

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO  
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL  
**REPORT NUMBER 359 OF**  
**THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

**Monday, April 21, 2003**

To the Governing Council,  
University of Toronto.

Your Committee reports that it held a meeting on Monday, April 21, 2003 at 5:00 p.m. in the Boardroom, Simcoe Hall, with the following members present:

Dr. Thomas Simpson (In the Chair)  
Professor Robert J. Birgeneau, President  
Dr. Robert Bennett  
Ms Susan Eng  
Dr. Shari Graham Fell  
Professor David Jenkins  
Professor Brian Langille  
Professor Ian McDonald  
Mr. David Melville  
Mr. Sean Mullin  
Ms Rose Patten  
Mrs. Susan M. Scace

**Non-Voting Member:**

Mr. Louis R. Charpentier

**Regrets:**

Mr. Brian Davis  
Dr. Joseph Rotman

**Secretariat:**

Ms Susan Girard

**In Attendance:**

Professor W. Raymond Cummins, Chair, Academic Board and Member of the Governing Council

Dr. John Nestor, Chair, University Affairs Board and Member of the Governing Council

Professor Shirley Neuman, Vice-President and Provost and Member of the Governing Council

Mr. Felix Chee, Vice-President, Business Affairs

Dr. Beata FitzPatrick, Assistant Vice-President and Director, Office of the President

**Vary the Agenda**

With the approval of the Committee, the Chair moved item 1, external appointments, to follow the President's report.

**1. Report of the Previous Meeting**

Report Number 358 of the Executive Committee meeting held on March 24, 2003 was approved.

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

There was no business arising from the report of the previous meeting.

### **3. Minutes of the Governing Council Meeting held on April 3, 2003**

The Committee received for information the minutes of the Governing Council meetings held on April 3, 2003.

### **4. Business Arising from the Governing Council Meeting**

There was no business arising from the Governing Council meeting. The items on the agenda that were not considered at the meeting would be placed on the May 1 agenda.

### **5. Report of the President**

#### **SuperBuild Announcement**

The President reported that the provincial government recently announced \$150 million in SuperBuild funding for the universities of Ontario. This University's allocation would be \$55.5 million to support capital projects at the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM) and the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC). Funding in the first round had supported the Bahen Centre for Information Technology and the Centre for Cellular and Biomolecular Research on the St. George campus. He recalled that the University had repeatedly stated that enrolment expansion was conditional on receiving appropriate capital funding. The administration had made the case to the Ministry that the bulk of the province's enrolment expansion was linked to the Greater Toronto Area (GTA). More than half the funding in this round was allocated to the three universities in the GTA.

A member congratulated the administration on its success. Professor Neuman indicated that the funding would flow over several years.

A member asked about the gap between what was requested and what was received. Professor Neuman said that there would have to be some scaling back of projects.

#### **G10, AUCC and AAU Meetings**

The President said that owing to a winter storm at the recent G10 meeting of the research-intensive universities of Canada only 4 of the 10 presidents had been present. The main issue of discussion had been the real cost of education and what percentage should be covered by tuition fees. At this University, the percentage was 21% or 30% of the operating budget, depending on whether research costs were factored in. The group also discussed with Dr. Cal Stiller, Chair, Ontario Research and Development Challenge Fund, and Chair and CEO, Canadian Medical Discoveries Fund Inc., the announcement of the \$100 million Cancer Research Initiative in the provincial budget. The President believed strongly that the most successful model for doing such research was through universities that could bring rich faculty resources and students to the research problems at hand.

At the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC) meeting, the Honourable Jean Chretien was the invited dinner speaker. The presidents had taken the opportunity to thank him for his government's very substantial support to the universities in the recent budget. AUCC had also discussed a survey done by EKOS which showed post-secondary education was greatly valued by the public. However, the President noted that there was a disconnect between the value placed on universities and what the public was willing to pay to support them.

