

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO MISSISSAUGA CAMPUS COUNCIL

SEPTEMBER 30, 2013

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CAMPUS COUNCIL held on September 30, 2013 at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chambers, William G. Davis Building, University of Toronto Mississauga.

Mr. John Switzer, Chair
Professor Hugh Gunz, Vice-Chair
Professor Deep Saini, Vice-President & Principal
Ms Kelly Akers
Ms Melissa Berger
Mr. Jeff Collins Mr. Neil Davis
Professor Shay Fuchs
Mr. Simon Gilmartin
Mr. Kevin Golding
Ms Pam King
Dr. Rav Kumar
Mr. Nykolaj Kuryluk
Dr. Joseph Leydon
Ms Alice Li
Mr. Muhammed Mahmood
Professor Kathy Pichora-Fuller
Professor Mihaela Pirvulescu

Ms Judith Poë
Mr. Ron Raciopo
Mr. Masood Samim
Dr. Karima Velji

Regrets:

Mr. Sheldon Leiba
Mr. David Szwarc

Non-Voting Assessors:

Professor Amy Mullin, Vice-Principal Academic & Dean
Mr. Paul Donoghue, Chief Administrative Officer

In Attendance:

Professor Meric Gertler, President-designate
Professor Amrita Daniere, Vice-Dean Graduate
Mr. Mark Overton, Dean of Student Affairs
Mr. Raymond Noronha, President, University of Toronto Mississauga Students' Union (UTMSU)
Mr. Hamza Ansari, VP University Affairs & Academics, UTMSU
Ms Ro'a Saafan, VP Equity, UTMSU
Ms Melissa Theodore, VP External, UTMSU
Ms Sara da Silva, Co-President, UTM's Association of Graduate Students (UTMAGS)
Mr. Daniel Ball, Co-President, UTMAGS

Secretariat:

Mr. Louis Charpentier, Secretary of the Governing Council
Ms Cindy Ferencz Hammond, Director of Governance
Ms Mariam Ali, Committee Secretary
Mr. Jim Delaney, Acting Assistant Secretary of the Governing Council

1. Chair's Remarks

The Chair welcomed new members to the inaugural meeting of the Campus Council for the 2013-14 academic year. The Chair also welcomed Professor Meric Gertler, President-designate, who spoke about

the significance of this momentous occasion in the life of UTM. He noted UTM's ongoing developments in infrastructure, specialized programs, and remarked upon its vibrant faculty, staff and student body.

The Chair then introduced Professor Hugh Gunz, Vice-Chair of the Campus Council, and Professor Saini, Vice-President and Principal, the Voting Assessor to Council. The Council's Non-Voting Assessors were also introduced: Professor Amy Mullin, Vice-Principal Academic & Dean and Mr. Paul Donoghue, Chief Administrative Officer. The Chair acknowledged the members of the Secretariat who were present: Mr. Louis Charpentier, Secretary of the Governing Council, Mr. Jim Delaney, Acting Assistant Secretary of the Governing Council, Ms Cindy Ferencz Hammond, Director of Governance (UTM) and Assistant Secretary of the Governing Council, and Ms Mariam Ali, Committee Secretary (UTM).

2. Orientation

The Chair and Mr. Charpentier gave an Orientation presentation, which included the following key points¹:

- The essential role of governance was to provide guidance on the University's long-term strategic directions and to provide active oversight of the University's management;
- Good governance principles began with appropriate disclosure, transparency and clear lines of accountability between governance and administration;
- Governance responsibilities were conducted through a set of committees with clear accountability and delegated authority for advice, oversight and/or approval;
- While each member might be informed by concerns of his or her individual constituency, the expectation was that members would act in the best interests of the institution as a whole;
- Members should commit to participate actively in meetings and attend at least 75% of all meetings;
- Governance was a receiver of proposals and reports from administration and the primary functions of governance were to approve, provide oversight or advice on proposals

The presentation included a visual representation of the governance path of a new graduate program, the establishment of an Academic Unit (Extra Departmental Unit A and B), approval of Capital Projects (Level 3) and compulsory non-academic incidental fees (services). The Chair noted that the process for how UTM governance consideration of budget matters had not yet been finalized and that he would report back when the process was clarified.

