

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

MAY 19, 2011

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE GOVERNING COUNCIL held on May 19, 2011 at 4:30 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, University of Toronto Mississauga.

Present:

Mr. John F. (Jack) Petch (In the Chair)
Mr. Richard Nunn (Vice-Chair)
The Honourable David R. Peterson, Chancellor
Professor C. David Naylor, President
Professor Varouj Aivazian
Ms Diana A.R. Alli
Professor Robert L. Baker
Mr. P. C. Choo
Professor William Gough
Ms Judy Goldring
Ms Joeita Gupta
Dr. Gerald Halbert
Professor Ellen Hodnett
Mr. Kent Kuran
Mr. Nykolaj Kuryluk
Professor Emeritus Michael Marrus
Professor Cheryl Misak
Mr. Gary P. Mooney
Mr. James Yong Kyun Park
Mr. Jeff Peters
Mr. Tim Reid
Professor Arthur S. Ripstein
Professor Andrea Sass-Kortsak
Mr. Howard Shearer
Professor Elizabeth M. Smyth
Miss Maureen J. Somerville
Mr. Olivier Sorin
Mr. W. John Switzer
Mr. W. Keith Thomas
Professor Franco J. Vaccarino
Dr. Sarita Verma
Ms B. Elizabeth Vosburgh
Mr. Greg West

Secretariat:

Mr. Louis R. Charpentier
Mr. Anwar Kazimi
Mr. Henry Mulhall

Regrets:

Mr. Brent S. Belzberg
Professor Philip H. Byer
Mr. William Crothers
Mr. Steve (Suresh) Gupta
Ms Shirley Hoy
Professor Christina E. Kramer
Professor Louise Lemieux-Charles
Mr. Joseph Mapa
Ms Natalie Melton
Ms Florence Minz
Mr. George E. Myhal
Ms Priatharsini Sivananthajothy
Ms Melinda Rogers
Professor Janice Gross Stein
Ms Rita Tsang
Mr. W. David Wilson

In Attendance:

Mr. Kenneth Davy, member-elect of the Governing Council
Mr. Andrew Donald, member-elect of the Governing Council
Ms Maria Pilar Galvez, member-elect of the Governing Council
Mr. Aly Madhavji, member-elect of the Governing Council
Ms Morgan Vanek, member-elect of the Governing Council
Mr. Chirag Variawa, member-elect of the Governing Council
Professor Angela Hildyard, Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity
Ms Cathy Riggall, Vice-President, Business Affairs
Professor Hargurdeep (Deep) Saini, Vice-President and Principal, University of Toronto
Mississauga (UTM)
Ms Judith Wolfson, Vice-President, University Relations
Dr. Tim McTiernan, Assistant Vice-President, Government, Institutional and Community
Relations
Ms Gillian Morrison, Assistant Vice-President, Divisional Relations and Campaigns
Ms Christina Sass-Kortsak, Assistant Vice-President, Human Resources
Ms Elizabeth Sisam, Assistant Vice-President, Campus and Facilities Planning
Professor Scott Mabury, Vice-Provost, Academic Operations
Professor Cheryl Regehr, Vice-Provost, Academic Programs
Mr. Gilbert Cassar, President, University of Toronto Mississauga Students' Union (UTMSU)
Ms Sara Chalvez, Let's Talk Science, UTM
Ms Yvonne Chen, Association of Part-Time Undergraduate Students
Mr. Jim Delaney, Director, Office of the Vice-Provost, Students
Ms Sheree Drummond, Assistant Provost
Ms Sally Garner, Executive Director, Planning and Budget
Professor Meric Gertler, Dean, Faculty of Arts and Science
Ms Nora Gillespie, Legal Counsel, Office of the Vice-President and Provost, Office of the Vice-
President Human Resources and Equity
Dr. Anthony Gray, Special Advisor to the President
Mr. Christopher Lang, Director, Appeals, Discipline and Faculty Grievances
Mr. Sacha Larda, Let's Talk Science, UTM
Ms Helen Lasthiotakis, Assistant Dean and Director of the Office of the Dean, Faculty of Arts
and Science
Dr. Glenn Loney, Registrar, Faculty of Arts and Science
Ms Kim Luke, Director of Communications, Faculty of Arts and Science
Ms Bryn Macpherson, Executive Director, Office of the President
Mr. Bernardo Melendez, University of Toronto Vote Mob
Professor Mark McGowan, Principal, St. Michael's College
Mr. Steve Moate, Senior Legal Counsel, Office of the President
Professor Amy Mullin, Vice Principal Academic and Dean, UTM
Mr. Gavin Nowlan, President, Arts and Science Students' Union (ASSU)
Mr. Mark Overton, Dean of Student Affairs, UTM
Mr. Mark Quintos, President, Communication, Culture and Information Technology, UTM
Ms Danielle Sandhu, Students' Administrative Council (SA) which operates as the University of
Toronto Students' Union (UTSU)
Ms Laurie Stephens, Director of Media Relations and Stakeholder Communications
Professor Anthony Wensley, Director, Institute of Communication, Culture and Information
Technology, UTM

