

## THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

### REPORT NUMBER 166 OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD

March 23, 2010

To the Governing Council,  
University of Toronto

Your Board reports that it held a meeting on Tuesday, March 23, 2010 at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall at which the following were present:

Professor Louise Lemieux-Charles, Chair  
Professor David Naylor, President  
Professor Cheryl Misak, Vice-President and Provost  
Professor Scott Mabury, Vice-Provost, Academic Operations  
Professor Cheryl Regehr, Vice-Provost, Academic Programs  
Professor Stewart Aitchison  
Professor Varouj Aivazian  
Professor Derek Allen  
Ms Yvette Ali  
Professor Cristina Amon  
Mr. Konstantin Anosov  
Professor Gage Averill  
Professor Ronald Beiner  
Ms Patricia Bellamy  
Professor Katherine Berg  
Professor Parth Bhatt  
Ms Marilyn Booth  
Professor Brian Corman

Professor Elizabeth Cowper  
Professor Alister Cumming  
Professor Gerald Cupchik  
Professor Gabriele D'Eleuterio  
Professor Christopher Damaren  
Professor Charles Deber  
Mr. Sybil Derrible  
Professor Joseph Desloges  
Ms Caroline Di Giovanni  
Professor Meric Gertler  
Professor Robert Gibbs  
Professor Avrum Gotlieb  
Professor Rick Halpern  
Mr. Adam Heller  
Professor Ellen Hodnett  
Mrs. Bonnie Horne  
Ms Jemy Joseph  
Ms Min Hee (Margaret) Kim  
Professor Christina Kramer  
Professor Jim Lai  
Ms Lesley Ann Lavack  
Professor Hy Van Luong  
Professor Heather MacNeil

Professor Henry Mann  
Dr. Thomas Mathien  
Professor Douglas McDougall  
Professor Angelo Melino  
Dr. Ahmed Mian  
Professor David Mock  
Professor Michelle Murphy  
Ms Judith Poë  
Mr. Matthew Purser  
Dr. Susan Rappolt  
Professor Wendy Rotenberg  
Professor Andrea Sass-Kortsak  
Ms Helen Slade  
Professor Elizabeth M. Smyth  
Ms Lynn Snowden  
Miss Maureen J. Somerville  
Professor Suzanne Stevenson  
Miss Sabrina Tang  
Ms Rita Tsang  
Professor Njoki Wane  
Mr. Gregory West  
Professor Charmaine Williams  
Dr. Cindy Woodland

**Regrets:**

Ms Binish Ahmed  
Professor Maydianne Andrade  
Professor Jan Angus  
Professor Sylvia Bashevkin  
Professor Denise Belsham  
Mr. Andrew Brown  
Ms Katarina Cadete  
Professor Terry Carleton  
Professor Sujit Choudhry  
Professor Will Cluett  
Professor David Cook  
Ms Saswati Deb  
Ms Netila Demneri  
Professor Miriam Diamond  
Professor Wendy Duff  
Professor Darryl Edwards  
Professor Guy Faulkner

Mr. John A. Fraser  
Professor Jane Gaskell  
Ms Joeita Gupta  
Ms Tulika Gupta  
Professor Russell Hartenberger  
Dr. Allan S. Kaplan  
Professor Alison Keith  
Professor Bruce Kidd  
Dr. Chris Koenig-Woodyard  
Professor Audrey Laporte  
Professor Robert Levit  
Professor Roger L. Martin  
Professor Mark McGowan  
Professor John R. Miron  
Professor Faye Mishna  
Ms Michelle Mitrovich  
Professor Shahrzad Mojab  
Ms Carole Moore

Professor Mayo Moran  
Professor Sioban Nelson  
Professor Linda Northrup  
Professor Janet Paterson  
Professor Ito Peng  
Professor Ato Quayson  
Professor Doug Reeve  
Professor Jolie Ringash  
Professor Seamus Ross  
Professor Lock Rowe  
Professor Tattersall Smith  
Professor Richard Sommer  
Professor Romin Tafarodi  
Mr. Daniel Taranovsky  
Dr. Donald A. Wasylenki  
Professor Catharine Whiteside  
Mr. Jason Wong

