Faculty of Arts and Science, effective immediately.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 156 of the Academic Board as Appendix “A”.

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

(b) Faculty of Arts and Science: School of International Studies Extra-Departmental Unit B (EDU:B)

Professor Marrus reported that the proposed School of International Studies within the Faculty of Arts and Science would cut across departments, faculties and campuses, while maintaining the traditional strength of the Munk Centre for International Studies at Trinity College. As an EDU:B, the School would admit students to programs of study, and faculty would be cross-appointed. Funding for the School would be based on existing financial commitments to the Munk Centre; revenues and costs would be part of the budget of the Faculty of Arts and Science. As well, the University had been successful in obtaining \$25 million of funding from the Province of Ontario for the School. In response to a question from a member of the Academic Board, Professor Janice Stein, Director of the Munk Centre, emphasized that extensive consultation with all partner faculties would occur prior to any future organizational change of collaborative Masters programs currently housed in the Centre; current program requirements would continue to be followed for existing programs. Professor Goel had explained that while the Munk Centre building housed many academic programs, it was not an academic unit at the University. Over time, following extensive consultation, there would be a goal to house those programs within the proposed School.

A member inquired whether the government funding which had been received had influenced the decision to establish the School as an EDU:B. Professor Goel replied that the decision to create the School arose from the recommendations of a review of the Munk Centre. He explained that in this case, academic initiative had driven the government's priorities.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

THAT the School of International Studies be established as an Extra-Departmental Unit B (EDU:B) within the Faculty of Arts and Science, effective July 1, 2008.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 156 of the Academic Board as Appendix "B".

(c) Business Board Terms of Reference: Revisions

Ms Vosburgh, introducing the item on behalf of the Business Board, noted that the Board had considered the relationship between the University and the University of Toronto Asset Management Corporation (UTAM) at two meetings this year. The proposal to review the Board's Terms of Reference would enable the establishment of a very simple relationship. The Business Board, acting for the Governing Council, would approve appropriate investment return targets and risk tolerances for the funds under UTAM's management. It would then monitor their achievement. The management of the funds would be left to UTAM—who had the appropriate expertise—overseen by the expert UTAM Board. That Board was nominated by the Executive Committee on the recommendation of the President.

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

(c) Business Board Terms of Reference: Revisions (cont'd)

There were no questions.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

THAT the proposed, revised section 5.1 of the Business Board Terms of Reference, “Financial Policy and Transactions,” a copy of which is included in the attachment to Richard Nunn’s memorandum to the Business Board dated April 8, 2008, be approved.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 166 of the Business Board as Appendix “A”.

7. Towards 2030 Task Force on Governance – Phase 1 Report

The Chair reminded members that at its meeting of March 31, 2008, the Executive Committee resolved that the Task Force on Governance Phase 1 Report be considered by the Governing Council *in camera*. That decision was taken in anticipation of a discussion regarding a proposal for “next steps”, which could have included potential Task Force membership—it was intended that any such membership discussion would be considered *in camera*, with the remainder in open session. However, since the proposal regarding next steps would be considered at a future meeting, the Report would accordingly be received entirely in open session.

The Chair welcomed Ms Rose M. Patten, Chair of the Task Force on Governance, to the meeting. Ms Patten began by thanking members of the Task Force who were in attendance at the meeting, and recognized the special contribution of Professor Goel as Vice-Chair of the Task Force. She also thanked the Honourable William G. Davis for his particular contribution, in providing expert advice on governance issues.

Ms Patten indicated that her intention was to comment briefly on some of the highlights of the Report; to have an opportunity to hear Governors’ comments and questions, and to obtain the Council’s acceptance of the Report and its approval of the recommendation to move to the next phase. She reminded members that at this phase, the mandate of the Task Force had been to identify relevant issues through a broad consultation process, rather than to propose solutions.

Generally, the consultations had confirmed the assumptions with which the Task Force had commenced its work:

- There was nothing compelling to point to change from the unicameral system;
- If necessary, the *University of Toronto Act* would be revisited;
- Representation of the five key estates (administrative staff, alumni, students, teaching staff and government appointees) would be preserved; and
- Governance must address the complexity of decision-making and improve governance oversight of the three campuses.

7. Towards 2030 Task Force on Governance – Phase 1 Report (cont'd)

There was also confirmation of the essential strength of the University's governance system; change is necessary, but the basic foundation was strong.

The Report addressed six major themes, emerging from the advice and input that the Task Force received:

- Oversight and accountability—the quality of the Governing Council's meeting agendas;
- Overlap/duplication, deficiencies, and ambiguities—Board and Committee mandates;
- Delegated authority for academic divisions—lack of clarity and inconsistency;
- Delegated authority in the tri-campus context—levels of oversight and accountability redundancy;
- Quality of Governors—experience mix and representation; and
- The role of and the appropriate interfaces between Governors and the administration.

