

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL
REPORT NUMBER 395 OF
THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Friday, April 21, 2006

To the Governing Council,
University of Toronto.

Your Committee reports that it held a meeting on Friday, April 21, 2006 at 12:00 p.m. in the Boardroom, Simcoe Hall, with the following members present:

Ms Rose M. Patten (In the Chair)
Mr. John F. (Jack) Petch, Vice-Chair
Professor C. David Naylor,
President
Ms Holly Andrews-Taylor
Mr. P.C. Choo
The Honourable William G. Davis
Ms Susan Eng
Dr. Shari Graham Fell
Mr. Ran Goel
Professor Michael R. Marrus

Mr. Timothy Reid
Professor Arthur S. Ripstein
Mr. Robert S. Weiss

Secretariat:

Mr. Neil Dobbs
Mr. Andrew Drummond
Mr. Henry Mulhall, Secretary

Regrets:

Mr. Louis R. Charpentier (non-voting member)
Professor Barbara Sherwood Lollar

In Attendance:

Dr. Robert M. Bennett, Chair, University Affairs Board and member of the Governing Council
Professor Raymond Cummins, Chair, Academic Board and member of the Governing Council
Mr. Richard Nunn, Vice-Chair, Business Board and member of the Governing Council
Ms Catherine Riggall, Vice-President, Business Affairs
Dr. Chris Cunningham, Special Advisor to the President

On motion duly moved and seconded,

IT WAS RESOLVED

THAT, pursuant to sections 28 (e) and 33 of *By-Law Number 2*, consideration of items 1 and 2 take place *in camera*, with the Board Chairs, Vice-Presidents and Special Advisor to the President admitted to facilitate the work of the Committee.

1. Senior Appointments

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED

To the Governing Council for consideration the recommendations for senior appointments contained in the memoranda from the President dated April 20, 2006 and April 21, 2006.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

That, pursuant to Section 38 of By-Law Number 2, the recommendations for the senior appointments be considered by the Governing Council *in camera*.

2. External Appointments

(a) McLelland and Stewart Limited

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

THAT the following individuals be approved and nominated as directors of McClelland and Stewart Ltd. for one year terms until the 2007 annual meeting of the Corporation, or until their successors are appointed, effective immediately.

Dr. Avie Bennett (Chair)
Dr. John Evans
Mr. Douglas Pepper (President and Publisher)
Ms. Arlene Perly Rae
Ms Catherine Riggall

The Committee returned to closed session.

3. Report of the Previous Meeting

Report Number 394 of the Executive Committee meeting held on March 9, 2006 was approved.

4. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting

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

5. Minutes of the Governing Council Meeting

Members received for information the draft minutes of the Governing Council meeting held on March 23, 2006.

6. Business Arising from the Governing Council Meeting

There were no items of business arising from the previous meeting.

7. Report of the President**(a) External Relations (PACER)**

The President's Advisory Committee on External Relations (PACER) had completed the primary round of the search to fill the new position of Vice-President, University Relations, and negotiations were underway. It was expected that these would be completed by the end of April. If negotiations were successful with the final candidate, the proposed appointment would be brought forward to the Executive Committee for consideration, prior to its proceeding to the Governing Council.

(b) Provincial Government Relations

The President reported that the Provincial Government had in recent weeks provided some further information regarding the planned expansion of graduate studies at the province's universities. It now appeared that the University would receive funding for approximately the number of new graduate places that it had proposed to create in its submission to the Government. However, the Government had introduced a target ratio of master's to doctoral students of approximately 4:1, whereas the current ratio at the University was approximately 2:1. Further, the Government intended to introduce the expansion of graduate places very rapidly before the 2007-08 academic year, rather than phasing in the expansion more gradually. It had initially appeared that the proposed 4:1 target would be very difficult to achieve given the pool of available applicants. However, it now appeared that University would be able to 'convert' many of its master's level places into doctoral places. The net result would be that the University could potentially end up being allotted approximately the same number of new graduate places that it had originally proposed to create. However, meeting the accelerated expansion targets would be a major challenge. With respect to the capital plan to support the graduate expansion, much less detail had been provided by the Government. Similarly, it was not yet known whether the Ontario Graduate Scholarship program would be enhanced. This made the University's planning process more difficult, but nonetheless, it was moving forward. Further, the University and other institutions from the Council of Ontario Universities (COU) were in constant communication with the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities in order to receive greater clarity on these issues and to forewarn about the problems inherent in the accelerated targets.

