

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

COLLEGE OF ELECTORS

Minutes of the College of Electors meeting held on Wednesday, September 24, 2008 at 5:30 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, at which the following were present:

Dr. Françoise Ko (In the Chair)	Ms Pamela McPherson (Victoria)
Mr. Doug Allen (Architecture, Landscape, and Design)	Mr. Peter Murchison (Social Work)
Ms Sadia Butt (Forestry)	Ms Florence Newman (Victoria)
Ms Ruhee Chaudhry (Community Health)	Mr. Lennox Phillips (Mississauga)
Ms Tiffany Chow (Engineering)	Ms Linda Prytula (Pharmacy)
Ms Ann Clarke (Scarborough)	Mr. Devin S. Ragwen (Scarborough)
Professor Mary Condon (SGS)	Professor Peter Russell (Trinity)
Ms Celeste Francis (Woodsworth)	Mr. Gordon Shantz (Mississauga)
Mr. Pierre François (OISE/UT)	Dr. Mahadeo Sukhai (SGS)
Mr. Craig Hegins (New)	Ms Ann Sullivan (St. Michael's)
Ms Erica Henderson	Ms Nancy Sutherland (Victoria)
Ms Victoria Hurlihay	Mr. Colin Swift (New)
Mr. Scott MacKendrick (Engineering)	Ms Maria Topalovich (Music)
	Mr. Jason Wong (UC)
	Mr. William Wrigley (Woodsworth)

Regrets:

Dr. Lita-Rose Betcherman (SGS)	Mr. Paul Morrison (Law)
Dr. Vic Chiasson (Innis)	Dr. Betty Power (OISE/UT)
Dr. Don H. Cowan (Medicine)	Ms Patricia Robb (Physical Education and Health)
Mr. Chris Driscoll (St. Michael's)	Ms Barbara Salmon (Physiotherapy & Occupational Therapy)
Dr. Inez Elliston (OISE/UT)	Ms Padma Tata (Engineering)
Mr. Aran Hamilton (Rotman)	Ms Liz Terry (OISE/UT)
Mr. Garry Kwan (Mississauga)	Mr. Rajesh Uttamchandani (SGS)
Dr. Claire Mallette (Nursing)	Dr. Carolyn Poon Woo (Dentistry)
Mr. Michael Meth (Information Studies)	

Secretary: Ms Mae-Yu Tan

Guests: Mr. Louis Charpentier, Secretary of the Governing Council
Ms Maureen Simpson, member, Nominating Committee

1. Welcome and Chair's Remarks

The Chair welcomed members to the meeting, and explained that she served as Chair by virtue of her position as Vice-President, University Governance, of the University of Toronto Alumni Association. She also informed members that she had previously served as a student member of the Governing Council.

The Chair acknowledged the seven new members of the College:

Dr. Carolyn Poon Woo, Dentistry
Ms Tiffany Chow, Engineering
Mr. Scott MacKendrick, Engineering
Ms Sadia Butt, Forestry

1. Welcome and Chair's Remarks (cont'd)

Mr. Aran Hamilton, Management
Mr. Craig Hegins, New College
Professor Peter Russell, Trinity College

Members introduced themselves and indicated the alumni group that they represented.

The Chair stated that the University of Toronto at Scarborough was eligible to have a third representative on the College, as the number of their alumni now exceeded 30,000. However, they had chosen not to do so. All forty-four seats on the College were now filled.

The Chair reported on the "coffee meetings" that she had held with small groups of new members of the College over the summer. These informal gatherings had provided her with an opportunity to get to know members, obtain their feedback, and seek ways of strengthening the College. Many members had made thoughtful suggestions of how to improve the operation of the College, and the Chair would try to implement some of those suggestions over the next year. As well, she would arrange for similar meetings with those members with whom she had not yet met.

The Chair informed members that two alumni governors' terms would end on June 30, 2009. Mr. Larry Wasser was eligible for re-election, as he would have completed two years as alumni governor, but Ms Susan Eng was not. She would have completed the maximum nine years of service. The Chair also stated that an election for a Chancellor would be required as Chancellor David Peterson's three-year term would end on June 30, 2009. It was the responsibility of the College to ensure that highly competent individuals who possessed the required characteristics and skills were elected to serve as alumni governors and as Chancellor. Members of the College were encouraged to attend meetings of the Governing Council and its Boards and Committees in order to understand the types of issues considered at those levels of governance.

The Chair then outlined the process of the College over the coming year. At the next meeting, which would be held jointly with the Council of Presidents, the Chair of the Governing Council, the President of the University of Toronto, and the President of the University of Toronto Alumni Association would address the College, and members would have an opportunity to learn of the requirements for the alumni governor positions that were to be filled. The College would then meet on March 25, 2009 to review the nominations for alumni governors that were received, to select the candidates to be interviewed, and to finalize the details of the interview process. At that meeting, the College would also receive the Report of the Chancellor Search Committee and would hold the election for the Chancellor. On April 8, 2009, the College would interview selected candidates and elect two alumni governors.