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| <b>Non-voting Assessors:</b><br>Professor Angela Hildyard, Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity<br>Professor Peter Lewis, Acting Vice-President, Research   | Ms Catherine Riggall, Vice-President, Business Affairs<br>Professor Edith Hillan, Vice-Provost, Faculty and Academic Life  | Ms Elizabeth Sisam, Assistant Vice-President, Campus and Facilities Planning   |
| <b>In Attendance:</b><br>Professor William Gough, Member of the Governing Council, and Vice-Dean, Graduate Education and Program Development, University of Toronto at Scarborough<br>Professor Jill Matus, Vice-Provost, Students<br>Ms Lucy Fromowitz, Assistant Vice-President, Student Life | Ms Melissa Berger, Program and Planning Officer/ROP Coordinator, Office of the Dean, University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM)<br>Mr. Neil Dobbs, Deputy Secretary of the Governing Council<br>Ms Sally Garner, Executive Director, Planning and Budget<br>Dr. Anthony Gray, Special Advisor to the President | <b>Secretariat:</b><br>Ms Mae-Yu Tan<br><br>Mr. Anwar Kazimi, Committee Secretary, Office of the Governing Council<br>Ms Helen Lasthiotakis, Director, Academic Programs and Policy, Office of the Vice-President and Provost<br>Mr. Steve Moate, Senior Legal Counsel, Office of the President<br>Professor Anthony Wensley, Director, Communication, Culture and Information Technology, UTM |

In this report, items 5 to 8 are recommended to the Governing Council for approval. The remaining items are reported for information.

### Chair's Remarks

The Chair welcomed members and guests to the meeting.

#### (a) Academic Board Elections

The Chair announced that five additional members of the teaching staff had been acclaimed to serve a three-year term on the Academic Board from July 1, 2010 to June 30, 2013. The list of members-elect is provided below.

Professor Chris Damaren\* – Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering  
Ms Judith Poë\* - University of Toronto at Mississauga  
Ms Carol Moukheiber – John H. Daniels Faculty of Architecture, Landscape and Design  
Professor Catharine Amara - Faculty of Physical Education and Health  
Professor Suzanne Erb - University of Toronto at Scarborough  
\*indicates current Board member

#### (b) 2010-2011 Committee Selection for Continuing Members

The Chair encouraged members who would continue their term on the Board in 2010-2011 to consider volunteering to serve on one of the Board's four standing Committees – the Academic Appeals Committee, the Agenda Committee, the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs, and the Planning and Budget Committee. She noted that, on the previous day, the Secretary had sent an email to all continuing Board members asking them to complete an online form to indicate on which committee they would like to serve next year. Members were asked to complete the form by Monday, April 12, 2010, so that the Board's Striking Committee could refer to the selections when developing recommendations for committee membership. The

**Chair's Remarks** (cont'd)(c) 2010-2011 Committee Selection for Continuing Members (cont'd)

Striking Committee would bring its report to the Board for approval at the final meeting for the year on June 2nd. Questions could be directed to the Secretary.

(d) 2010 Call for Applications – Membership on the Boards and Committees of the Governing Council and the University Tribunal

The Chair announced that a call for applications for 2010-2011 membership of the Boards and Committees of the Governing Council and the University Tribunal had also been sent recently by email to the University community. Members were asked to encourage suitable administrative staff, students, and alumni who could contribute to the work of the Academic Board to consider submitting an online application form to serve in the coming year. It was most important to have committed members of the University community serve on the governance bodies. The online application form was available from the Governing Council website, and the deadline to submit the application form was Friday, April 9, 2010 at 5:00 p.m.

**1. Approval of Report Number 165 of the Meeting held on January 28, 2010**

Report Number 165 of the meeting held on January 28, 2010 was approved.

**2. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting**

There was no business arising from the Report of January 28, 2010.