Within each of these themes, there were clearly a number of specific issues to examine. Some would require modest changes to practice; others would be more substantive. Under each theme in the Report, examples of feedback were provided in the yellow boxes. These were views that were expressed to the Task Force, not its own observations or conclusions.

Recommendations reflected the Task Force's judgment on the varying complexity of issues and what would be required to address them. The recommended staged approach would enable integration with, and consideration of, strategic directions which had emerged from the other *Towards 2030* Task Forces.

Before moving on to discussion of the Report, the Chair wished to thank past-member of the Governing Council Dr. Robert Bennett (who was present at the meeting) for his continuing dedication to governance issues, and for providing valuable feedback during the Task Force consultations.

The Chair reminded members that a speaking request had been granted for this item. He invited Ms Binish Ahmed, Vice-President University Affairs, Students' Administrative Council (operating as the University of Toronto Students' Union), to address the Council for a maximum of three minutes. Ms Ahmed stated that she had been advised that the audio webcast may have been interrupted. She inquired whether the webcast had resumed. The Secretary confirmed that it had. Ms Ahmed began by remarking that it appeared that the Task Force's consultation process had not incorporated much of the University community, particularly labour unions and student groups. She stated her view that there were points at which various bodies had attempted to participate, but the process had not been accessible to them. She stated that in a conversation with the President, student groups were advised that it was not in the interest of the *Towards 2030* process to include student feedback in the Task Force consultations because, as Ms Ahmed reported, "they would never get passed." She added that even when students had been included in the process, they did not have parity with other groups. Ms Ahmed then advised that she wished to make comments about the events of March 20, 2008. The Chair directed her to address the issue under discussion, *i.e.*, the Task Force on Governance Report. Ms Ahmed reiterated that the University was not paying attention to students.

7. *Towards 2030* Task Force on Governance – Phase 1 Report (cont'd)

The President expressed his surprise at Ms Ahmed's interpretation of his discussion with student leaders. He indicated that he had advised that if Task Forces were created to include various representative bodies, the potential number of members would be limitless. Because of Governors' fiduciary responsibilities—regardless of constituency—the view that the Task Forces should be composed chiefly of Governors, including student members, was endorsed by Governors themselves.

A member added that it must not be forgotten that the Task Force on Governance had had student input, membership, and commentary, as well as at least one member who was also a member of a union. He stated that the idea that the Task Force should adopt “party politics” at the University would not serve governance well. As Governors, all members must consider the interests of the entire University community. He also noted that student officers who represented particular organizations should consider the views of all other students who generally shared a number of their concerns. However, in his view, the issues that were often pored over in great detail by particularly vocal members of student groups, creating much controversy, were not necessarily shared by other students, and these tactics were unproductive.

A student member commented that he had been a representative on a *Towards 2030* Task Force, and noted its concern from the outset to maximize student input. He remarked that the Task Force had gone out of its way to meet with members of various student unions, even after several attempts to do so had failed. He advised that he had also been asked by the Task Force on Governance to participate in a consultation discussion, along with other student representatives, to whom invitations had been widely distributed. However, only he and one other student had attended at the consultation session. He noted that when students had chosen to participate in the process, their contributions had been valuable.

Another member of the Task Force also wished to refute the notion that student voices had been ignored. He reminded members that a student Governor had been a representative on the Task Force, and pointed out that she spoke passionately on issues of importance to students.

A member stated that since the number of student members on the Council had been enshrined in the *University of Toronto Act*, student enrolment had increased. Therefore, the proportion of student representation on the Council had essentially decreased. Accordingly, he felt that student representation on the Governing Council should receive particular consideration in Phase 2 of the process.

A member indicated that he wished to make two suggestions which he hoped would clarify the meaning of some of the text in the Report. First, in the yellow box on the bottom of page 8, the second bullet read “The current process for selecting LGIC candidates is not well understood and could be more clearly articulated.” The member acknowledged that the Task Force was forthright in noting that the process used by the Premier and Cabinet in receiving advice on who to appoint could be more clearly articulated, in order to adhere to the principle of transparency. However, we wondered whether this was sufficient in considering the Terms of Reference for Phase 2. He suggested adding to the passage “...while at the same time assess improvements to that process such as those used at other Canadian universities and other organizations whose

7. *Towards 2030* Task Force on Governance – Phase 1 Report (cont'd)

Board members are appointed by the Government”. Related to this point, in the same box on page 8, there was a question concerning the sequencing of bullet points. He suggested the second bullet should follow, rather than precede, the third bullet, which concerned the means for identifying potential LGIC candidates. The second suggestion related to the fourth bullet in the yellow box on page 4. It highlighted “the special responsibility of academic staff for advancing the academic mission of the University. Those bodies representing the faculty of the University should be vested with primary responsibility for reviewing all matters regarding ‘who teaches what to whom’” The member suggested that this was an incomplete statement regarding a critical aspect of governance, and instead, it should be reworded to reflect the language in the *Act*, which in section 14 limits the powers of committees of the Council (including the Academic Board), of which a majority of members are not members of the Governing Council. The member commented that it would be helpful to have this particular passage redrafted to clarify the responsibilities and accountabilities of a body such as the Academic Board, in this context. In response, the Chair reminded the member that the text in the yellow boxes represented feedback received from participants during consultations. However, he assured the member that his feedback would be given due consideration as the Task Force process moved into the next phase.