2. Minutes of the Previous Meeting – April 3, 2008

The minutes of the meeting of April 3, 2008 were approved with one correction to the attendance – Dr. Lita-Rose Betcherman had been incorrectly marked as absent.

3. Business Arising

There was no business arising from the previous meeting.

4. *Guidelines for the Nominating Committee: Proposed Revision*

Invited by the Chair to address the College, Ms Maureen Simpson, a former member of the College and a member of its 2007-08 Nominating Committee, stated that in July, she and Mr. Mike Branch had met to review the nomination forms for membership on the 2008-09 Executive Committee. During that meeting, they had also reviewed the *Guidelines for the Nominating Committee*, as they had not been reviewed since 1994. The goal of the Nominating Committee had been to identify any areas for refinement. In their opinion, one procedure which required clarification was the process of selecting members of the Nominating Committee in the event that fewer than three members were available to serve. They recommended the approval of the following excerpt from the *Guidelines*.

In the unlikely event that fewer than three current members of the College are available to serve on the Nominating Committee, as many past Nominating Committee members, who are not current members of the College, as are required to bring the number of committee members to three will be co-opted to serve on the Committee for one year. The co-opted members will be selected by the Nominating Committee in consultation with the Chair of the College.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

The College of Electors APPROVED

THAT the revised *Guidelines for the Nominating Committee* be approved, replacing the *Guidelines* amended on April 19, 1994.

5. *Report of the Nominating Committee*

The Chair stated that members in their first year of the College were not eligible to serve on the Executive Committee. She explained that nominations other than those presented by the Nominating Committee could be put forward by members, but would be considered as an alternative to the names on the slate.

The College moved *in camera*.

(a) *Vice-Chair*

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

The College of Electors APPROVED

THAT Mr. Colin Swift (New College) be Vice-Chair for 2008-2009.

(b) *Executive Members*

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

The College of Electors APPROVED

THAT the remaining members of the Executive Committee for 2008-2009 be Ms Ann Clarke (UTSC), Mr. Lennox Phillips (UTM), and Mr. William Wrigley (Woodsworth College).

The College returned to open session.

6. Selection of a Nominating Committee, 2008-09

The Chair reminded members that the Nominating Committee was composed of three members who were chosen by election or formed of volunteers from among the members who were in their final year on the College. The Nominating Committee was responsible for recommending to the College the Vice-Chair and three other members of the Executive Committee of the College. The Nominating Committee normally met once prior to the fall meeting of the College, either in person or by conference call, to develop its recommendations. The Chair stated Mr. Garry Kwan and Dr. Betty Power had volunteered to serve on the Nominating Committee for 2008-09. Unfortunately, neither had been able to attend the meeting that evening. Following a call for volunteers from the Chair, Ms Maria Topalovich also offered to serve on the Committee.

7. Governance Case Study

The Chair informed members that this year a case study would be presented to the College, rather than an overview of governance, as had been done in past years. This approach would likely be more valuable for members, since the majority had served on the College for one or more years. Members were, however, encouraged to review the background information about the Governing Council that was contained in their information manual.

At the invitation of the Chair, Mr. Louis Charpentier, Secretary of the Governing Council, presented a case study focused on the Varsity Centre Capital Project. Mr. Charpentier explained that this particular project had been selected because it was especially rich in complexity, demonstrated the transparency of each level of governance, and had spanned several years. It also showed the consultative process that had occurred; the University community had provided input at each stage of discussion since the development opportunities of the Varsity Site had first been considered in 1985. As well, this case revealed the multi-leveled nature of the University's governance system through the consideration of the Varsity Centre proposal by multiple bodies. Perhaps most importantly, this case showed the important role that Governors served in decision-making at the University and the contributions that the College indirectly makes to such decisions.

Mr. Charpentier highlighted the importance of the policy framework that guided the University's decisions with respect to the Varsity Centre. First, for the past several years, the *Stepping Up* plan had provided the academic framework for the University. However, the University was entering a new phase with the *Towards 2030* long-term planning framework¹ that was currently under consideration by the University's governance bodies. If approved, that document would provide direction for the next academic cycle. Second, the *Policy on Capital Planning and Capital Projects*, which was approved by Governing Council in June 2001, provided a framework for the development of the University's physical assets. It contained the requirement for the establishment of a Project Committee to oversee the full cycle of a Capital Project. A Project Committee was responsible for producing a Project Planning Report that outlined the user needs, choice of site, cost estimates, and sources of funding. Third, the *University of Toronto Capital Plan, 2006-2011*, approved by Governing Council in March 2007, guided the use of the University's remaining development sites, providing key criteria for capital construction.