**3. Reports of the Agenda Committee - Number 160** (February 16, 2010) and **Number 161** (March 9, 2010)

Referring to Report Number 161, item 3, Review of Academic Programs and Units, July 2008 – December 2009 Annual Report, the Chair explained that the Agenda Committee had decided that some highlights from the “review of reviews” that had been carried out by the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs (AP&P) should be presented to the Board.

Invited to give her report, Professor Sass-Kortsak explained that AP&P was responsible for undertaking a comprehensive appraisal of review results and administrative responses to ensure that reviews were performed on a regular basis, that they were conducted appropriately, and that the issues identified were dealt with appropriately by the administration. On March 2, 2010, AP&P had considered reviews of nineteen programs or units that had been commissioned by the Vice-President and Provost or by the University's academic divisions. The primary conclusion of that “review of reviews” was that the University's programs continued to be regarded as outstanding ones, among the best in Canada, in North America, and internationally. The Committee had been entirely satisfied with the process, documentation, and follow-up of fifteen of the nineteen reviews. In four cases, usually very recent reviews, the Committee was awaiting additional updates or responses.

### 3. **Reports of the Agenda Committee - Number 160** (February 16, 2010) and **Number 161** (March 9, 2010) (cont'd)

Professor Sass-Kortsak informed the Board that the Provost had appointed a Working Group to consider reorganization of the Faculty of Forestry. Enrolments within the Faculty had declined, and the landscape of contemporary forest resources programs had been changing around the world. Discussions concerning the organization of the Faculty had been on-going for many years and existing options included a move to the Faculty of Arts and Science, the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC), or the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering. The Working Group, which was chaired by the new-Dean-designate, Professor Sandy Smith, was consulting widely and working hard, and organizational proposals would likely be forthcoming in the near future. Following that, the AP&P anticipated that it would receive reports on reviews of the programs being offered to the University's students. Professor Sass-Kortsak added that the external reviewers had regarded the quality of the Faculty as "unassailable".

Turning to the review of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE), which had been conducted in October, Professor Sass-Kortsak reported that it had also been highly favourable. The external reviewers had declared OISE to be "a prestigious, unique and highly regarded educational institution" that was "internationally recognized as a centre for excellence". However, the review had pointed to the need for the solution of certain organizational issues. For example, integrating the initial teacher education program and the OISE graduate programs, and encouraging OISE's full-time, tenure-track faculty to assume a greater role in the initial teacher education program. Professor Sass-Kortsak noted that OISE had acted quickly to address those matters, for example, by establishing a Teacher Education Council. Over time, the outcome of those actions would become apparent. At its meeting of March 9<sup>th</sup>, the Agenda Committee had approved the appointment of Professor Julia O'Sullivan as the incoming Dean of OISE, and her arrival would be marked by a new academic planning exercise. AP&P anticipated receiving an update on OISE's progress in the future.

Professor Sass-Kortsak stated that the review of the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM) Institute of Communication and Culture had taken place in the fall of 2008, affording the UTM Vice-Principal, Academic, and Dean, Professor Gage Averill, the opportunity to respond to the review, which he had done vigorously. The Institute offered a wide range of programs from Art History, to Digital Enterprise Management, to Biomedical Communications. Included in its offerings were a number of programs taught jointly by UTM and the Sheridan College of Applied Arts and Technology. Professor Sass-Kortsak commented that one proposal arising from the review would be considered by the Board at a later point in the meeting. UTM was also planning other changes, including moving the program in Biomedical Communications to the Department of Biology. As well, the AP&P had recently approved the closure of two of the Institute's programs, one major program and one specialist program, which had been regarded as underperforming.

The final review on which Professor Sass-Kortsak reported was that of the Department of Humanities at UTSC. She stated that the reviewers had made highly positive comments about the quality of students and faculty in the Department and about the quality of several new academic and administrative ventures. However, organizational issues had absorbed much of

### **3. Reports of the Agenda Committee - Number 160 (February 16, 2010) and Number 161 (March 9, 2010) (cont'd)**

their attention. UTSC had grown rapidly, and the Department of Humanities had become very large. Professor Rick Halpern, Dean and Vice-Principal (Academic), UTSC, had been responding vigorously and would propose the formation of two new Departments: English and Philosophy. The Dean would also establish a framework for oversight of a number of successful interdisciplinary programs that involved faculty from the proposed new Departments. The AP&P regarded the response to this review as a work in progress, and it looked forward to receiving further information, in particular, reviews of the programs offered by the Department and its successors.

