

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO  
**THE GOVERNING COUNCIL**

**Wednesday, December 10, 2008**

MINUTES OF THE GOVERNING COUNCIL meeting held on Wednesday, December 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. David Asper  
Mr. Ryan Matthew Campbell  
Mr. P.C. Choo  
Professor Brian Corman  
Dr. Claude S. Davis  
Ms Susan Eng  
Mr. David Ford  
Ms Judith Goldring  
Mr. Grant Gonzales  
Dr. Gerald Halbert  
Professor Ellen Hodnett  
Professor Ronald H. Kluger  
Professor Louise Lemieux-Charles  
Mr. Joseph Mapa  
Ms Florence Minz  
Professor Cheryl Misak  
Mr. Gary P. Mooney  
Professor Ian Orchard  
Mr. Jeff Peters  
Mr. Timothy Reid  
Professor Arthur S. Ripstein  
Miss Anna Okorokov  
Mr. Stephen C. Smith  
Ms Maureen J. Somerville

Mr. Oliver Sorin  
Mr. John David Stewart  
Dr. Sarita Verma  
Ms B. Elizabeth Vosburgh  
Mr. Larry Wasser

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

Secretariat:  
Ms Alison Webb

**Absent:**

Mr. Ken Davy  
Professor William Gough  
Dr. Joel A. Kirsh  
Mr. Joseph Koo  
Dr. Stefan Mathias Larson  
Mr. Geoffrey Matus  
Professor Michael R. Marrus  
Mr. George E. Myhal  
Mr. Richard Nunn  
The Honourable David R. Peterson  
Professor Doug W. Reeve  
Ms Melinda Rogers  
Professor Elizabeth M. Smyth  
Ms Rita Tsang  
Mr. W. David Wilson

**In Attendance:**

Miss Coralie D'Souza, Past Member of the Governing Council  
Professor Angela Hildyard, Vice-President, Human Resources & Equity  
Mr. David Palmer, Vice-President, Advancement and Chief Advancement Officer  
Catherine Riggall, Vice-President, Business Affairs  
Professor Franco Vaccarino, Vice-President, University of Toronto and Principal, University of Toronto  
at Scarborough  
Ms Judith Wolfson, Vice-President, University Relations  
Professor Paul Young, Vice-President Research  
Professor Emeritus Jonathan Freedman, Deputy-Provost  
Ms Lucy Fromowitz, Assistant Vice-President, Student Life  
Professor Edith Hillan, Vice-Provost, Academic  
Mr. Tim McTiernan, Assistant Vice-President, Research and Executive Director of Innovations Group

Ms Christina Sass-Kortsak, Assistant Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity  
Mr. Ron Swail, Assistant Vice-President, Facilities and Services  
Professor Safwat Zaky, Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget  
Mr. Jim Delaney, Director, Office of the Vice-Provost, Students  
Ms Sheree Drummond, Assistant Provost  
Ms Sally Garner, Executive Director, Planning and Budget  
Dr. Anthony Gray, Special Advisor to the President  
Ms Helen Lasthiotakis, Director, Policy and Planning, Office of the Vice-President and Provost  
Ms Bryn McPherson-White, Director, Office of the President and Special Events  
Mr. Steve Moate, Senior Legal Counsel  
Mr. Henry Mulhall, Assistant Secretary of the Governing Council  
Ms Linda Vranic, Director of Operations, Office of the Vice-President Advancement  
Mr. Thomas Felix, Co-Chair, University of Toronto Committee on Responsible Investment  
Ms Sandy Hudson, President, Students' Administrative Council (operating as the University of Toronto Students' Union)  
Ms Rini Rashid, Co-Chair, University of Toronto Committee on Responsible Investment

IN ACCORDANCE WITH A DETERMINATION BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE PURSUANT TO SECTION 38 OF BY-LAW NUMBER 2, ITEM 9 WAS CONSIDERED BY THE GOVERNING COUNCIL *IN CAMERA*

**1. Chair's Remarks**

**a) Welcome**

The Chair welcomed members and guests to the last regular meeting of the Governing Council for the 2008 year.

**b) Audio Web-Cast**

The Chair reminded members that, following its usual practice, the meeting was being broadcast on the web. He asked senior administrators and other non-members who were invited to speak during the meeting to use a standing microphone so that their comments could be heard by those listening to the audio web-cast.

**c) Holiday Reception**

The Chair reminded members that a reception would follow the meeting in the lobby area outside the Council Chamber. Everyone was welcome and he hoped they would be able to stay.