1. Chair's Remarks

(a) Welcome

The Chair welcomed the members and guests to the meeting at the University of Toronto Mississauga campus, and noted that it was pleasure to spend time at UTM particularly at a time of expansion and renewal. He added that he was looking forward to Professor Saini's remarks about UTM's initiatives and activities in the months ahead.

The Chair explained the presence of uniformed officers of the Campus Community Police at the entrance of the Chamber, and two Campus Community Police officers within the Council Chamber. This was a precautionary measure made in light of the disruptive action of some attendees at the Council's recent meetings. It was hoped that at the end of the meeting this would be deemed unnecessary. The Chair said that all seats in the Council Chamber for non-members had been assigned to those who had requested them. Any seats that would become vacant during the course of the meeting would be made available to non-members on a first-come first-served basis. Additionally, the audio cast of the meeting would be relayed to room 3093 of the William G. Davis building at UTM.

(b) Appointment of Lieutenant-Governor-In-Council Member to Governing Council

The Chair announced that the Lieutenant-Governor had issued the order that Ms Jane Pepino be appointed to the Governing Council for a period of three years, effective the 1st day of July, 2011.

(c) Speaking Requests

The Chair noted that several speaking requests had been granted for the meeting. Some of the speakers had been invited to address the previous meeting of the Governing Council that was held on April 7, 2011, but had been unable to do so.

(d) Vice-President and Principal's Remarks

Professor Saini welcomed members and guests to UTM and invited them to tour the campus to observe its continuous physical transformation. Professor Saini highlighted two of the new buildings on campus that had either been built or were close to completion:

- (i) Terrence Donnelly Health Sciences Complex: This building would be the home to the Mississauga Academy of Medicine; the Department of Anthropology; the Biomedical Communications program; and the Office of the Vice-Principal Research.
- (ii) Instructional Centre: With 27 new classrooms, ranging in capacity from 30 to 500 seats, this state-of-the-art building would provide much-needed study and social space for students, including a cafeteria.

Professor Saini said that the Terrence Donnelly Health Sciences Complex and the Instructional Centre had been completed on or below budget and on schedule, at a combined cost of \$107 million. The buildings had been built to high environmental and energy efficiency standards, and it was expected that both would earn Leadership in Energy & Environmental Design (LEED) Gold certification.

1. Chair's Remarks (cont'd)

(d) Vice-President and Principal's Remarks (cont'd)

Some of the other smaller capital projects at UTM that had recently been completed or were close to completion included:

- A new parking deck across from the Recreation, Athletics & Wellness Centre
- Academic Annexe
- South Building In-fill
- Chemistry teaching labs

Professor Saini noted that a significant feature of the physical growth at UTM was that it had been achieved without encroaching on the green spaces that were synonymous with the campus. The 2011 Campus Master Plan for UTM demonstrated how the campus was doubling its current 2 million square feet built space capacity while staying entirely inside the outer circle road.

UTM was looking forward to the first cohort of students at the Mississauga Academy of Medicine in August 2011. It was expected that collaborations between UTM and other divisions within the University would follow in the future.

In closing his remarks, Professor Saini said that the newly-built buildings at UTM would relieve the space stress on the rapidly expanding campus with a student population of approximately 12,000. The space would allow UTM to build on growth opportunities that existed within the GTA and internationally.

2. Minutes of the Previous Meeting

Approval of the minutes of April 7, 2011 meeting was deferred until the meeting of June 23, 2011. A member had sent the Secretary a request to consider changes to the minutes. The Chair and Secretary would review the suggested changes provided by the member and consider any revisions to the minutes. Members would be provided with the revised minutes prior to the meeting of June 23, 2011.

3. Business Arising from the Minutes of the Previous Meeting

The Chair said that though it was strictly not a matter of Business Arising from the Minutes of the Previous Meeting, he would invite Mr. Gilbert Cassar, President, UTMSU, to address the Council on agenda item 5 (b) – 'Tuition Fee Schedule for Publicly Funded Programs, 2011-12' – from the meeting of April 7, 2011. The former President of UTMSU and Ms Sandhu had not been able to address the Council at its last meeting as planned.