Professor Sass-Kortsak closed by emphasizing that the outcome of this year's review of reviews had been highly positive, and she expressed the AP&P's appreciation to Professor Regehr and the staff in the Provost's Office, Ms Helen Lasthiotakis and Mr. Scott Moore, for their fine work in assembling the process and preparing the excellent compendium of reviews.

A member of the Board congratulated the AP&P on the work that it had conducted, and she noted the high calibre of the Committee's written report.

### **4. Report of the Vice-President and Provost**

Professor Misak indicated that she would confine her remarks to prefacing the budget report.

### **5. University of Toronto at Scarborough and School of Graduate Studies: Doctor of Philosophy in Environmental Science**

The Chair said that the proposal for a new Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) Environmental Science Program had been considered by the AP&P at its meeting of March 2, 2010 and by the Planning and Budget Committee (P&B) at its March 3rd meeting. If recommended by the Academic Board, the proposal would be considered for approval by the Governing Council on April 8<sup>th</sup>.

Upon introducing the proposal<sup>1</sup>, which had been included in the agenda package distributed to members of the Board, Professor Sass-Kortsak stated that the AP&P had supported the initiative without dissent. Dr. Gotlieb added that the P&B had been assured that the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC) had committed to providing all of the resources needed for the program. As such, there were no resource implications for the University's operating budget resulting from the proposal. The P&B had fully supported the proposal.

Invited by the Chair to comment, Professor William Gough, Vice-Dean, Graduate Education and Program Development, UTSC, remarked on the significance of the proposal, which, if approved, would allow the first tri-campus doctoral program to be housed at UTSC. He recognized the

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/AssetFactory.aspx?did=6773>

## **5. University of Toronto at Scarborough and School of Graduate Studies: Doctor of Philosophy in Environmental Science (cont'd)**

administrative staff, alumni, students, and teaching staff members of the UTSC community who were present at the meeting on this important occasion.

Members congratulated UTSC on the historic proposal and commented on its high calibre.

During the discussion of the Board, members raised questions about the interdisciplinary component, which appeared to be core to the proposed program. A member asked whether UTSC had considered mandating interdisciplinary thesis committee membership. Professor Gough replied that, while such a requirement had not been set forth, committee membership would most likely be interdisciplinary, given the composition of the faculty members who would be involved with the program. The core faculty at UTSC possessed expertise in diverse disciplines including physical geography, evolutionary biology, ecology, chemistry, and chemical engineering. As well, faculty from the other two campuses within the University of Toronto and researchers from other universities and government research laboratories would serve as resources to the program.

The member noted that, in some units, doctoral students were permitted to forego their departmental oral examination and proceed directly to the School of Graduate Studies final oral examination. She suggested that such a process be considered in the future for students in the proposed Environmental Science program. Professor Gough thanked the member for her comment.

A member observed that the proposed doctoral program was quite unusual, and he noted that it had implications for other graduate interdisciplinary programs that might be brought forward to the Board for consideration in the future. In response to the member's comments, Professor Gough provided a distinction between a multi-disciplinary model, in which the culture of a particular discipline influenced the manner in which a researcher approached a problem, and an interdisciplinary model, in which a researcher drew from multiple broader perspectives when tackling a problem. With respect to the proposed program, Professor Gough stated that he had consulted extensively over the past two years with the deans of the Faculty of Arts and Science and the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM), and with the chairs of relevant departments and centres in UTM, the Faculty of Arts and Science, the Faculty of Forestry, and the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering. During those meaningful conversations, they had wrestled with the question of a multi-disciplinary versus an inter-disciplinary program focusing on environmental research issues.