**d) Appointment of Lieutenant-Governor-In-Council Member to Governing Council**

The Chair advised that the Lieutenant Governor had issued the order that Ms Shirley Hoy be appointed to the University of Toronto Governing Council, for a period of three years, effective the 3<sup>rd</sup> day of December 2008.

**1. Chairs Remarks (cont'd)**

**e) Upcoming Elections**

The Chair invited Mr. Charpentier, Secretary of the Governing Council, to inform members about upcoming elections.

Mr. Charpentier advised that the nomination period for Governing Council and Academic Board elections would open on Friday, January 9, 2009 at 12:00 noon. There were vacancies for 1 administrative staff seat; 8 student seats; 5 teaching staff seats; and 2 alumni seats on the Governing Council. On the Academic Board there were vacancies for 17 teaching staff and librarian seats. All positions, except for the student seats, would be for three-year terms beginning July 1, 2009. Student members of Governing Council served for one-year terms. Nominations for teaching staff and student members of the Governing Council would close on Friday January 23, 2009 at noon, and nominations for alumni members would close on Monday, February 23, 2009. Information about applications for co-opted members of the three Boards, including administrative staff, alumni, and students, would be provided in the next term.

The Secretary further advised that the *2009 Election Guidelines*, which contained detailed information about the elections, was currently available on the Governing Council website<sup>1</sup>, and nomination forms would be available online once the nomination period began. Any questions regarding the Governing Council or Academic Board elections were to be directed to Ms Nancy Smart, the Chief Returning Officer, or the Deputy Returning Officers, Ms Mae-Yu Tan and Ms Alison Webb. The Secretary asked members to encourage their colleagues to become involved in governance, and to continue to serve as ambassadors by both nominating their peers, and voting in elections for their constituency.

Mr. Charpentier reminded members that the nomination period for Chancellor of the University would open on Friday, January 9, 2009 at noon and would close on Friday, February 6, 2009. Information on this nomination process would be available on the Governing Council website shortly.

**2. Minutes of the Previous Meeting of October 23, 2008**

The minutes of the meeting of October 23, 2008 were approved.

**3. Business Arising from the Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

There was no business arising from the meeting.

**4. Report of the President**

The President advised that, following the student presentation members would be provided with an update on the impact of the current unprecedented economic circumstances on the University, and a mid-year report from the Vice-Presidents on the administration's priorities for 2008-2009.

He informed members of the sad news of the passing of Mr. Ted Rogers, an alumnus and friend of the University of Toronto. Mr. Rogers was a truly remarkable individual and had been an extraordinary benefactor. The President expressed sincere condolences to the Rogers family, most especially to Ms Melinda Rogers, a member of the Governing Council.

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/elections.htm>

#### 4. **Report of the President** (cont'd)

##### (a) **Student Presentation**

The President introduced Mr. Thomas Felix, a third-year Trinity College student pursuing a specialist degree in Political Science and Economics, and Ms Rini Rashid, a third-year Innis College student in Peace and Conflict Studies and Political Science. Mr. Felix and Ms Rashid were the Co-Chairs of the student-led University of Toronto Committee on Responsible Investment (RIC).

Mr. Felix said that it was an honour and privilege to be invited to address Governing Council, and that it spoke to the open-mindedness, co-operative spirit, and determination of this University to rise above obstacles in pursuit of a positive idea. He noted that responsible investment was often easily dismissed due to its intricacies, and to the stigma attached to the concept of ethical investing that put political issues ahead of long-term value considerations. Mr. Felix asserted that responsible investment was different. Responsible investment was about the need for a more informative, pro-active and eclectic approach to how to make value-based decisions. There had been growing recognition worldwide that stakeholders needed to take more direct control of how to best use existing shareholder powers, such as proxy-voting, to better incorporate qualitative factors of corporate performance. The *Principles for Responsible Investment*<sup>2</sup> had been developed by an international group of institutional investors and reflected the increasing relevance of environmental, social and corporate governance issues (ESG) to investment practices. The process to develop these *Principles* had been convened by the United Nations Secretary-General. Universities such as Harvard, Columbia and Stanford, as well as the Canada Pension Plan, and large private investors such as J.P. Morgan, had adopted the *Principles for Responsible Investment* in an effort to improve their ability to meet commitments to beneficiaries as well as to better align investment activities with the broader interests of society.