The President had recently attended a meeting of the Association of American Universities (AAU). Both Toronto and McGill were members of AAU and he had supported the suggestion that the group be expanded to include universities from Mexico and some more Canadian ones. A main topic of discussion had been how border security issues were affecting the academic enterprise. The group had met with Mr. Tom Ridge, the Head of Homeland Security. Mr. Ridge had recently begun his

## 5. Report of the President (cont'd)

new post, inheriting 180,000 employees who dealt with 1 billion border crossings a year. It would take some time for the system to work smoothly. The academic community accounted for 2% of the traffic but it was easy to control and that control was having an effect on the faculty and students. Some Canadian citizens were being treated differentially, depending on their country of origin. It was unacceptable to have two classes of citizens and it was equally impossible to boycott the U.S. where many important academic conferences occurred each year. A report on the impact of current practices had been prepared and had been presented to Mr. Ridge.

A member asked if it would be possible to prepare an information package for faculty. Another member said that the preparation of an information package accepted the logic that there were two types of Canadian citizens. Public announcements or direct contact with those in power might work better. The President said that he would like to wait and see if direct contact with Mr. Ridge had any impact. He said that the case had also been made to Vice-President Richard Cheney.

The President also had the opportunity to speak to other presidents about their respective budget situations. Many were in a worse situation than this University.

### Toronto City Summit Alliance

The Toronto City Summit Alliance has released its report *Enough Talk: An Action Plan for the Toronto Region*. The President said that it was a compelling document for government re-investment in the City and he hoped it would generate an excellent response.

### Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS) Update

Professor Neuman reported that the University continued to monitor the situation and react as required in response to changing Public Health guidelines. Despite a recent scare at UTSC, no cases have been confirmed on any campus. A notice has been posted on all examination hall doors telling students not to take the exam if they suspected they have been in contact with a confirmed case of SARS or if they exhibited any symptoms of SARS. The notice stated that new times for deferred exams would be set and the usual fee for deferral would be waived. On the clinical side, the University has suspended all clinical practica for all medical students. Professor Neuman said that the graduating medical students would be able to fulfill the requirements to sit their licensing exams.

The University's website was being updated regularly based on Public Health directives. Professors Goel and Hildyard were co-ordinating the University's efforts in this area.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

IT WAS RESOLVED

THAT, pursuant to sections 28 (e) and (f) of By-Law Number 2, consideration of agenda item 6 and part of 5 take place *in camera*, with the Board Chairs and Vice-Chair, Mr. Chee, Professor Neuman, and Dr. FitzPatrick admitted to the meeting to facilitate the work of the Committee.

The President reported on several personnel matters *in camera*.

## 6. External Appointments

### (a) University of Toronto Asset Management Corporation Board

Dr. Simpson vacated the Chair and he and Mr. Chee were not present for the discussion of this item. Ms Patten assumed the Chair.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

THAT the following individuals be approved and nominated as members and directors of the University of Toronto Asset Management Corporation for one year terms until the 2004 annual meeting of the corporation and until their successors are appointed:

Mr. Ira Gluskin (Chair)  
Mr. Joseph L. Rotman (*ex officio*, member of the Governing Council/Business Board; Vice-Chair)  
Professor Robert J. Birgeneau (*ex officio*)  
Ms Sheila Brown (*ex officio*)  
Mr. Felix P. Chee (President of the Corporation, *pro tem*)  
Professor Eric Kirzner  
Dr. Anthony R. Melman  
Mr. James J. Mossman  
Ms Andrea Rosen  
Dr. Thomas H. Simpson

THE COMMITTEE MOVED INTO CLOSED SESSION.

## 7. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council

### (a) Arising from Report Number 118 of the Academic Board (April 10, 2003)

#### (i) School of Graduate Studies: Proposal for a New Master of International Trade in Forest Products (M.I.T.F.P.) Program

Professor Cummins reported that this was a proposal for a professional master's degree, taken over a 16-month period, and targeted at individuals with strong professional experience in high level positions in government or industry. It would be a self-funded program.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED

to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation

THAT the new Master of International Trade in Forest Products (M.I.T.F.P.) program, as described in the submission from the School of Graduate Studies, dated February 10, 2003, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 118 of Academic Board as Appendix "A", effective January 2004, be approved.