(c) Federal Government Relations

The President noted that constructive relationships and effective dialogue were being established with members of the federal government and civil service. Events were planned in the weeks ahead for University officials to meet with members of these groups, as well as alumni based in the Ottawa area. He thanked the Chancellor for her facilitation in this regard. The President was pleased that a strong commitment to the support of higher education was in evidence in a number of federal ministries and offices.

(d) Hong Kong / Singapore Trip

The President reported that he, the Chancellor, Interim Vice-President Frankle, and other members of the senior administration had had a very successful trip the previous week to Hong Kong, Singapore and Shanghai. Receptions had been held in each of these cities, and the highlight of the trip had been a ceremony in Hong Kong to celebrate the convocation for over 90 recent graduates of the University who were based in the region. The President noted that his brief visit had made readily apparent the degree to which the governments of the countries he had visited were investing in education, innovation, technology, and the knowledge economy. Canada, along with its leading teaching and research institutions like the University, would need to do likewise to remain competitive on a global scale.

7. Report of the President (cont'd)**(e) Maclean's**

The President reported that 8-10 executive heads of Canadian universities, rather than just the four (including himself) reported in the media, had decided not to continue to participate in *Maclean's* magazine's annual survey of recently graduated students. The university presidents had serious concerns about the scientific validity of the survey, based on the low response rates used in the past, and the lack of rigorous analysis carried out on the data. There was also growing dissatisfaction with *Maclean's* annual spring rankings of Canadian universities. Despite the fact that the University had been ranked Number 1 among Canadian universities with medical schools and Ph.D. programs for the last 12 years, this positive result was not as meaningful as it might appear to be. By conflating consideration of graduate and undergraduate education to produce a single ranking for the University, the exercise had, for example, masked the fact that there was an urgent need to enhance the undergraduate student experience in some of the University's largest programs. The National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) had made this apparent, whereas the *Maclean's* survey had not.

(f) Discussion

A member asked if it was likely, in the process of implementing the planned expansion of graduate studies, that the differing views of the University and the Provincial Government with respect to the definition of a master's versus a doctoral student were likely to be reconciled. The President responded that he was hopeful that the University's position regarding the status of direct entry doctoral students would be accepted by the Government, and that funding would be made available for graduate places of this type from the 30% pool of funds that had been held back. The hold back had been made possible by the 4:1 Masters-to-Ph.D. ratio in the first allocation. He noted that the University of Western Ontario had advocated a very similar position on this issue. Professor Dan Lang of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto (OISE/UT) had also been working one day per week on this and related files on the University's behalf.

A member asked what metrics would be used to ensure that academic standards were maintained as graduate enrolment was increased in coming years. The President responded that the Provincial Government was concerned first and foremost that there be adequate capacity in the university system to accommodate members of the 'double cohort' who would be entering graduate studies in the next few years. However, the Minister had specifically elected to recognize excellence in the 30% hold back on the graduate funding envelope, and had gone so far as to suggest that a capacity building component to the hold back was not fixed in size, and would not necessarily advantage primarily-undergraduate universities. Rather, it would go to exciting new programs, whether in traditional graduate-intensive institutions like the University of Toronto, or in other institutions with a much higher ratio of undergraduates to graduates. The University was committed to maintaining its academic standards, and, given the increased size of the applicant pool, would not need to sacrifice excellence in order to fill graduate places. Rather, the President was more concerned that adequate financial support would be forthcoming to fund the necessary expansion of graduate studies.

In response to a question regarding general developments in post-secondary education in the province, the President noted that two strategic issues of growing importance were the division of government support between the university and college sectors, and the question of how best to develop partnerships between individual colleges and universities. A member added that the increasing tendency for colleges to be allowed to grant degrees was, at times, creating the impression that they were in direct competition with universities.

7. Report of the President (cont'd)**(f) Discussion** (cont'd)

A member asked if corporate sponsorships would be used to help secure adequate funding for the new Varsity Centre. The President responded that if such a proposal were to be brought forward that involved an official naming, it would be carefully considered on its merits by the Governing Council as required by the University's *Policy on Naming*. The University had accepted gifts from corporations in the past in support of, for example, professorial chairs and capital projects, and had been careful not to compromise its reputation.