Ms Rashid advised that the RIC was a product of more than five years of work dedicated to bringing the benefits of responsible investment to the University of Toronto, and it would be the first of its kind amongst Canadian universities. The Committee would be an advisory body to the Vice President, Business Affairs, and would provide a forum to create useful recommendations on matters of ESG importance. Its research sub-committees would provide opportunities for students to consult with faculty supervisors on relevant topics of ESG research. Membership of the RIC consisted of students, faculty, staff and alumni. This would ensure that a diversity of University viewpoints was represented, and would facilitate interaction amongst the four communities. Cross-constituency consultation and collaboration had been the hallmark of the initiative and one of its greatest strengths. All four groups would work together in a single, non-partisan forum that identified key tensions, brainstormed suggestions, and ultimately arrived at a consensus.

Ms Rashid noted that she had been working with the Student Affairs Office to share the lessons with other student leaders that she and her colleagues on the RIC had learned from this experience. She hoped to be able to give perspective to her peers that collaboration, while perhaps at times slow and tedious, had been an effective and productive approach. She believed this initiative reinforced the notion that this University had been built on ideas that came from many sources and communities. With responsible investment, ideas could be refined and applied to positively impact both the immediate community, and the greater global village.

---

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.unpri.org/principles/>

**4. Report of the President (cont'd)****(a) Student Presentation (cont'd)**

Ms Rashid thanked her committee members, former Governors, student and employee union representatives, and campus leaders who had helped to make it possible to bring a pan-university perspective to the University administration. She specifically thanked Ms Cathy Riggall, Dr. Tony Gray, and Mr. Bill Moriarty, along with other members of the administration, noting that their open-mindedness had helped turn responsible investment into a soon-to-be reality at the University of Toronto. She also thanked the Governing Council for the opportunity to share information about the Committee for Responsible Investment and provided contact information for herself and Mr. Felix should anyone have questions.

There were no questions at this time.

**(b) Awards and Honours**

The President drew the attention of members to the exceptional list of faculty, student and staff awards and honours that had been circulated with the agenda packages for the meeting, and highlighted the following:

Two faculty members had recently received honorary doctorates from other universities. University Professor Emeritus Edward Chamberlain had received an honorary Doctor of Canon Law Degree from St. John's College at the University of Manitoba during convocation ceremonies on November 2, 2008, and Professor George Elliott Clarke of English was a recipient of an Honorary Doctor of Letters Degree from St. Mary's University on October 26, 2008. The President commented that these were extraordinary faculty members and he was pleased that they had been honoured by other institutions.

Megan Brown of the Varsity Blues had reclaimed the Canadian Interuniversity Sport cross country individual title on November 8, 2008, a title she had first won in 2006. She had completed the five-kilometre event twenty-two seconds faster than her closest rival and had helped lead the Varsity Blues women's team to a second place finish.

Eight faculty members had appeared on the list of the top twenty candidates in the 2009 TVO Big Ideas Best Lecturer competition. Thirty-one University of Toronto faculty members had been originally nominated by students from all three campuses. A jury would evaluate the top twenty candidates, and select the ten finalists to deliver televised lectures on TVO's Big Ideas program, beginning Saturday, February 28, 2009. The winner would receive a \$10,000 scholarship for his or her school from TD Insurance Meloche Monnex, the competition's sponsor.

**(c) Towards 2009**

President Naylor advised that he and other members of the University administration had recently spent many hours in preparation for presentations to the consultants retained by the provincial government to assess and prioritize infrastructure and capital spending requests. In the past year, the Government of Ontario had made a commitment to a large-scale capital investment in Ontario's colleges and universities, aimed not only at addressing long-standing deferred maintenance, but also at fostering exciting initiatives in teaching and research. A province-wide review process was underway, and the consultants would visit the University's three campuses during December to consider the merits of the University's capital proposals. This was an exciting opportunity to address the University's facilities expansion needs for both current enrolments and staffing, and for the ongoing growth in the numbers of graduate students. By the space standards of the Council of Ontario Universities (COU), all three campuses, but particularly the University

**4. Report of the President (cont'd)****(c) Towards 2009 (cont'd)**

of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM) and the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC), fell significantly short of the nasms recommended for their configuration of faculty, staff, and students. The total UTSC space inventory was currently only 60% of the space standards designated by the COU.