Mr. Cassar said that he had carefully reviewed the minutes of the Governing Council meeting of April 7, 2011 and related board reports. Mr. Cassar expressed his concern about the implementation of the program fee in the Faculty of Arts and Science at the St. George campus that had, in his opinion, been put in place without proper consultation with students. In his opinion, an underfunded system that was financed on the back of student debt compromised the priorities of student experience. Mr. Cassar expressed his view that charging full tuition for only three courses was effectively a 66 per cent increase in tuition fees. He added that students in such a situation would be left with a false choice - to attend university, taking a course load of at least five courses; or to work for one or two years to be able to afford their education. In closing his address, Mr. Cassar called on the Governing Council to work with the student organizations to lobby the government for a better funding model for higher education to ensure that students who had the grades to attend university were able to do so in a manner that was affordable.

3. Business Arising from the Minutes of the Previous Meeting (cont'd)

Invited to attend the Council, Ms Danielle Sandhu, President, UTSU (SAC), said that the minutes of meeting of April 7, 2011, were inaccurate in suggesting that representatives of student groups had not been present to address the Governing Council when invited to do so by the President. Ms Sandhu said that she, like other members of the University community, was forcefully locked out of the meeting where the tuition fees and budget report were presented. In Ms Sandhu's opinion, this action had infringed upon her freedom of speech and assembly, while violating the principles of an open and democratic institution. According to Ms Sandhu, the University had declared that it was fiscally sound, and yet it had used the budgetary crisis to justify the increase in tuition fees. Notably, the tuition fees had surpassed the contribution from the provincial government for 2011-12. Ms Sandhu stressed on the need to prioritize the University's efforts to lobby the government for more public funding in order to make higher education more accessible. Ms Sandhu was of the opinion that private funding came with attached conditions. She questioned why certain professional faculties with high tuition fees were being subsidized by students at the Faculty of Arts and Science. Ms Sandhu alleged that the de facto increase in tuition fees of up to 66 per cent in the Faculty of Arts and Science through the implementation of the program fees was higher than the increase of 5 per cent mandated by the provincial government. Finally, Ms Sandhu called for a review and a vote on the implementation of the program fees at the Faculty of Arts and Science.

A member said that the University was a public institution and the events of the April 7, 2011, were avoidable. In the opinion of the member, the Governing Council meetings were to be open and members of the University community had a right to be present at those meetings as outlined in the *University of Toronto Act*. Another member said he had missed half of the meeting on April 7, 2011, as he was prevented from doing so by the Community Campus Police. The member wanted to know what was being done to ensure that the public was able to gain access to the Chamber, and that those constitutionally elected to the Council could express the opinions of those whom they represented. Another member said that the characterization of the April 7, 2011, meeting was not on the agenda of the current meeting. The member disagreed with the views of Ms Sandhu and the two members who had addressed the Council previously. He said that members had felt a reasonably founded fear of violence at the meeting of April 7, 2011. He added that he would not accept the agenda of another meeting of the Governing Council being hijacked to discuss an item that was not on the agenda. The Chair ruled that the meeting continue without further debate on the matter.

4. Report of the President

The President began by thanking the UTM community for the manner in which that campus had evolved over several years. He expressed his gratitude to the present and past leadership at UTM and he noted the vitality and energy on the campus fueled, in part, by the continuing growth in capital projects at UTM.

(a) Student Presentation

The President introduced the members to the UTM chapter of Let's Talk Science (LTS). LTS was UTM's largest graduate student initiative. The President introduced Ms Sara Chalvez (alumna, current co-coordinator and volunteer); Mr. Sacha Larda (PhD candidate – Chemistry, co-coordinator); Ms Michele Taffs (graduate student – Psychology; incoming-coordinator); Mr. Andrew Catalano (PhD candidate – Biology, incoming-coordinator); Ms Marzena Serwin (graduate student – Biology); Ms Faiza Ishtiaq (undergraduate student – Life Sciences);

4. Report of the President (cont'd)

Mr Zack Abuwalla (undergraduate student – Biology); Mr. Tanmay Dave (alumnus); and Mr. Mark Overton, Dean of Student Affairs, who provided his experience in coordinating and advising on the initiative.

Ms Sara Chavez provided an overview of the initiative – the presentation is [appended](#) to this report. LTS was a national charitable organization committed to building youth interest and engagement in science, engineering and technology. The program had attracted more than two thousand graduate and undergraduate students from thirty colleges and universities across Canada. The projects launched at UTM included, the Green Roof Projects, the Atlantic Salmon Release, the All Science Challenge, in addition to projects in robotics and engineering. LTS was welcomed at school across the GTA but the UTM chapter focused its efforts on the Mississauga community. Its volunteers helped to foster interest among youth in a variety of areas with hands-on participation in science projects. The growth of the LTS program, in terms of its volunteers and the youth participating in the initiative, had more than doubled since 2009. In closing, Ms Chavez said that LTS UTM had been supported by the Office of the Dean of Arts and Science, the National Sciences and Engineering Council of Canada (NSERC), the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR), and AMGEN.