7. **Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council (cont'd)**

(a) **Arising from Report Number 118 of the Academic Board (April 10, 2003) (cont'd)**

(ii) **University of Toronto at Scarborough: Discontinuation of 15-Credit B.A./B.Sc. Program**

Professor Cummins recalled that the 15-credit B.A. and B.Sc. programs on the St. George and UTM campuses had been discontinued. UTSC now proposed to do the same. The Planning and Budget Committee had noted that demand for the program continued to decline dramatically and that there would be no resource implications. The Committee on Academic Policy and Programs had

discussed the academic reasons for discontinuation, citing the need for a 20-credit program to give the breadth and depth of study necessary for academic excellence. Two or three members of the Board were concerned that other options be considered. A motion to refer back was defeated. The point was made that the University should have one degree format that was instantly recognizable in this area.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED

to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation

THAT the proposal for the discontinuation of the 15-credit B.A. and B.Sc. degrees, as described in the University of Toronto at Scarborough submission, dated February 26, 2003, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 118 of Academic Board as Appendix "B", be approved, effective for students registering at the University of Toronto at Scarborough in the Summer of 2004.

(iii) **Capital Project: Project Planning Report - Faculty of Arts and Science, Economics Building**

Professor Cummins noted that this project had been proposed in response to an urgent need for faculty and graduate student space as well as classroom space. The project was presented in two phases. Funding for the first phase was already in hand and fund-raising for the second was under way. Designing the project would proceed immediately and the decision to proceed with one or two phases, depending on availability of funding, would be made in December 2004.

A member asked whether the project would proceed if all the funds were not available. Professor Neuman said that the project had been designed in two separate phases. Phase 2 would not proceed until all the funding was on hand. The project would be considered for execution by the Business Board in the normal manner.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED

to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation

1. THAT the project planning report for the Department of Economics, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 118 of Academic Board as Appendix "E", be approved in principle. The project

**7. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council (cont'd)****(a) Arising from Report Number 118 of the Academic Board (April 10, 2003) (cont'd)**

has two phases and the initial design will incorporate both phases in the design stage. The two phases will only be constructed concurrently if all funding is secured; presently only the funding for phase 1 has been defined.

2. THAT the project scope of 1880 nasm of new space and 450 nasm renovated space be approved at an estimated total project cost of \$14,300,000 (May 2004), with funding as follows:

(i) Financing of a mortgage in the amount of \$6,000,000 to be repaid over a 25 year amortization period at 8% per annum by the Faculty of Arts and Science to coincide with needs of the project. This contribution will address the first phase of the project.

(ii) \$8.3 million to be raised from external sources by the Faculty of Arts and Science for the second phase of the project. The second phase of the project will only proceed to construction once all funds are secured.

**(b) Arising from Report Number 118 of the Academic Board (April 10, 2003) and Report Number 125 of the Business Board (April 7, 2003)****(i) Budget Report, 2003-04**

Professor Cummins reported that the Provost had given an excellent presentation to the Academic Board; a copy of the presentation was attached to the Board's report. Also in the report were the highlights of the budget. There had been a very good discussion of the budget at the Academic Board. A motion to refer back had been defeated. The budget had passed with an overwhelming majority.

Professor Langille, reporting for Mr. Shalaby, noted that the Business Board was responsible for reviewing the Budget Report and advising the Governing Council whether it was a financially responsible budget. Professor Neuman had also provided a detailed presentation to the Board. The budget would be balanced, and it would bring the cumulative deficit back within the policy limit of 1.5% of revenue. This would have serious repercussions, with divisions required to reduce their budgets by 4.45%. Professor Langille commented that the budget assumptions were conservative. They included no assumption of any inflationary increase in government funding, and they recognized the highly probable need to resume employer contributions to the pension plan. The budget also included a lower payout rate from the endowment funds. A capital budget was a new addition to the Budget Report. In conclusion, he reported that the Business Board had been satisfied that the budget was prudent, and it had concurred with the recommendation of the Academic Board that the Budget Report be approved.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED

to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation

THAT the Budget Report, 2003-04, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 118 of Academic Board as Appendix "D", be approved.

It was agreed that the Provost make a full presentation of the budget to Governing Council.

## **8. Participation in Meetings via Audio or Video Conferencing**

The Chair noted that this item had been deferred from the previous two meetings. If By-Law Number 2 were to be amended before July 1, 2003 to allow participation by audio or video conferencing, the matter must be considered now in order that appropriate notice of motion for the by-law change could be provided. There were a number of options that had been proposed in the documentation, and the Chair proposed to proceed by means of straw votes.