Regarding progress made to date against concepts outlined in the *Towards 2030* Synthesis Report, the President informed members that the University had continued to build on these concepts and implementation of initiatives contained therein had been moving forward. There had been strong affirmation and widespread support of the unique mandate of the University of Toronto outlined in *Towards 2030*, specifically in meeting provincial enrolment expansion pressures in graduate and second-entry professional programs. He recalled that the University of Toronto alone among universities had been granted its full requested graduate allocation but noted that the growth of graduate scholarships and fellowships had not kept pace with enrolment expansion in Ontario. The President stated that he would continue to report back to Governing Council on progress with respect to *Towards 2030*.

The President noted that the current economic crisis presented a number of short- and medium-term challenges quite apart from the implementation of directions contained in *Towards 2030*. The need for cost containment would intensify the challenges of collective bargaining with staff unions and negotiations with the faculty association. Also, capital projects without firm financing in place would have to be carefully reviewed with a critical eye. However, while cost control was imperative, it was not reasonable to put all plans for growth on hold, and the economic down-turn actually made this a good time to engage in strategic real estate acquisitions and in construction projects.

The President reminded members that in his last update to Governing Council he spoke about the increasing concern regarding the fiscal climate and the potential impact the down-turn would have on the endowment. The massive decline in the equity markets, unprecedented since 1937-38, had now eroded the cushion in the endowment revenue and it was difficult to contemplate that the University would have the ability to pay out the \$62 million from the endowment as scheduled in April 2009. However, the university had legal and moral obligations, many of which could not be deferred or reduced. Thus, meeting these obligations would lead to budget pressures.

He addressed questions that had arisen in the previous weeks in light of the economic crisis:

- Presently, there were no plans for a general hiring freeze or cuts as had been recently implemented at other Ontario universities. Across-the-board budget reductions, if used, might have perverse or unfair effects on specific divisions. Each division had been asked, however, to make careful decisions regarding cost containment, using measures most appropriate to its specific circumstances.
- The University would meet as many of its payout obligations from the endowment as could responsibly be met. Divisions were actively planning to ensure that they would still be able to meet critical commitments such as endowed professorships and chairs, as well as endowed support for needs-based student aid. Some divisions had millions of dollars available to them in their particular endowment accounts and there accordingly remained some cushion in these accounts that they would now be expected to draw upon. Other divisions had built up 'rainy-day' funds that they would now access. Some divisions without such reserves would possibly seek concurrence from central administration to run short-term deficits.
- The rationale for not eroding accumulated capital to make payouts, regardless of income earned, was that the erosion of capital would negatively impact future growth in the endowed funds. Endowments had been put in place for the very long term and pay-outs under the current economic circumstances

**4. Report of the President (cont'd)****(c) Towards 2009 (cont'd)**

would compromise the ability to return rapidly to usual payout levels as the investments supporting the endowments recovered their values.

- The University was not currently considering large-scale borrowing to cover operating costs, as Harvard had recently done. Stringency would, however, be expected within the University community at all divisional levels, including central administration. He advised that it would be announced within the next twenty-four hours that the President, Vice-Presidents, Vice-Provosts, Principals, Deans, and Senior Administrative staff in the professionals and managers employee group at levels eight and nine, such as Assistant Vice-Presidents, had agreed to a salary freeze. While increases for 2008-09 had already taken effect, there would be no merit increases in 2009-10 for this group.
- The current state of the University's balance sheet would constrain borrowing capacity. However, as noted, there would need to be a careful review of any attractive real estate opportunities that presented themselves, recognizing that caution would be needed in order to not unreasonably erode cash reserves.

The President advised that he anticipated that the year ahead would be a difficult one financially, and might require some refocusing. The guidance and oversight of the Governing Council would be valuable to the Administration in making those difficult decisions. .

**Report of the Interim Vice-President and Provost**

Professor Misak reported that her first priority was to see the University through these difficult financial times. During the two months previous, she had met with the Deans, division by division, to discuss their budgets. The forecasts used at that time were however no longer relevant. She and Professor Zaky had now begun meeting with the Deans again and every division has been asked to take appropriate cost-containment measures. Some of these would be significant, but all decisions would be made in light of preserving the University's core academic mission, and maintaining scholarship and the student experience, while at the same time working through the challenges presented by the non-payment from the endowment. While divisions were affected differently depending on the degree of benefactor support, these were difficult times for all Deans. She reiterated that there were no plans to address these financial issues with any across-the-board measures, such as immediate base budget cuts. Divisional leaders had been given responsibility for determining priorities and how best to meet their financial obligations in these unusual times. She commented that there had been few, if any, complaints from the divisions about how the University was dealing with these extreme financial circumstances, and that it was heartening to see everyone approaching the situation with the spirit of cooperation.