The President thanked Ms Chavez and noted the impact that the LTS had had in numerous cities.

(b) Awards and Honours

The President drew the members' attention to the Awards and Honours list. He congratulated all the awardees and encouraged the members to review the list closely. The President highlighted the following:

- Professor Leah Cowen (Molecular Genetics) had won the prestigious American Society for Microbiology Merck Irving S. Sigal Memorial Award for excellence in basic research medical microbiology and infectious diseases. Professor Cowan was an emerging star in the field of medical mycology.
- Professor Roger Martin (Dean, Rotman School of Management) had won the second prize in the 2010 McKinsey Awards. Professor Martin's article "The Age of Customer Capitalism" had been judged one of the two best articles to appear in the *Harvard Business Review* in 2010.
- Ms Jemy Joseph (graduate student, Institute of Medical Sciences and member, Academic Board) was the winner of 2011 Skills for Change New Pioneer Award. Ms Joseph had been recognized for her outstanding contributions to Toronto's immigrant and refugee community.

(c) Open Letter

Members were provided a copy of letter titled "The University of Toronto: Retrospect on 2010-11 and a Look Ahead" – the letter is appended here. The President said that the letter was an update on the "State of the University-style" from his perspective. He invited members to review the online version of the letter that included a number of hyperlinks to provide additional and supporting material¹.

¹ See "The University of Toronto; Retrospect on 2010-11 and a Look Ahead" at: <http://www.president.utoronto.ca/presidents-open-letter.htm>

4. Report of the President (cont'd)

(d) Convocation season

The President concluded his report by announcing the official opening of the University's Convocation Season. The first of this spring's twenty four convocations for approximately 12,500 graduating students was scheduled for Tuesday, May 31 when graduates from the Rotman School of Management would receive their degrees. Governors would be receiving information about the convocation schedule and were encouraged to attend the convocation ceremonies as their schedules permitted.²

The President commented that the convocation ceremonies were a highlight on the academic calendar. The celebration of the achievements of the University's students and honorary graduands was of primary importance to the institution and its mission. New to the convocation ceremonies would be the Convocation Plaza - a marquee that would serve as a space for gathering and celebration. In closing, the President expressed the gratitude of the University to the Chancellor for his generous time commitment and leadership during convocation.

5. Items for Governing Council Approval

(a) Committee on Academic Policy and Programs, Planning and Budget Committee, and Academic Board Terms of Reference: Revisions Re Approval of Academic Programs

(Arising from Report Number 173 of the Academic Board [April 26, 2011])

Professor Hodnett provided highlights of the thorough consideration of this proposal that had occurred at the Academic Board meeting of April 26, 2011, as well as at the preceding meetings of the Planning and Budget Committee and Committee on Academic Policy and Programs.³ There had been extensive discussion at all the meetings, and each body had been strongly supportive of the proposal.

A member said that she was concerned with the proposal on two levels. Firstly, recommendation 15 of the *Report of the Task Force on Governance* had called for the reduction of duplication through the delegation of transactional matters to the lowest appropriate governance level. According to the member, this would reduce the opportunities for various stakeholders within the University to engage in matters of importance concerning academic programs. Secondly, the member referred to recommendation 21 of the *Report* wherein more authority would be delegated to the Executive Committee. The member alleged that the delegation of additional authority to the Executive Committee would result in diminished accountability and transparency.

A motion to defer the proposal to the next scheduled meeting of the Governing Council on June 23, 2011, to allow for further deliberation within the broader University community was seconded and defeated.

A member sought clarity that there would be a report presented to the Governing Council if any programs were closed or changed. Professor Misak replied that the closures or changes to programs would be recorded in the minutes of the relevant Boards and Governing Council.

² http://www.convocation.utoronto.ca/Honorary_Graduands_and_Speakers.htm

³ See: Report Number 173 of the Academic Board (April 26, 2011), pages 4-6, at: <http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/AssetFactory.aspx?did=7949>

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

(a) Committee on Academic Policy and Programs, Planning and Budget Committee, and Academic Board Terms of Reference: Revisions Re Approval of Academic Programs (cont'd)

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

- (a) THAT the proposed amendments to section 3, 4.1, 4.4, and 4.9 of the Terms of Reference of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs, and the proposed amendments to the section of the *Guidelines Regarding Levels of Approval* dealing with academic program proposals, be approved;
- (b) THAT the proposed amendment to section 4.4.2 of the Terms of Reference of the Planning and Budget Committee be approved; and
- (c) THAT the proposed amendment to sections 5.3.1 and 5.3.2 of the Terms of Reference of the Academic Board be approved.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 173 of the Academic Board as [Appendix "A"](#).