Professor Gough added that the Vice-President and Provost had established a working group on environmental matters. In gathering information for the working group, it had become clear that awareness and consideration of environmental issues permeated all departments at UTSC.

A member of the Board asked why the proposed program was named Environmental Science. He stated that, in his view, the program did not seem to focus on research in the basic sciences.

**5. University of Toronto at Scarborough and School of Graduate Studies: Doctor of Philosophy in Environmental Science (cont'd)**

Professor Gough responded that, while the field was an emerging discipline, it was based in the sciences, and the core faculty in the program were scientists rather than social scientists or humanists.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the proposed Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) Program in Environmental Science, as described in the proposal from the University of Toronto at Scarborough dated January 8, 2010, a copy of which is attached hereto as [Appendix "A"](#), be approved, with enrolment commencing September 2010.

**6. University of Toronto at Mississauga: Proposal to Disestablish the Institute of Communication and Culture and Establish an Institute of Communication, Culture and Information Technology (Extra Departmental Unit: A (EDU:A)) and a Department of Visual Studies**

The Chair informed members that the UTM proposal to disestablish the Institute of Communication and Culture and establish an Institute of Communication, Culture and Information Technology and a Department of Visual Studies had been considered by the P&B at its March 3rd meeting. If recommended by the Academic Board, the Report would be considered for approval by the Governing Council on April 8<sup>th</sup>.

Upon introducing the proposal<sup>2</sup>, which had been included in the agenda package distributed to members of the Board, Dr. Gotlieb stated that the P&B had been supportive of the proposed unit changes. He reported that, in response to a question from a Committee member, Professor Anthony Wensley, Director, Communication, Culture and Information Technology, had explained that the proposed restructuring would result in the reclassification of two administrative staff positions, and that the Institute was working closely with the UTM Human Resources Office to ensure that staff would be reassigned within the units.

There were no questions from the Board.

---

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/AssetFactory.aspx?did=6790>

**6. University of Toronto at Mississauga: Proposal to Disestablish the Institute of Communication and Culture and Establish an Institute of Communication, Culture and Information Technology (Extra Departmental Unit: A (EDU:A)) and a Department of Visual Studies (cont'd)**

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

**YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS**

1. THAT the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM) Institute of Communication and Culture be disestablished, effective July 1, 2010;
2. THAT the UTM Institute of Communication, Culture and Information Technology be established as an Extra-Departmental Unit A (EDU:A), effective July 1, 2010;
3. THAT the UTM Department of Visual Studies be established, effective July 1, 2010.

Documentation is attached hereto as [Appendix "B"](#).

**7. Capital Project: Project Planning Report for the Biozone: Bioengineering Research Facility**

The Chair explained that the Biozone Bioengineering Research Facility capital project had also been considered by the P&B at its March 3rd meeting and, if recommended by the Academic Board, would be considered for approval by the Governing Council on April 8th.

Dr. Gotlieb summarized the Biozone proposal<sup>3</sup>, which had been included in members' agenda packages. He reported that, during the Committee's discussion, a member had asked about the process needed to replace existing equipment. The Committee had been advised that in such a case there would be two options. Either the budget could be re-examined in order to identify possible modifications that could be contained within its scope, or additional contributions could be sought from the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering.

No questions were raised by members of the Board.

---

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/AssetFactory.aspx?did=6683>



**7. Capital Project: Project Planning Report for the Biozone: Bioengineering Research Facility (cont'd)**

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

**YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS**

1. That the Project Planning Report for the Biozone: Bioengineering Research Facility for Energy, Environmental, and Economic Sustainability, a copy of which is attached hereto as [Appendix "C"](#), be approved in principle.
2. That the project scope as identified in the Project Planning Report be approved in principle at a Total Project Cost of \$4,429,000 with funding as follows:

|  |                     |
|--|---------------------|
| Canada Foundation for Innovation                         | \$ 1,771,679        |
| Ontario Research Fund                                    | \$ 1,771,679        |
| Department of Chemical Engineering and Applied Chemistry | \$ 485,642          |
| Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering               | \$ 400,000          |
| <b>Total</b>   | <b>\$ 4,429,000</b> |

**8. Budget Report, 2010-2011 and Long Range Budget Guidelines 2010-11 to 2014-15**

The Chair informed members that the *Budget Report, 2010-2011 and Long Range Budget Guidelines 2010-11 to 2014-15* had been considered by the P&B at its March 3rd meeting. If recommended by the Academic Board, the Report would be considered for approval by the Governing Council on April 8<sup>th</sup>. Documentation<sup>4</sup> had been provided in Board members' agenda packages.