The Provost advised that her office was also heavily engaged in determining how to plan academically in light of *Towards 2030*, the current financial circumstances, and the experience of the past decade. Normally all divisional academic plans had followed the same general framework and five-year cycle. However, divisions in the midst of a leadership transition had found it beneficial to delay finalizing their academic plans until such time as a new Dean or Principal was in place. Planning in tandem with a leadership change had proven to be an effective model and was being considered for the planning process moving forward. In the short term, each division would undertake a planning exercise to determine goals, and set advocacy plans and budgets for the next year in light of the directions contained in *Towards 2030*.

**Report of the Vice-President and Provost (cont'd)**

While this process would not be as comprehensive as the *Stepping Up* planning exercise five years ago, it would provide the basis for the more extensive planning to take place in divisions at the time of a leadership change.

The Provost noted that another major item of focus for her was strategic recruitment into the undergraduate, first-entry divisions. A Strategic Recruitment Planning Committee had now been formed to consider current recruitment efforts and enrolment patterns, and to set the direction for recruiting the kind of student the University wanted to recruit in the years to come.

**Report of the Vice-President, Business Affairs**

Ms. Riggall noted that the Business Affairs team was charged with the stewardship of financial, physical and ancillary services at the University. This had been an interesting year. When objectives had been set for 2008-2009, there had been no way of knowing how much time would be devoted to the economic crisis.

She advised that Mr. Moriarity and the University of Toronto Asset Management (UTAM) team were doing an excellent job of keeping the administration well informed of the impact of the economic situation. A reference portfolio had recently been created, and would be presented at the next meeting of the Business Board, comparing UTAM results to a simplified portfolio, with the objective of providing a low cost way of assessing the value added by UTAM.

Ms Riggall commented that she was pleased with the increased productivity of all operations and with the increased quality of communications. Financial statements and endowment and pension fund reports were now more easily understood by the average reader. Another success was the recent switch to commercial insurance providers which resulted in an \$800,000 per year savings in premiums for the same coverage and made it possible to consider the coverage actually necessary for the University of Toronto alone, without being hampered by circumstances at other universities.

With regard to buildings, Ms Riggall's team was responsible to ensure the University had enough space of the type required, and that the buildings were well-managed. Recent milestones included the sale of the Dunlap Observatory after twenty years of effort, and the purchase of two or three strategically located properties for the St. George campus. On the building operations side, Mr. Swail's team had done a great job managing the University's buildings, and had implemented changes that had resulted in the use of less power than in the past.

With respect to ancillary services, Ms Riggall advised that Beverage Services continued to work hard to ensure alcohol on campus was managed effectively and responsibly and that the University complied with legislation. The Food Services launch of Local Flavour Plus, which introduced local, environmentally responsible and sustainable food into campus cafeterias, had been well received by students.

The Sustainability Office had continued to be successful at addressing the sustainability of the institution, and had expanded the scope of its projects, and the network of involved students, staff, and faculty, and community partnerships. Ms. Riggall also noted her involvement with the enthusiastic students on the Responsible Investment Committee to look for ways to fit these principles with the University of Toronto's investment strategy.



## Report of the Vice President, Human Resources and Equity

Professor Hildyard advised that the top priorities for Human Resources and Equity (HR&E) in the past year had been the development of policies and practices to ensure that the University of Toronto continued to be an employer of choice, demonstrated a commitment to a culture of inclusivity, and sustained a safe working and learning environment.

Having been given a mandate in 2001 to bring about 'cultural change' within HR&E itself, and with its clients, she had worked to create a team of outstanding professionals, who were now recognized as such by their peers within the university sector and beyond, and to develop strategic relationships with academic units so that HR&E was seen as a partner in the accomplishment of the divisions' academic mission.

She noted that research showed that in order to recruit and retain the best individuals we must create an environment that engaged and instilled a sense of pride in our faculty and staff; that recognized and rewarded those who excelled; and, that provided opportunities for growth and development. Recognition of the University of Toronto as one of Canada's top 100 employers, one of the GTA's top 75 employers, and one of Canada's top 10 Family Friendly employers was evidence that the University was doing something right! We were also the only university to have developed an institutional statement on Equity, Diversity and Excellence and were now recognized as one of Canada's top 25 Diversity Employers.