Mr. Charpentier drew members' attention to the handout, *Quick Reference Guide to the Use of Cover Sheets*. He explained that cover sheets were designed to enhance the focus of members on the major elements of proposals and that they were a valuable tool in providing guidance with respect to the responsibilities of the relevant governance body for each item of business.

The Chair gave an overview of the agenda planning process. The Agenda Committee differed from the agenda planning groups of the AAC and CAC in two respects: it was formally constituted; and its membership included the Chairs and Vice-Chairs of the standing committees. Otherwise, the guiding principle was the same: agenda planning was a technical process whereby consideration was given to whether an item was ready for consideration.

¹A copy of the Orientation Presentation is attached as Attachment A.

The Chair closed the Orientation presentation with an explanation of *Consent Agendas*. He explained that the intent of the “consent” portion of governance agendas was to streamline meetings, allowing more time for items where more discussion and debate was required and less time for items of a routine nature. Items on the consent agenda would not be given individual consideration unless requested in advance by a member.

A member asked if it was appropriate to speak more than once to an item. The Chair responded that it is the Chair’s right to recognize a speaker a second time, and the object of a time limit was not to curtail discussion, but to ensure that all members who wished to speak were given the opportunity to be heard.

In response to a member’s question, the Chair reviewed the membership of the Agenda Committee. The member noted that the student representative on the Agenda Committee for the current year, was a graduate student, and therefore might not be able to identify issues pertaining to the undergraduate population. The Chair advised that the student may discuss agenda items with other student members of various governance bodies and in that process identify issues particular to undergraduate students.²

3. Report of the Vice-President & Principal

Professor Saini noted that this meeting represented a moment of historical significance in the evolution of UTM. He thanked the large number of individuals involved in the planning and implementation of the new governance model. He also thanked all members of the Campus Council for being engaged in UTM’s governance processes. Professor Saini introduced presenters Mr. Raymond Noronha, President of the UTM Student Union (UTMSU), and Sara da Silva and Daniel Ball, Co-Presidents of the UTM Association of Graduate Students (UTMAGS).

a. Presentation by Student Government Leaders:

Mr. Noronha presented an overview of the UTMSU³, including its organizational structure, the Student Centre and Blind Duck pub, current campaigns, and an overview of FroshWeek participation.

Ms da Silva and Mr. Ball presented an overview of the UTMAGS⁴. They highlighted their leadership in representing UTM graduate students on a variety of committees on campus, serving as the link to the University’s Graduate Student Union, and providing networking opportunities to graduate students by organizing annual events.

The Chair then invited Professor Saini to present an overview of the Campus and his role as Voting Assessor to Campus Council⁵. The presentation outlined UTM’s role in the community, as a driver of regional innovation and economic development in a strategically important city and region, including UTM’s economic impact. Professor Saini highlighted the diversity of students at UTM, provided

² Secretary’s Note: Such issues, however, would properly be discussed at the Campus Council itself when it is considering item and the merits of the proposal in question, not at the Agenda Committee. The Agenda Committee’s discussion is meant to focus on readiness and completeness of documentation, not the merits of the proposal.

³A copy of the UTMSU Presentation is attached as Attachment B (as a web link)

⁴A copy of the UTMAGS Presentation is attached as Attachment C

⁵A copy of the Vice-President and Principal’s Presentation and the Assessor Handout is attached as Attachment D and E respectively.

information on domestic and international student enrollment, and the student population's commitment to volunteerism. He also gave an overview of the senior administrative structure of the campus, including that of the Office of the Dean, Office of the Chief Administrative Officer and Student Affairs. Professor Saini also highlighted the Institute for Management and Innovation, an amalgamation of unique management programs that were tailored to combine the study of management with those of key disciplines, professions or particular industrial sectors.

The Chair commented that the level of connectivity and engagement with the community - the City of Mississauga and the Region of Peel - was a great source of pride for UTM, and that this would continue as a model for broader engagement within the university community.

4. Calendar of Business

The Chair referred members to the Calendar of Business, and advised that the document would be updated on the Office of the Campus Council website every Friday; he encouraged members to review the Calendar on a regular basis.