Professor Misak gave some introductory remarks. She noted that global government deficits were resulting in extremely limited university funding. There had been many recent examples in the United Kingdom and the United States of reductions in the number of tenure-stream faculty as well as significant increases in tuition fees due to the staggering financial pressures faced by postsecondary institutions. The University of Toronto was not immune to such pressures. However, given the extreme financial uncertainty of the times, the University was taking great care to strategically plan how best to maximize its resources. The Budget was one of the tools the University could use to ensure that its academic values, commitment to student aid, and emphasis on access remained intact during this challenging period.

Professor Misak alerted the Board that forthcoming changes would be brought through the governance process in order to achieve greater financial footing for faculties. She noted that some of the changes had been highlighted by Professor Sass-Kortsak earlier in the meeting. The University was also examining its academic programs and units review process in an effort to strengthen both the review process and the programs themselves.

<sup>4</sup> <http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/AssetFactory.aspx?did=6831>

**8. Budget Report, 2010-2011 and Long Range Budget Guidelines 2010-11 to 2014-15 (cont'd)**

Dr. Gotlieb then reported that Professor Scott Mabury, Vice-Provost, Academic Operations, and Ms Sally Garner, Executive Director, Planning and Budget, had given an excellent presentation on the budget to the P&B. During the limited discussion that had subsequently occurred, a member inquired about factors that influenced decisions on University Fund allocations. Specifically, were the allocations determined primarily by academic values and priorities or by past divisional funding? Professor Misak had responded that allocations were made on a year-to-year basis taking into account a wide range of factors.

Dr. Gotlieb said that some discussion with respect to the University's pension fund deficit had also taken place at the Committee meeting. In response to a member's question, Ms Cathy Riggall, Vice-President, Business Affairs, had stated that the strategies for dealing with the pension deficit remained limited. They included increasing the contributions of the members of the plan through negotiations with the employee unions, increasing the University's contribution, borrowing money, and exploring other forms of assets. She had added that one opportunity for employee involvement was to join the Business Board or the new Pension Committee once it had been formed.

Ms Garner and Professor Mabury then highlighted the key points of the Budget Report, 2010-2011 and Long Range Budget Guidelines 2010-11 to 2014-15 by means of a Powerpoint presentation, a copy of which is attached as [Appendix "D"](#).

Among the matters that arose in discussion were the following.

(a) Revenue

In response to a question from a member regarding the amount of revenue generated by the library user fees that were collected by the University, Professor Misak replied that approximately \$200,000 had been received as a result of the new policy. While it was anticipated that that amount, which was collected from non-University faculty, staff, and alumni, would increase in the future, and that a stack access fee would eventually be implemented, such user fees would never cover the cost of the University's library acquisitions. However, the additional revenue was certainly helpful, and there could possibly be a secondary effect of increased student employment once the stack access fee was initiated. Professor Misak reported that some institutions had paid the University of Toronto directly on behalf of their members who were using the University's library services. It was hoped that such institutional participation would increase over time. Other institutions had outlined their reliance on the University's library resources in program proposals submitted to the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies.

During a discussion of revenue assumptions contained in the budget report, Professor Mabury clarified that tuition fees would likely increase by 4.31% on average in 2010-11 for continuing domestic students. The average fee increase for incoming and international students was assumed to be higher.