The University's employee survey demonstrated that in general we had high levels of engagement and satisfaction among staff and faculty. Voluntary turnover rates were less than half of the external benchmark, and 1,300 individuals (14% of our fulltime workforce) had been here for 25 years or more. These, along with the more than 52,000 employment applications received in the past year, were additional proof that the University of Toronto was considered to be a good employer.

Professor Hildyard remarked that the most significant short term challenge for HR&E was to find ways to ensure that the University remained an employer of choice during times of financial restraint. Over the past years, student numbers had increased at a faster rate than had the numbers of faculty and staff, and as a result faculty and staff felt overworked, and expressed that the quantity of their work affected quality. Finding solutions would not be easy when resources were tight.

Looking at a longer time perspective, she advised that at the University of Toronto, as was the case at most other universities in North America and beyond, one third of the faculty and senior administrative staff were 55 or over and therefore eligible to retire. There would be fierce competition for their replacements. In order for the University to recruit and retain the best in a competitive environment, and to continue to be recognized externally as an outstanding employer, it would be necessary to demonstrate innovative and exemplary practice, and to be more strategic in how we marketed the University of Toronto as an employer. A key long term focus for administrative staff was talent management. Mentoring programs, strong and varied leadership courses, the use of 360 degree reviews, and more intensive coaching were being used for those identified as having strong potential for leadership positions within the University.

Professor Hildyard stated that her most immediate short- and long-term challenges were in the labour relations arena. Unions looked for comparators both outside the university and internally and this made it extremely difficult to limit or decrease financial mandates from one month to the next. Over the past six months final or tentative agreements had been reached with eight of the university's twenty-two bargaining units, with an additional five agreements expected before the end of the year. In addition, negotiations with the teaching assistants and graduate assistants represented by the Canadian Union of Public Employees were ongoing. The first collective agreement with the United Steel Workers for English Second Language (ESL) instructors, as well as negotiations with the University of Toronto Faculty Association, would commence in early 2009.

**Report of the Vice-President, Research**

Professor Young advised that he would discuss the following four areas within the Research portfolio:

1) Communicating the Social Impact of Research; 2) Research Competitiveness; 3) Awards and Honours; and, 4) Innovation and Commercialization.

Since it was brought to his attention that there was a wonderful untold story about some of the University's research, Professor Young had met with a number of people and determined that the focus for the upcoming annual research report would be the social impact of research at the University of Toronto, covering such areas as disease, hunger, poverty, homelessness, conflict resolution, and social/cultural innovation. More information would be available in the coming months.

New procedures for more competitive grant applications were being investigated with the input of the Deans. Recent Canadian Foundation for Innovation (CFI) applications for the University of Toronto and its affiliated hospitals amounted to \$170 million. As peer review was ultimately what drove the granting process, a number of the recent applications were submitted to members of a newly created external review college, set up for this purpose by the Research Office, for their input on the applications prior to submission to the granting agency. There had been a very strong response from individuals wanting to help and willing to serve as reviewers. Most teams had received more than twenty pages of comments. The outcome of this new process was not yet known. The expectation however was for a twenty-five to thirty percent application success rate, or approximately \$50 million.

The University of Toronto had recently submitted fourteen applications, our allotment, for Canada Excellence Research Chairs. This prestigious program would award up to twenty Chair holders and their research teams with up to \$10M over seven years to conduct research in areas of strategic importance to Canada.

The Social Science and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) Gold Medal for Achievement in Research is the Council's highest research honour. The University of Toronto had never won a gold medal before, but this year won not only the Gold Medal but three of the four major prizes offered by SSHRC to researchers at various levels of seniority. It was a very proud night in Ottawa for the University and Professor Young noted that this achievement highlighted that the extra efforts of divisions, centres, and awards committees were beginning to pay off.

The partnership known as MaRS Innovation had been launched on December 1<sup>st</sup>, bringing together sixteen Toronto institutions, including the University of Toronto, to aggregate and build a diversified research portfolio. MaRS, as a Centre of Excellence for Commercialization and Research (CECR), would receive \$14.95 million for a five-year program that would hopefully accelerate the commercialization of promising research from its member institutions.

Professor Young highlighted the longer-term challenges within the research portfolio including determining how the University could best organize to deal with major calls for proposals that required an institutional response. Work was also required to determine how the University could better respond to a research pull model, and be more responsive to bringing together teams to address specific questions.