(b) Policy on the Student Evaluation of Teaching in Courses
(Arising from Report Number 173 of the Academic Board [April 26, 2011])

Professor Hodnett summarized the highlights of the proposal and of the extensive discussion that had occurred at the Academic Board meeting.⁴ She clarified that students had been consulted both during the development of the Policy, as well as regarding its implementation, and that their contributions had been exemplary. It was also noted that some faculty members chose not to allow release of the data collected through the evaluation process (allowable under the opt-out clause in the Policy) for a variety of individual reasons.

Members expressed concern with reference to the opt-out clause contained in the proposal. A member said that the students were justifiably agitated about this clause. Students would not be able to make informed choices. He said that while he appreciated that the administration had to contend with the official position of the University of Toronto Faculty Association (UTFA), the opt-out clause would result in a lack of accountability. Another member said that a risk of the opt-out clause would be negative selection as the data for evaluation would not be complete. Another member asked whether merit pay could be withheld for instructors who opted out of the course evaluations.

Professor Misak clarified that all instructors would be evaluated. However, instructors could choose to opt-out of the results being made public. There was recognition that students wanted to access course evaluation data to select courses. The Principals and Deans would continue to encourage the few instructors who did exercise the opt-out option to make the results of course evaluations public. Course evaluations were only one factor of many factors used in the assessment of merit pay and so the suggestion that merit pay could be withheld would not be acceptable.

⁴ See: Report Number 173 of the Academic Board (April 26, 2011), pages 6-9, at: <http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/AssetFactory.aspx?did=7949>

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

(b) Policy on the Student Evaluation of Teaching in Courses (cont'd)

A student member said that a lot of his colleagues relied on the course evaluations in the Anti-Calendar published by the Arts and Science Students' Union (ASSU) to select courses and asked what impact the Policy would have on this tool.

Professor Regehr replied that every division had its own unique method in place for course evaluations. The Anti-Calendar was one example of the use of course evaluations; students in other divisions did not necessarily have access to the same kind of information. The Faculty of Arts and Science would continue to make the information on course evaluations public and it was hoped that other divisions would take its lead.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

THAT the proposed *Policy on the Student Evaluation of Teaching in Courses* be approved.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 173 of the Academic Board as [Appendix "B"](#).

(c) University of Toronto Mississauga and Faculty of Information: Specialist Program in Interactive Digital Media

(Arising from Report Number 173 of the Academic Board [April 26, 2011])

Professor Hodnett noted that this proposed program had received enthusiastic support from stakeholders as it had proceeded through various stages of consultation, external appraisal, and governance approval.

A member asked whether the program allowed a student registered on a part-time basis would be able to pursue the structured program. In response, Professor Anthony Wensley, Director, Institute of Communication, Culture and Information Technology (ICCIT), said that students registered on a part-time basis were enrolled in the program and the ICCIT would continue its efforts to offer courses to meet the needs of part-time students.

The Chair invited Mr. Mark Quintos, President, CCIT Council, to address the Council. Mr. Quintos said that CCIT was an academic society at UTM that organized events and workshops for students at the ICCIT and the Visual Studies Program. The input of the CCIT Council had been sought and considered, along side those of the external review, in the planning process of the proposed programs offered by the ICCIT. Mr. Quintos thanked Professor Anthony Wensley, and Professor Amy Mullin for providing regular updates on proposed changes to the program and acknowledging the input of students. Mr. Quintos said that the proposed changes would prove be beneficial to incoming students and would provide them with the requirement to succeeding in the field. In closing, Mr. Quintos hoped that the students and faculty would continue to work on future ventures of academic planning.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

THAT the proposed Bachelor of Arts (B.A.) Specialist Program in Interactive Digital Media, as described in the proposal dated February 1, 2011, be approved, effective July 1, 2011.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 173 of the Academic Board as [Appendix "C"](#).

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

(d) Capital Project: 2011 Campus Master Plan

(Arising from Report Number 173 of the Academic Board [April 26, 2011] - Item 10)

The Chair said that there had been thorough presentations of the 2011 Campus Master Plans at the meetings of the Planning and Budget Committee (April 6, 2011) and the Academic Board (April 26, 2011). In addition to this, the administration had organized two information sessions for governors where further details on the plans were provided. The Chair acknowledged the extensive work done on the plans by Vice-Provost Mabury and Assistant Vice-President Sisam and her team.