5. Revision to the *Policy on Capital Planning and Capital Projects*

The Chair invited Mr. Charpentier to outline the governance path for the proposed revision to the *Policy on Capital Planning and Capital Projects*. Mr. Charpentier explained that in May 2012, Governing Council had approved revisions arising from recommendations of the *Task Force on Governance*. The revisions involved: streamlined consideration of capital planning and capital projects; increased minimum thresholds for consideration by various bodies; the separation of policy and procedure; and strengthened coordination and integration of project review between and among central and divisional offices.

Mr. Charpentier noted that the proposed revision to the *Policy* increased delegated authority at the campus level as the Campus Affairs Committee, rather than the Planning and Budget Committee, would consider capital projects in the \$3 – 10 million dollar range before proceeding to the Academic Board for final consideration. For projects over \$10 million, the same process would occur except that projects would proceed to the Governing Council for final consideration.

He also explained that consideration of capital projects was divided into two components: discussion regarding non-financial aspects of the project would be considered in open session, while financial details such as projected total projects costs would be discussed *in camera*. Mr. Charpentier emphasized that in keeping with the governance principles of openness and transparency, once the bids for the project were received and finalized, complete documentation would be made publicly available.

A member asked for clarification on the role of Campus Council with respect to capital projects under \$3 million and whether reports related to these projects would be coming to CC as items for information. Mr. Charpentier explained that projects in that range were the responsibility of administration. He added that accountability reports on capital projects would be brought forth as items for information to Campus Council on an annual basis. He noted that the Business Board of the Governing Council had clear responsibility for approval of capital expenditures for, and the execution of, approved projects, as required by approved policies. He added that each governance body's responsibility would be respected. He further noted that the annual accountability reports to Campus Council would include information on project timelines and progress reports.

The Chair commented that UTM was well known for its ability to complete projects on time and usually under budget.

CONSENT AGENDA

6. Reports of Information

The following items for information were received by Council.

- b. Report 1 of the Academic Affairs Committee (September 11, 2013)
- c. Report 1 of the Campus Affairs Committee (September 9, 2013)

7. Date of Next Meeting – Monday, December 9, 2013, 4:10 p.m.

The Chair reminded members that the next meeting of the Council was scheduled for Monday, December 9, 2013 at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber, William G. Davis Building.

8. Other Business

Professor Saini introduced a matter regarding the naming of the North Building Phase II. In June of 2013, the Vice-President and Principal's office launched a campus-wide naming contest to seek the advice of the UTM community for a working name for Phase 1 of the North Building Re-construction. This new building was a free-standing structure linked at two levels to the remainder of the old North Building and remained on schedule for occupancy in August, 2014. The main floor would include new and expanded food services, open and bookable study spaces, and rehearsal facilities for the Theater and Drama program. The remaining three floors would have several classrooms, dry research laboratories and provide new homes for the Department of Mathematical and Computational Sciences and a large portion of the Department of Psychology. The communication for the naming contest asked that submissions avoid naming suggestions that were after an individual, family or company, in order to protect a possible future opportunity to permanently name the building.

Professor Saini noted that the naming contest had a tremendous response and had reinforced the excitement and anticipation that surrounded this project. Out of a total of 185 submissions, almost half were from students. He announced that a naming committee, consisting of the senior administrative team of the campus, carefully reviewed all of the submissions and would be recommending to the Governing Council's Sub-Committee on Namings the following name for Phase I of the North Building Re-construction: Deerfield Hall.

When the senior administrative team considered the recommendation, it was noted that one of the defining characteristics of the UTM campus was its natural, almost bucolic setting and the wildlife that surrounded it. While UTM has gone through a period of tremendous growth in the recent past, in both student numbers and capital expansion, the campus had maintained its reputation for growing sustainably, protecting its natural areas and strengthening the overall image of being physically defined by its surroundings. Many of the suggestions received through the naming contest reflected that image.

Professor Saini remarked that he hoped members of Council were satisfied with his recommendation and explained that he would be submitting the name “Deerfield Hall” to the Governing Council’s Subcommittee on Namings for final approval.

The Chair invited all members and guests to remain for a celebratory reception immediately following the meeting to mark the occasion of the inaugural Campus Council meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 6:15 p.m.

Secretary
October 7, 2013

Chair