**Report of the Vice-President and Principal, University of Toronto Mississauga**

Professor Orchard advised that the overall priority for the University of Toronto Mississauga (UTM) was to create an environment for success for each faculty, staff and student. This year UTM's work focussed around four key areas: enhancing the academic experience; enhancing the student experience; enhancing the learning environment; and, enhancing the infrastructure and resource base.

**Report of the Vice-President and Principal, University of Toronto Mississauga (cont'd)**

He noted the physical transformation of the campus with the opening of new facilities including the Hazel McCallion Academic Learning Centre; the Recreation, Athletics & Wellness Centre; the Communication, Culture and Technology building; and the Oscar Peterson Hall residence. Also, under the leadership of the Dean, UTM had implemented numerous innovative teaching and learning practices, as well as the application of strategies for student success. There had been heightened focus on the instructional mission wedded to a sophisticated understanding of how students learn. UTM had also strengthened its relationship with the City of Mississauga, its citizens and industry. There were wonderful partnerships in place with local stakeholders and UTM had become the 'go to' place for research and for advice on best practices for policy and program development.

In terms of short and long-term challenges, Professor Orchard highlighted pressures arising from the short- and longer-range budget picture. UTM was in desperate need of an increase in the quality and quantity of space. Teaching hours already ran from 8:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. and there were simply no seats available for expansion. There were also no research labs available for recruiting new faculty in the sciences. As part of the province-wide process described by the President, UTM would therefore be putting forward a capital request for an instructional centre and a science building.

**Report of the Vice-President and Principal, University of Toronto Scarborough**

Professor Vaccarino advised that the major focus of his first year had been priority setting and planning to respond to the rapid growth that had occurred at the University of Toronto Scarborough (UTSC) over the last few years. The foci for the coming year would be: the implementation of the campus plan, and the departmental and academic plans; and the identification of new undergraduate and graduate programs that built on the strengths of UTSC, and balanced both student demand and faculty interests. Additional priorities included the development and implementation of organizational structures and processes that met the needs of a 10,000 student campus. In this respect, the campus had not only outgrown its physical plant but its administrative capacity. There was a particular need for space planning in the Science Research Building and the Classroom Building. External partnerships and network development, particularly in the eastern GTA and surrounding regions, were also a focus to both help realize long term infrastructure goals, and build industry partners for the Co-op Program that had been consolidated as a key area for the campus.

Recent milestones at UTSC included the opening of the Science Building, and the development of a strengthened organizational structure to better meet the needs of the campus and increase efficiency. Work had begun to both rectify the identified faculty shortfalls in a planned way, and to recruit for a number of senior campus leadership positions. The City of Toronto had identified the campus as key to development in the northeast area and work was underway to address infrastructure needs including transit plans, athletic/recreational facilities, and classroom buildings.

Professor Vaccarino discussed the areas of short- and long-term challenge. Due to the lack of appropriate facilities there were ongoing challenges to accommodate the student community, the growing science and research enterprise, the 30,000 plus alumni community, and evolving campus-based events. UTSC could not accommodate more students without new facilities, and the current economic situation would extend the time required to open a new facility. Finally, UTSC was challenged to continue to differentiate itself and create a unique identity within the tri-campus system. A bold branding and marketing campaign would assist in meeting the strategic plan objectives and goals.

### **Report of the Vice-President and Chief Advancement Officer**

Mr. Palmer advised that there were four strategic priorities within the mandate of the Office of the Vice President and Chief Advancement Officer: enhancing the participation of the alumni; doubling the bottom line of annual giving; building advancement capacity across divisions; and, building the external relations platform.

He noted that *Towards 2030* and the timing of academic plans led to a good campaign case both divisionally and institution wide. However, if the University was going to raise \$1.5 to \$2 billion by 2015, it was necessary to mobilize the great strength of the alumni. This in turn would require doing things differently than in the past. Development and communications capacity would have to be built in both large and small divisions and there would need to be a University-wide shift to more front line staff focused exclusively on the cultivation of meaningful relationships.

In a discussion of areas of positive transformation within his portfolio, Mr. Palmer noted that the intent was to build capacity to raise \$200 million per year on a sustained basis. The past year argued well for the ability to meet that goal and capped four years of consistent growth with \$183 million raised (\$206 million if one included all verbal commitments). Huge strides had been made in the management of the solicitation process and in advancement communications. His office was also engaging divisional leaders across the university in strategy development and the campaign planning process.