**8. *Budget Report, 2010-2011 and Long Range Budget Guidelines 2010-11 to 2014-15* (cont'd)**

A member expressed the concern that many students viewed the program fee that had been introduced this year in the Faculty of Arts and Science as a mechanism for increasing tuition fees. Professor Misak stated that the practice of charging a program fee was a common one, both in many programs at the University of Toronto and elsewhere in Ontario, and she emphasized that it was simply another way of collecting tuition, not a tuition fee increase.

**(b) Expense**

Noting the projected tuition fee increase for the next five years, a member asked whether financial assistance would be provided to graduate students who were no longer in the funded cohort. Professor Misak expressed the University's commitment to graduate students and confirmed that the School of Graduate Studies was currently developing a proposal for a program that would provide funding to graduate students who had excellent academic reasons for needing to extend their period of study.

Professor Misak assured a member that the University's student aid would increase and Professor Matus outlined the various scenarios in which that aid could be distributed to students.

Referring to the implementation of a new student system to replace the existing Repository of Student Information system (ROSI), a member questioned whether such an expense of \$30-million was necessary. She suggested that students would prefer that the funds be used to reduce the need for tuition fee increases. Professor Misak said that the University had decided to proceed at this time with the initiative in part because of the student outcry for an improved system. She pointed to ROSI's many inadequacies, and she noted that it had been and continued to be extremely costly to repair and maintain ROSI's limited functions. Professor Mabury added that the University was planning a new, multi-functional system that would allow interoperability and enhanced connectivity, and that would possess the foundation necessary to support new technology that might be developed in the future.

In response to a query about the University-wide expense of shared-infrastructure investments that was contained in the budget, Professor Misak explained that the \$18.9-million allocated for 2010-11 should actually be considered as an increase over two years rather than one. Because of the University's constrained financial situation in the previous year, spending on these initiatives had been very limited last year. Professor Misak added that the cost of launching a major fundraising campaign was also included in that category and was composed mainly of human and advertising resources. It was expected that the campaign would be a wonderful investment that would allow the University to make even greater advances across all disciplines.

**(c) Student Enrolment**

A member suggested that it might be more desirable to manage enrolment so that there were fewer students at the University, and he pointed to successful American universities that had very low enrolment levels. Professor Misak agreed that smaller communities of students were more attractive and said that the college system within the Faculty of Arts and Science and the environments at UTM and UTSC facilitated a more intimate student experience.

**8. Budget Report, 2010-2011 and Long Range Budget Guidelines 2010-11 to 2014-15 (cont'd)****(d) Student Enrolment (cont'd)**

A member suggested that it would be valuable to study the admission applications of international students, controlling for the distribution in quality, to gain a better sense of their variability over time. Professor Mabury said that managing international enrolment was more problematic than managing domestic enrolment, as contributing factors, such as global economic change and political stability, were complex. However, the University was trying to increasing its international student enrolment from the current 11.2% to 13% over the next four years, and it would continue to allocate necessary resources to support that mandate.

**(e) University Fund**

A member commented on the variance between divisions with respect to contribution to and allocation from the University Fund. It had been her understanding that at some point in the future, the inter-divisional variance would decrease, yet that did not seem to be occurring. Professor Misak stated that it had always been the case that some faculties were not financially viable on their own and would therefore require allocations from the University Fund. The University was not striving for parity between divisions. Professor Misak and her staff worked closely with divisions to ensure that they only drew a necessary amount from the University Fund.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the 2010-11 budget be approved; and

THAT the Long Range Budget Guidelines 2010-11 to 2014-15 be approved in principle.

Documentation is attached hereto as [Appendix "E"](#).

**9. Items for Information**

Members received the following reports for information:

- (a) Appointments: President's Teaching Award Selection Committee
- (b) Appointments and Status Changes
- (c) Report Number 144 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs (March 2, 2010)

There were no questions arising from the reports.

**10. Date of Next Meeting**

The Chair reminded members that the date of the next meeting was Wednesday, April 21, 2010, at 4:10 p.m.

**11. Other Business**

There were no items of other business.

**12. Quarterly Report on Donations - November 1, 2009 – January 31, 2010**

Members received this report for information. There were no questions.

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

---

Secretary  
March 24, 2010

---

Chair