The first option was that there be no change to current practice. At present, chairs made occasional, informal arrangements for a member to participate by audio conferencing. The member could participate in debate but was not counted in the quorum nor could the member vote. This practice required no changes to By-Law Number 2. The Chair noted that the Senior Salary Committee was an exception to the current practice in that its members sometimes met by audio conferencing and the members were considered present and voted.

Several members commented that only members present in the room for the debate, particularly for complicated issues, should be allowed to vote.

By means of a straw vote, the Committee members indicated that they supported the current practice of informal arrangements made by the chairs. No changes to the by-law would be considered at this time.

## **9. Governing Council Elections: Definition of Full-time and Part-time Undergraduate Students**

The Chair reported that the Elections Committee would be considering the definitions of full-time and part-time undergraduate students for the purposes of the Governing Council elections. At present, Governing Council used four or more full course equivalents (FCE) for the full-time definition and less than four for the part-time definition. The Faculty of Arts and Science and the University of Toronto at Mississauga had changed the definition they used, lowering the full-time definition to three FCE. The University of Toronto at Scarborough had recently moved to a trimester system, changing its definition of full and part time in the process. The Elections Committee would consider whether to make a change or stay with a modified version of the current definition. If a change was proposed, the matter would come to the final meetings of the University Affairs Board and the Governing Council.

## **10. Review of Consolidated Calendar of Business**

The Chair referred members to the updated consolidated Calendar of Business. It had been revised to show which matters had been dealt with and which were still to come. He considered it a “good report card”, tracking progress on the items of business.

## **11. Performance Measures for Governance**

The Chair noted that the information on participation at the April 3 Governing Council meeting had been placed on the table. The data showed increased participation in debate from the members of Council but there were still a large number of interventions on procedural matters. He continued to encourage members of the Governing Council to contact the Secretariat before the meetings to discuss procedural matters.

A member who was unable to attend the previous Council meeting had followed the proceedings through the web broadcast. He commented on the high quality of the debate and said that it had been very helpful to be able to follow the proceedings.

## **11. Performance Measures for Governance (cont'd)**

Several members noted that the question had been called without hearing from a number of members. The Chair confirmed that there had been three members left on the speakers' list that had not had an opportunity to address Council. It was also noted that, if during debate, a member acceded to the Chair's request to wait until others had had an opportunity to comment before moving motions, the member might not get the chance to do so. The Chair reminded members that he kept only one speakers' list and members had the opportunity to speak only once on an item, for up to five minutes.

A member noted that there was no indication in the data of the number of external speakers who had requested to speak to Governing Council. The Chair said that he had been responding to members' comments that they wished the opportunity to debate the issues and the data measured the members' participation.

## **12. Reports for Information**

Members received for information the following reports:

Report Number 118 of the Academic Board (April 10, 2003)  
Excerpt of Report Number 125 of the Business Board (April 7, 2003)  
Report Number 113 of the University Affairs Board (March 25, 2003)

There were no comments on the reports.

## **13. Date of the Next Meeting**

The Chair reminded members that the next regular meeting of the Executive Committee was scheduled for Tuesday, May 20, 2003 at 5:00 p.m.

## **14. Other Business**

### **(a) Virology and Microbiology Institute**

A member commented that Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS) would change the way the University conducted its work. It was a major source of community concern. The virus was similar to that for the common cold and it would, therefore, be difficult to produce a vaccine. He noted that the chicken flu of several years ago could have been much worse without the dedication of the Chinese authorities in containing the disease and he believed that diseases like these would likely arise on a regular basis in future. There was immense academic potential in dealing with such diseases and he proposed that the University should consider establishing, on an urgent basis, an institute of virology and microbiology. In his view, this multicultural university should respond to this trans-cultural issue. The President thanked the member and suggested that he and the member discuss the matter.

### **(b) Notice of Motion**

The Chair recalled that at the Governing Council meeting, a member had indicated the intention of raising a notice of motion concerning the continuation of the accessibility and career choice review in the Faculty of Law and the establishment of reviews for all the professional or second-entry programs, with the results to be presented in a timely manner to inform decisions on future tuition increases.

The member asked the Provost whether there were any plans to continue the accessibility and career choice study. Professor Neuman said that the University was committed to monitoring accessibility. She recalled that the Faculty of Law had collected relevant data and, for the purpose of the study, her

#### 14. Other Business (cont'd)

Office had verified the data. She said that a report was prepared annually by the Vice-Provost, Students, for presentation to the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs (AP&P), that looked at student financial aid and accessibility. Her Office was considering various enhancements to the annual report which could include data for all faculties. She was not prepared to do separate studies for all professional faculties.