Mr. Charpentier outlined the 2004-2005 approval process for the Varsity Centre. It was initiated in November, 2004 with the presentation of the membership and terms of reference of the Project Planning Committee for Varsity 2005 to the Planning and Budget Committee. Subsequently, in May, 2005, the Planning and Budget Committee recommended to the Academic Board that the Interim Project Planning Report be approved in principle, having determined that the project met the academic criteria listed in the *University of Toronto Capital Plan, 2006-2011*. The recommendation for the approval of the first phase

¹ The *Towards 2030: A Long-term Planning Framework for the University of Toronto* is available online at <http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/AssetFactory.aspx?did=5626>.

7. Governance Case Study (cont'd)

of the project, the completion of the track and field and support facilities, was also forwarded to the Board. The plan for a multi-phased project had evolved over the years out of a series of discussions that had explored opportunities such as private partnerships for site development, student housing, and a 25,000 seat stadium. In June, 2005, the Academic Board recommended the Varsity Centre proposal to the Governing Council for approval, recognizing the role that the Centre would play in enhancing the student experience, one of the stated goals of the *Stepping Up* plan.

Mr. Charpentier explained that because the Varsity Centre project would have a major impact on the life of the University community, it had been important for the University Affairs Board (UAB) to be consulted in addition to the Academic Board's consideration. Upon review of the proposal, the UAB had been satisfied that the project would address the needs of the University community, and in May, 2005, it had concurred with the Academic Board's prospective recommendation for approval.

Normally, a Project Implementation Report was submitted for review by the Business Board and the Board's authorization for execution was sought after the Governing Council had approved a project in principle. However, in light of the pressing need for the University to proceed with development of the Varsity Centre site, members of the Business Board had been asked to authorize execution of the first phase of the project with a total project cost of \$16,386,000, subject to Governing Council approval. Elaborating on the approval process for capital projects, Mr. Charpentier said that governors were asked to provide approval "in principle". That afforded the administration some necessary flexibility as projects evolved. The *Policy on Capital Planning and Capital Projects* also permitted limited project cost increases upon authorization of the President². Significant cost increases must be resubmitted to the Business Board for approval and significant changes to the project must be reconsidered by governance. Although the approval process described could be lengthy, it ensured that proper oversight was maintained by governors.

Addressing the role of governors in decision-making, Mr. Charpentier commented that they often initiated refinements in policy that had an impact on the development of the University. Alumni governors in particular, frequently provided leadership. For example, Ms Jacqueline Orange, a former alumni governor who had chaired the Business Board for a number of years, had provided leadership during a period when the University had considered numerous capital projects. In part due to her efforts, the reporting process had been improved to ensure that the Board received information in a timely manner. Mr. Charpentier also pointed to the contributions of alumni governors to the *Towards 2030* strategic planning process, noting that their involvement as Task Force Chairs and Task Force members had helped to shape future directions of the University. The potential for leadership and the ability to serve in the dynamic setting of the University were characteristics that members of the College were asked to consider when evaluating prospective alumni governors.

Members thanked Mr. Charpentier for his presentation, stating that it had provided them with greater insight into the important role and responsibilities of governors. Through reading the Varsity Centre documentation that had been provided, members had also gained a deeper understanding of the multi-

² Increases in the cost of projects with approved Project Planning Reports may be authorized by the President, up to a total of the lesser of \$2,000,000 or 10% of the total project cost. In the event that the costs have increased from the approved/ tendered price to beyond the lesser of \$2,000,000 or 10% of the project cost, the project is required to be resubmitted for Business Board approval and, with respect to sources of funding, Governing Council approval through the Planning and Budget Committee and the Academic Board. Irrespective of cost issues, a re-submission to Governing Council is required to secure approval when significant changes to a space program has been introduced (*Policy on Capital Planning and Capital Projects*, Project Cost Increases, Section 4. G3, p. 12.)