A member commended the Report and noted that it addressed many issues that members experienced on a regular basis in trying to govern the University efficiently. He remarked that the issues highlighted in the Report, and the insights which had arisen from the consultations, had been profound.

The Chair thanked Ms Patten and Professor Goel for their extraordinary effort during this phase of the Task Force’s work, and stated that he was confident that the end result would be more efficient and effective institutional governance. A member also expressed his thanks on behalf of the Council for the work of the Secretary in supporting the Task Force process.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

1. THAT the *Towards 2030* Task Force on Governance Phase 1 Report to the Chair of the Governing Council and the President, dated February 28, 2008, be accepted; and
2. THAT, with reference to the Task Force’s recommendations, the Chair develop for consideration by the Governing Council a proposal regarding continuation of the review process.

8. Reports for Information

Members received the following reports for information:

- (a) Report Number 156 of the Academic Board (April 24, 2008)
- (b) Excerpt of Report Number 166 of the Business Board (April 28, 2008)
- (c) Report Number 146 of the University Affairs Board (March 25, 2008)
- (d) Report Number 414 of the Executive Committee (May 12, 2008)

There were no questions arising from the Reports.

9. Date of the Next Meeting

The Chair reminded members that the final regular meeting of the Governing Council for the current governance year was scheduled for Monday, June 23, 2008, at 4:00 p.m., in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall. This was 30 minutes earlier than the usual time.

10. Question Period

Members took this opportunity to engage Professor Vaccarino in further discussion about initiatives at UTSC arising out of his presentation.

A member inquired about the physical capacity of UTSC to expand in order to accommodate a possible 5,000 additional students. Professor Vaccarino clarified that the figure of 15,000 students represented a potential increase based on a preliminary analysis of UTSC's capacity. He indicated that the campus was approximately 300 acres, and that it was likely that about 100 acres had the potential to be developed. The current designation of the land required certain conditions to be fulfilled prior to development; however, he suggested that this would not be a significant barrier, and any necessary conditions would be incorporated into the planning process. Currently, infrastructure was being upgraded to accommodate the recent growth in student enrolment.

A member noted that UTSC had undergone its own planning exercise similar to the broader *Towards 2030* initiative. He wondered whether this exercise had considered existing models of multi-campus organization which may have been relevant for the tri-campus organization at the University of Toronto. Professor Vaccarino indicated that they had examined various models, but that it was not easy to find a model that overlapped with the University of Toronto structure. He remarked that the tri-campus organization at the University was less about geography than about functionality, and observed that there may be potential to add value to the entire University through diversification of the campuses based on strategic differentiation. He added that both the Scarborough and Mississauga campuses were on a trajectory of increasing local scholarship and local strength; however, the University of Toronto identity across all three campuses was fundamental.

A member suggested that UTSC, which had grown to the size of a mid-sized Ontario university in its own right, pursue an objective of recruiting students at a provincial or national level, rather than just within the Greater Toronto Area (GTA). Professor Vaccarino explained that the focus on the eastern GTA related to expanding local opportunities and

10. Question Period (cont'd)

focusing on needs at a regional level. However, those realities should not be seen as distracting UTSC from its fundamental mandate, which was international in reach. The President added that the reality was that the St. George campus was also overwhelmingly drawing from the GTA region. The *Towards 2030* initiative had highlighted the objective of strengthening the University's national recruitment base.

A member inquired where student experience and co-curricular activities ranked among UTSC's priorities. Professor Vaccarino replied that UTSC was proud of its strength in these areas, and pointed to its mentorship programs and experiential learning opportunities as unique examples. The President also noted that there were ongoing plans to examine the expansion of athletics and wellness facilities at the campus.

11. Other Business

There were no items of Other Business.

The Chair thanked the staff at UTSC for their excellent work in preparing for the meeting. He reminded members that there would be an optional tour of the UTSC campus after the meeting, followed by a reception at Bluff's Restaurant co-hosted by the Chancellor, the Honourable David R. Peterson, and Professor Franco Vaccarino.

IN ACCORDANCE WITH A DETERMINATION BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE PURSUANT TO SECTION 38 OF BY-LAW NUMBER 2, ITEM 12 WAS CONSIDERED BY THE GOVERNING COUNCIL IN CAMERA.

12. Board and Committee Assignments 2008-09

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

THAT the proposal from the Chair for Board and Committee assignments for 2008-09 be approved.

The meeting adjourned at 6:32 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

June 5, 2008