With respect to career choice studies, Professor Neuman said that she could do the study for the Faculty of Law for one more year as she had committed to do at the AP&P meeting. She would collect the data on the careers chosen by the graduating class. She was not prepared to do the type of study requested by the external speakers, one that projected career choice into the future; in her opinion, such work did not constitute solid social science research. She would repeat the methodology approved by AP&P but she would not modify it because the introduction of modifications invalidated comparison of results from year to year. Decisions concerning career choice did not relate solely to tuition fees and debt levels but could be affected by a number of factors, including for example, a professor's enthusiasm for a particular field, a project undertaken during the course of study, commitment to a particular lifestyle, etc. Any study of career choice would best be conducted periodically, rather than annually. She concluded that the proposal of the notice of motion would be unbelievably work intensive.

The member indicated that she was satisfied with the proposal that Professor Farrar would look at changes to the annual report to include data on all professional faculties. With respect to the career choice study, she understood that tuition could not be isolated as a single factor affecting career choice. She recalled that the group of law deans would be undertaking a study of this area, and she proposed that the University continue one more year with the current methodology and perhaps look at the results of the law deans' study to inform future studies. She was aware that the *Tuition Fee Policy* did not refer to career choice in the matter of setting fees. Noting the important role of employers Professor Neuman suggested that the University could undertake some initiative in dealing with major law firms with respect to hiring excellent minority students.

The President said that he cared deeply about accessibility issues and that accessibility was better understood through longitudinal studies and solid data. Data showed that participation from those with family income in the lower quartile had doubled since the 1980s. Career choice issues should be addressed in connection with the responsibility of employers. Tuition freezes were not the answer since it would treat all the same, whereas student aid programs helped those who needed support. In the public interest law area, he suggested the government should put in place incentives, such as debt relief programs, that would make this area more attractive to new graduates in spite of generally low salary levels.

The member said that she was prepared to withdraw her notice of motion.

A member commented that if the Dean of the Faculty of Law had spoken at the Governing Council he would have reported that although the tuition fee this year was \$14,000, two thirds of the students did not pay that amount. Of the 181 students who enrolled in first year, 115 applied for student aid and for those the average fee paid was \$6,900. The Faculty had no statistics for those who did not apply for student aid. He noted that the Osgoode law school fees were not as high but it also did not have as good a student aid program as this University's.

A member noted his belief that there was a connection between career choice and debt level. He believed the University should move forward with a debt relief program. More should be done to inform students of the resources available to them. The President reiterated his view that the employers had a responsibility to provide debt relief programs.

**14. Other Business (cont'd)**

A member asked whether it was necessary to prepare a specific report on the Faculty of Law again this year or if the upgraded annual report would be sufficient. In the member's opinion, the matter had been well addressed and additional work was unnecessary. The Chair asked members, in view of the limited resources and time available to the Provost, whether another year of the career choice study would be appropriate especially in light of the Provost's commitment to enhancing the annual report. Professor Neuman added that the data provided by the study this year had not satisfied the skeptics who wished to incorporate qualitative or anecdotal information. A member suggested that another year of data would be helpful. Several members said that it was time to move on to more pressing issues rather than focusing efforts on this one matter. A "straw poll" on the matter was split. It was evident that a majority of members felt that the accessibility study should not be repeated in the coming year and they expressed the view emphatically. However, a number felt that the study should be continued for one more year.

A member referred the Committee to a book written by Ms Keren Brathwaite, *Access and Equity in the University: A Collection of Papers from the 30<sup>th</sup> Anniversary Conference of the Transitional Year Programme*.

**(c) Speakers**

The Chair noted that there had been no requests from external speakers. A member said that a student from a local alternative school wished to address the Council on the general topics of accessibility, equity and tuition. The Chair said that he would like more information before making a decision. Several members stressed that these matters had been fully discussed on several occasions and most recently at the April 3 meeting of the Council. They asked if anything new would be added to the discussion and whether the provision of University policies in these areas might be helpful to the potential speaker rather than granting permission to address the Council.

The meeting adjourned at 7:00 p.m.

Secretary  
April 22, 2003

Chair