Professor Hodnett reported that the Plans had been designed to provide a framework for future developments on the University's three campuses under which balanced intensification of built form as well as facility renewal would allow the planned growth in enrolment and expanded research initiatives articulated in the *Towards 2030* Report.

A member said that as this was the last of the items being put forward by Ms Sisam, the Governing Council should express its appreciation of her service to the University over the years. The Chair drew the attention to the members to Report Number 438 of the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee had agreed that it would be appropriate to express formally the Council's appreciation of the work that Ms Sisam had done and the impact that she had had on the University and its space. The President said that Ms Sisam's work over thirty years had contributed to the remarkable built form on the three campuses, the numerous architectural awards, and support from the government and benefactors. The Master Plans represented the magnum opus of her distinguished career. The President thanked Ms Sisam for her service to the University and wished her well in her retirement. The Chair added that because of her responsibilities, Ms Sisam had worked closely with governors and governance for much of three decades. Ms Sisam's commitment and passion for the University as well as her extensive knowledge were consistently evident in her work and the many proposals that she had brought to governance over the years. She had set a high standard and governors had benefitted greatly from her advice. The Chair concluded that the Executive Committee resolution was made on behalf of the Governing Council and reflected the immense respect and high regard in which Ms Sisam was held.

(i) 2011 Campus Master Plan – University of Toronto Mississauga

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

THAT the Campus Master Plan for the University of Toronto Mississauga be approved in principle to allow the University to negotiate municipal acceptance and municipal approvals.

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

(d) Capital Project: 2011 Campus Master Plan (cont'd)

(ii) 2011 Campus Master Plan – St. George Campus

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

THAT the Campus Master Plan for the St. George Campus be approved in principle to allow the University to negotiate municipal acceptance and municipal approvals.

(iii) 2011 Campus Master Plan – University of Toronto at Scarborough

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

THAT the Campus Master Plan for the University of Toronto at Scarborough be approved in principle to allow the University to negotiate municipal acceptance and municipal approvals.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 173 of the Academic Board as [Appendix “F”](#).

6. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units: Semi-Annual Report, (July – December, 2010)

Professor Hodnett summarized some of the key findings of the five reviews of academic programs and units that had recently been carried out, as well as the follow-up report that had been provided by the University of Toronto at Scarborough at the request of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs. A number of members commented that the quality of the review process had improved markedly in recent years.

Referring to the review of the Faculty of Law, a member commented that this was the only review which had suggested that the Faculty consider moderate tuition fees increases to sustain to sustain its activities. In the opinion of the member, the tuition fees at the Faculty of Law were already very high. The member asked whether the University had considered other sources to sustain the Faculty, for example, seeking assistance from alumni, friends of the University, and the provincial government. Had any efforts been made to monitor the adverse effects of the impact of high fees on access to the Faculty by students from low socio-economic status and marginalized communities?

Professor Misak replied that each fall, the administration engaged in budget and academic review meetings with the divisions. At those meetings, sources of revenues for the divisions were scrutinized including tuition, benefaction or continuing education programs. Additionally, ways to reduce expenditure at these divisions were also considered. As was the case with all divisions, the Faculty of Law had found several ways to increase its revenues. Professor Misak said that the Faculty of Law had monitored the increase in tuition fees closely. The increase in tuition fees had been accompanied with a concomitant increase in financial aid for students who practiced professions in law that were not as lucrative as others. The effect of this had been an increase in the diversity of the student body, notably with more students from low socio economic status groups.

7. Performance Indicators for Governance, 2010 – A Summary

This item was deferred to a future special session of the Governing Council.

8. Faculty of Arts and Science Program Fee Report

The Chair invited Professor Misak to provide an update on the implementation of the program fees at the Faculty of Arts and Science (FAS). Professor Misak recalled that in 2009, when the proposal to implement the program fees at the FAS had been approved by the Council, a commitment had been made to evaluate the impact of this implementation on the students and the Faculty. The University had committed that revisions would be made to the implementation if the evaluation of the facts deemed it necessary. The Dean of FAS had commissioned a report to review the effects of the implementation. Professor Gertler said that in 2009 a number of concerns had been raised on the potential implications of the implementation of the program fee. The Program Fee Monitoring Committee (PFMC) had collected and analyzed data and had determined that the concerns that were raised had not materialized. He invited Professor McGowan, Chair, PFMC, to present the report and its findings.

The Report of the PFMC and the presentation to the Council are [appended](#) to the minutes.

At the conclusion of Professor McGowan's presentation, Professor Misak said that the conclusions presented in the report of the PFMC were encouraging and, consequently, no revisions were required to the implementation of the program fee.

Discussion

(i) *Members' Comments and Questions*

In the course of discussion, members raised the following points.