7. Governance Case Study (cont'd)

faceted issues that governors were required to consider. During the discussion, a number of matters were considered including the following.

a) Current status of the Varsity Centre

Members inquired about the outcome of the Varsity Centre project. Mr. Charpentier informed the College that Phase 1 of the project, the track and field and installation of the Dome had been completed by January 2007. In June, 2007, the Governing Council had approved in principle the remaining components of the project. That included the planning and construction of the Varsity Entrance Building and the renovations to Varsity Arena on 299 Bloor Street West and of the Centre for High Performance Sport on 100 Devonshire Place, and the construction of a combined Box Office and Beacon. The total project cost was approximately \$70 million, to be funded by fundraising initiatives.

b) Sources of funding for capital projects

In response to a question about funding of capital projects, Mr. Charpentier explained that most projects had a fundraising component that was outlined in the project planning report. Other sources of funds included reserve funds set aside by the University for capital construction, matching funds provided by the Provincial or Federal Government, and infrequently, funds provided through student levies.

c) Participation in governance

A member commented that if governors were required to physically attend meetings, a large portion of the University's alumni who were located around the world would be excluded from participating. Mr. Charpentier replied that the *Towards 2030* Task Force on University Governance would be examining complementary models of participation for Governors and Board and Committee members for the future.

d) Towards 2030 strategic planning initiative

Members asked for an elaboration of the *Towards 2030* planning initiative. Mr. Charpentier outlined the process that had occurred, beginning with the dissemination of the *Towards 2030* background document in June, 2007, followed by the creation of five Task Forces. The Task Forces had addressed Long-term Enrolment Strategy, Institutional Organization, University Resources, University Relations and Context, and University Governance. After extensive consultation, the Task Forces (with the exception of the Task Force on University Governance) had produced their final reports, which were now public. The *Towards 2030 Synthesis* document had drawn together common threads across the Task Force reports, identifying mutual, general themes. The general directions from the *Synthesis* document had then been presented in the *Towards 2030 Framework*, which would be considered by the Governing Council, pending a recommendation for approval from the Academic Board. The Planning and Budget Committee had already provided strong support for the *Framework*. The Task Force on University Governance had submitted a first phase report and would be proceeding this year with the second phase of its review of governance.

8. University of Toronto Magazine Advertisements

(a) Alumni Governors

The Chair informed members that advertisements for the Call for Nominations for Alumni Governors and the Chancellor would be placed in the Winter 2009 issue of the University of Toronto Magazine. She noted that the issue would include a brief article on former alumni governor, Ms Jacqueline Orange. The article was the outcome of a suggestion that the College had made last year when discussing strategies for providing

8. University of Toronto Magazine Advertisements (cont'd)

(a) Alumni Governors (cont'd)

information about alumni governors to alumni. Members reviewed the draft alumni governors advertisement and made suggestions for strengthening the ad.

Members also discussed the importance of reporting on their activities to their respective alumni associations, in order to increase awareness of the role of the College. By doing so, suitable alumni could be encouraged to serve as co-opted members on the Boards and Committee of the Governing Council and perhaps subsequently serve as an alumni governor. Resources such as alumni newsletters and magazines could be used to distribute the alumni governor ad.

(b) Chancellor

The College approved two ads for the Call for Nominations for Chancellor; one would be used in the event that Chancellor Peterson was willing to stand for re-election, and the other would be used if he declined to stand for another term.

9. The Alumni Guide to the College of Electors

The Chair stated that, during the summer “coffee meetings”, a suggestion had been made to develop an information sheet about the College of Electors. Members reviewed the draft information sheet and Powerpoint presentation on the College that had been created. Some suggestions for improvement and positive feedback were provided. The Chair noted that the final versions of the material would be distributed to members of the College and to the divisional alumni associations, adding that the OISE alumni association planned to use them at its meeting the following day.

10. Date of Next Meeting

The Chair informed members that the next meeting of the College was scheduled for Wednesday, November 19 2008 at 5:30 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall.

11. Other Business

The Chair said that she was interested in exploring the role that members of the College could play in encouraging other alumni to become more engaged with the University. That theme had also emerged from the coffee meetings. For example, some members had expressed a desire to make further contributions to their respective alumni associations. In her view, members had a range of experiences from which other alumni associations might benefit, but they hadn't necessarily had an opportunity to share them. As a means of encouraging the exchange of such ideas and information, the Chair suggested that members gather informally in the Council Chamber during the half-hour prior to meetings of the College.

At the invitation of the Chair, one of the members, Mr. Bill Wrigley, spoke briefly about his contributions to the Alumni Association of Woodsworth College (AAWC). Mr. Wrigley outlined some of the challenges that the AAWC had faced over the past decade, including problems of poor attendance, limited strategic planning, and decreased connection with alumni. However, over the past five years, the AAWC had worked to address such problems. Their Board and Committee meetings had become more focused, they had increased the number of events offered to their alumni, Board members had become more actively engaged, and they had developed a successful working relationship with the students of Woodsworth College.

11. Other Business (cont'd)

Mr. Wrigley offered to facilitate a discussion among members on activities of their alumni association. Some members expressed interest in such a discussion and noted the value of sharing their experiences. The Chair asked members to provide feedback to Mr. Wrigley by October 15, 2008.

The meeting adjourned at 7:45 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

October 31, 2008