The current economic crisis underscored the areas of challenges for the advancement mandate. The market downturn had led to a corresponding philanthropic downturn. Many donors remained fully supportive, however they had delayed or deferred their decisions due to the economy. To date, deferrals amounted to \$30 million. Mr. Palmer noted that while this was a very different fund-raising climate it was essential to remain focused on plans for growth, to undertake campaign planning for the future, and to thank those donors whose support had been so beneficial in the past. Organizations that maintained their focus would be in the best position to react when the economy began to improve.

### **Report of the Vice President, University Relations**

Ms Wolfson advised that the role of University Relations was to foster and support relationships with a wide range of external stakeholders and partners, and to be a champion and tireless promoter of the University of Toronto. Her office furthered external support for research and specific educational programs; and developed ties, domestically and internationally, that better positioned the University to sustain and advance its excellence in teaching and research, and its contributions to society at large. The three broad objectives of University Relations were: to increase brand awareness, to extend the reach of the University beyond its borders, and, most importantly, to maximize opportunities for all members of the University community.

She reminded members that the University of Toronto was strongly dependent on government for its operating revenue, both in terms of the grants it received from governments, and tuition rates that were controlled by provincial policy. She commented that the University had developed very good relationships with elected officials and staff, and that there was constant communication with these government representatives. For the past year, the University had been successful with respect to our regular operating grants, and also in securing additional resources from the provincial government. Moving forward, her portfolio would continue to do everything possible to identify funding and policy opportunities. The only way to achieve that objective was to maintain and broaden partnerships with all levels of government.

**Report of the Vice President, University Relations (cont'd)**

In view of the current economic recession, the next year would be a very difficult one, and it would be particularly important to work with the Government of Ontario on revising the existing funding model. Currently, the model directed funds to universities based solely on their enrolment and had the effect of encouraging large class size, high student-faculty ratios and an erosion of the quality of education. Also, work must continue to identify opportunities for year-end budget support and capital funding, as both the federal and provincial governments regarded investment in infrastructure as being particularly important at this time to encourage economic activity and recovery from the current recession.

A more consistent visual identity for the University was being implemented and would help to establish a stronger University of Toronto brand. This was important to global competitiveness and recruitment of talent. The Strategic Communications group worked to ensure that the messages from the University to its Canadian and international audiences were consistent and integrated. As the University continued to develop performance indicators, Strategic Communications would ensure strategic distribution of the resulting information and seek to enhance the University's reputation on the basis of its very positive performance.

She believed the University had made considerable progress over the past year in establishing an international presence and in developing better tools to ensure recognition of the University as one of the world's greatest. Work continued to establish additional bilateral and multilateral collaborations in focussed and strategic areas. In those collaborations, the University would seek to provide opportunities for its students to have international experiences, and for its faculty and staff to develop productive networks with partner institutions.

The Chair thanked the President and Vice-Presidents and suggested, that given the lateness of the hour, members address any questions they might have directly to the Vice-Presidents at the reception that followed.

**5. Reports for Information**

Members received the following three reports for information:

- Report Number 149 of University Affairs Board (November 4, 2008)
- Report Number 169 of the Business Board (November 10, 2008)
- Report Number 418 of the Executive Committee (November 24, 2008)

**6. Date of Next Meeting**

The Chair informed members that the next meeting of the Governing Council was scheduled for **Monday, January 26, 2009**, at 4:30 p.m.

**7. Question Period**

There were no questions for members of the senior administration.

**8. Other Business**

The Chair invited guests to proceed to the Reception in the lobby outside the Council Chamber.

IN ACCORDANCE WITH A DETERMINATION BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE PURSUANT TO SECTION 38 OF BY-LAW NUMBER 2, ITEMS 9 WAS CONSIDERED BY THE GOVERNING COUNCIL IN CAMERA.

**9. Report Number 52 of the Committee for Honorary Degrees**

On individual motions, duly moved and seconded,

It was Resolved

THAT the recommendations contained in Report Number 52 of the Committee for Honorary Degrees be approved; and

THAT the Chancellor and the President be empowered to determine the degree to be conferred on each candidate and the date of the conferral.

The Chair reminded members that the list of recommended candidates, and any discussion that had occurred, was strictly confidential. Over the next few weeks the president would extend offers to those candidates approved today for Honorary Degrees. As candidates accepted offers, the Secretary of the Committee for Honorary Degrees would notify Governors by email, and at that point the names, and only those names, would no longer be confidential. At the Council meeting in January or March, as appropriate, the President would read into the record the complete list of candidates who had accepted degrees. This was the only information that would be made public.

---

Secretary

---

Chair

January 15, 2009