- Some members commented on effects of the change on part-time students with the implementation of a lower threshold of 3.0 credits. Students enrolled in 3.0 credits would now have to pay 66 per cent more, and in addition, these students would pay more for incidental and ancillary fees. Would there be a further review to assess the effect of the reduction in the threshold of implementation of the program fee to 3.0 credits?
- Some members suggested that data on 1.5 cohorts was not sufficient for meaningful assessment.
- A member commented that the data presented on student life in the report was qualitative and based on a small sample size of 44 students. In the member's opinion, there was a need for quantitative data that explored the effect of the implementation of the program fee on student life, as it related to participation rates in extra curricular activities such as intramural sports and campus employment.
- Some members commented that student debt from the Ontario Student Assistance Program (OSAP) funding would increase as a result of the implementation of the program fee, particularly for a number of mature students with dependents. In the opinion of another member, OSAP provided an incentive to complete a degree program within four years.

8. Faculty of Arts and Science Program Fee Report (cont'd)

- A member described the report as innovative and called on the administration for similar strategic reports for the consideration of the Governing Council. In the member's opinion, the data in the report had been well presented and analyzed. The member understood the incentive to allow students to register in up to 6.0 credits with the tuition fees of 5.0 credits, but believed it was an unfair for students enrolled in 3.0 credits to be charged for 5.0 credits.
- Another member questioned whether students would enroll in extra courses that they would not necessarily complete, and this would prevent other students from having access to those courses.
- Members asked whether the PFMC took into account that courses and programs were not homogenous in structure. The need to complete pre-requisite courses would not allow some students to take advantage of the ability to take extra courses and accelerate through their program.
- A member called on the University to review its priorities that, in her opinion, were channeled towards balanced budgets at the expense of viewing tuition fees as a revenue stream, and favouring some faculties at the expense of others, as external sources of revenue were sought. The member urged the University to lobby the provincial government for more funding.
- A member commented that she understood there was to be a review, and not a monitoring committee, to assess the efficacy of the program fee, and said that she had understood that there was to have been a vote on the review.

(ii) *Guest Speakers*

Ms Yvonne Chen addressed the Council on behalf of APUS, stating the view that:

- A tuition fee increase of nearly 70 per cent for students enrolled in 3.0 to 3.5 credits was prohibitively steep and violated the provincial government's stipulation on the increase of tuition fees.
- Part-time students with other responsibilities were being forced to take on more debt.
- The PFMC needed to consult more mature students and student associations such as APUS to gain a better perspective on the impact of the implementation of the program fee.

Ms Sandhu addressed the Council on behalf of UTSU (SAC), stating the view that:

- A number of students had been unable to participate in the discussion at the meeting. A comprehensive review and a vote on the implementation of the program fees was required.
- The PFMC had drawn its conclusions based on an insignificant cohort size of 1.5, with a student sample size of 42. The PFMC had not consulted student groups.
- There was a need to broaden the definition of accessibility to include students who could not enroll in studies because of personal responsibilities, and relied on part-time employment. She questioned whether the increase in demand for enrolment at the FAS included students from economically marginalized communities.
- There had been 4,000 signatories on a petition calling on the University to reverse its decision on program fees.

8. Faculty of Arts and Science Program Fee Report (cont'd)

(iii) *Administrative Response*

Professor Misak's responses included the following:

- The PFMC report was a review of the impact of the program fee in the first phase. The facts outlined in the report did not warrant any changes to the implementation of the program fee at the FAS at this time.
- The implementation of the program fee was compliant with the tuition fees framework mandated by the provincial government.
- The University's student body was economically diverse, and the University had allocated over \$58 million for need-based financial aid, and close to \$136 million in total, when merit-based assistance was included. The FAS would be able to provide additional funds for students who required financial aid as a result of the implementation of the program fee.
- One reason for allowing students to register for more than 5.0 credits with no extra costs was to allow greater flexibility to drop courses to those who saw the need to drop a course in one term and add a course in the following term. This flexibility did not exist at many other universities that operated on the program fee system and charged students additional fees if they registered in more than a full course load.
- The University had continued to lobby the government for additional per student funding. These lobbying efforts remained the University's foremost priorities.
- Program fees were a common practice in many of the University's peer institutions in the UK and the US, even as tuition fees level continued to rise significantly in those jurisdictions.
- The University would continue to monitor the effects of the program fee and would make revisions as deemed necessary.

Professor McGowan added the following based on the mandate of the PFMC:

- The PFMC had been made up of individuals with a broad range of opinions that were extensively discussed. There was much discussion and deliberation on the questions
- Part-time students would continue to pay tuition fees on a per course basis.
- With reference to the effect on student life, the PFMC would have liked to have had more data. However, the PFMC also wanted to work with data that could be bench-marked effectively against the data from the National Survey on Student Experience (NSSE) in order to draw necessary comparisons. It was for this reason that the PFMC chose to examine 1.5 cohorts, in a year in which the NSSE was conducted.
- The PFMC aimed to create exploratory focus groups for qualitative analysis that could be looked at within the NSSE data on a quantitative basis.
- The PFMC included the methodology (Appendix 2) used in the report. Over 9,000 students were invited to participate in the focus groups. Of this, 94 students formed the focus groups with no emphasis to select students from a particular demographic in terms of age or marital status.
- The PFMC report did not make any correlations between students registering for extra courses and a higher GPA. However, there was perhaps an increase in the number of credits taken by students registered in colleges with a higher enrolment average, and that there was a trend across students registered in all programs with the FAS to register for more than 5.0 credits.

8. Faculty of Arts and Science Program Fee Report (cont'd)

Dr. Glenn Loney referred to figure 5 of the report and said that the introduction of the late withdrawal without academic penalty (LWD) by the FAS had enabled students to withdraw from courses. This was a major factor that had resulted in students being registered in fewer credits at the end of the academic year compared with the number of credits at the beginning of the academic year. The LWD policy had been well received by students.

Professor Gertler informed the members:

- Program fees had been in place at other faculties, including the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering for a number of years. The PFMC report pertained to the FAS only.
- Students who had to withdraw from courses due to unforeseen circumstances in the first term appreciated the flexibility of the system that allowed them to take an additional course in the second term. Students could register in up to 6.0 credits in an academic year without incurring extra tuition fees. This was an added benefit of the program fee and was unique to the University.
- The FAS had adjusted procedures related to enrolment and registration practices to prevent students from over-loading of courses.
- Revenue generated was channeled back into the classrooms to enrich the learning experience of students, and to increase support services programs.
- The University had one of the most comprehensive financial aid structures in place.
- It was expected that the reduction in the enrolment levels at the FAS in the coming years would reduce the demand of course enrolment.

A member requested a further follow-up report on the implementation of the program fees. The Council agreed to add a motion to that effect. On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

THAT the Program Fee Monitoring Committee continue its work for 2011-12; and

THAT the Vice-President and Provost present a report from the Monitoring Committee to the Governing Council during the 2011-12 academic year, along with the administration's recommendations to the Governing Council regarding the Committee's findings.

9. Report of the Implementation Committee for the Task Force on Governance

The Chair said that an update on the work of the Implementation Committee for the Task Force on Governance would be posted on the Governing Council website.

10. Reports for Information

Members received the following reports for information:

- (a) [Report Number 173 of the Academic Board \(April 26, 2011\)](#)
- (b) [Report Number 188 of the Business Board \(April 4, 2011\)](#)
- (c) [Report Number 163 of the University Affairs Board \(April 12, 2011\)](#)
- (d) [Report Number 438 of the Executive Committee \(May 9, 2011\)](#)

11. Date of Next Meeting

The Chair reminded the members that the next meeting of the Governing Council was scheduled for Thursday, June 23, 2011 at 4:00 p.m., thirty minutes earlier than the usual time, in the Council Chamber.

12. Question Period

There were no questions for members of the senior administration.

13. Other Business

The Chair informed members that Mr. Bernardo Melendez of the U of T Vote Mob had been scheduled to address the Council. Mr. Melendez would be invited to address the Governing Council at a future meeting.

IN ACCORDANCE WITH A DETERMINATION BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, PURSUANT TO SECTIONS 38 AND 40 OF BY LAW NUMBER 2, ITEMS 14 TO 16 WERE CONSIDERED BY THE GOVERNING COUNCIL *IN-CAMERA*.

14. Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters: Recommendation for Expulsion

On motion duly moved, seconded and carried

It was Resolved

THAT the President's recommendation for expulsion, as outlined in the memoranda and supporting documentation from the Secretary of the Governing Council, dated March 29, 2011 for April 7, 2011, be confirmed.

15. Board and Committee Assignments

On motion duly moved, seconded and carried,

It was Resolved,

THAT the proposal from the Chair for Board and Committee assignments for 2011-12 be approved.

16. Senior Appointments

On motion duly moved, seconded and carried,

It was Resolved,

THAT Professor Angela Hildyard be re-appointed Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity, for a second term, effective July 1, 2011 and continuing to June 30, 2014.

On motion duly moved, seconded and carried,

It was Resolved

THAT Ms Judith Wolfson be re-appointed Vice-President, University Relations, for a second term of two and one-half years, effective July 1, 2011 and continuing to December 31, 2013.

The meeting adjourned at 7:30 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

May 30, 2011