8. Items for Confirmation by the Executive Committee

(Arising from Report Number 142 of the Academic Board [March 30, 2006])

Item 14 – Constitution: School of Graduate Studies

Professor Cummins reported that the revisions to the Constitution of the School of Graduate Studies had been required as a result of the changes to graduate education governance and to the administration of the School of Graduate Studies. There had been no discussion of this item at the Academic Board.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE CONFIRMED THE DECISION OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD

THAT the Constitution of the School of Graduate Studies, as revised on February 28, 2006, be approved.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 142 of the Academic Board as Appendix 'J'.

9. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to Governing Council

*(a) Arising from Report Number 142 of the Academic Board (March 30, 2006)
and from Report Number 148 of the Business Board (March 27, 2006)*

Item 3 (c) – Tuition Fee Schedule for Publicly Funded Programs, 2006-07 and, for Special Programs, 2007-08

Mr. Nunn reported that the Business Board had considered the proposal for tuition-fee increases in the light of four very important factors. First, the Board had been briefed on the University's Budget Report for 2006-07 which called for severe expense-containment measures, requiring a 5% base-budget reduction for the year. No one welcomed tuition-fee increases, but without any increase, the expense-containment for the next year would be 8%, with a further 1.5% one-time-only reduction. The outcome would be devastating to the quality of education. If the increase were limited to 2%, the budget would require a 6% expense-containment plus a 1.5% one-time-only reduction.

Second, the Business Board had reviewed the enrolment report which had indicated that the University's enrolment was strong, the quality of its entering class remained very high, and the yield rate on offers of admission continued to improve. In addition, international enrolment had continued to increase to 9.5% of the total student body. The University was not pricing itself out of the market.

9. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to Governing Council (cont'd)***(a) Arising from Report Number 142 of the Academic Board (March 30, 2006) and from Report Number 148 of the Business Board (March 27, 2006) (cont'd)******Item 3 (c) – Tuition Fee Schedule for Publicly Funded Programs, 2006-07 and, for Special Programs, 2007-08 (cont'd)***

Third, the University was not pricing out students with limited financial means. The Report of the Vice-Provost, Students on Student Financial Support had indicated that the University was spending nearly \$46-million on need-based aid, as well as \$143-million on graduate student funding. Students from lower income families, visible minorities and other traditionally under-represented groups had maintained or improved their share of the University's enrolment.

Fourth, the Ontario Government had mandated new limits on tuition-fee increases to which the proposed fee schedule had adhered. For 96% of students, fees would increase either by 4% (all continuing students and graduate students) or by 4.5% (most entering students, apart from high-cost professional programs). The annual dollar cost in 62% of cases would be under \$200 per year, and under \$300 for a further 26%. Students in Engineering, Law, Dentistry and the M.B.A. program would have increases of 6% or 8%. Because of generous government support, fees in Medicine would increase by only 2%. All of these increased followed a two-year tuition fee freeze. For international students (who generated no Government funding), the new tuition fee schedule had been posted a year in advance to give applicants full notice. Fees for 2006-07 were to increase by 5% over the current year. In a few programs, including Commerce and Computer Science, students paid the regular Arts and Science fee in first year, but higher fees beginning in second year. In order to give students proper notice, the fees in those programs for 2007-08 were also being presented for approval.

A member asked if any decision had been made to expand the University's annual *Performance Indicators Report* in future years to include additional information regarding accessibility to the University. The President responded that the annual report of the Vice-Provost, Students on Student Financial Support already provided a number of metrics which addressed this issue. What was lacking, however, and was very difficult to obtain, were reliable data on parental household income. Estimates of household income would likely have to be made using Statistics Canada neighbourhood proxies ie. the postal code cross-linked to median household income by Forward Sortation Area. The University was willing to undertake such an analysis and include it in the *Performance Indicators Report*. The development of more detailed accessibility metrics would also be of use in the University's ongoing negotiations with the Provincial Government regarding the implementation of its recently announced Student Access Guarantee.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation

THAT the "Tuition-Fee Schedule For Publicly Funded Programs, 2006-07," a copy of which is attached to Report Number 148 of the Business Board as Attachment "A" be approved, including: the tuition fees for domestic students for 2006-07 contained in Table 1 of Appendix "B", the tuition fees for domestic students in special programs for 2006-07 and 2007-08 contained in table 2 of Appendix "B", and the tuition fees for international students for 2006-07 contained in Appendix "C".

9. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to Governing Council (cont'd)

(a) Arising from Report Number 142 of the Academic Board (March 30, 2006) and from Report Number 148 of the Business Board (March 27, 2006) (cont'd)

Item 3 (d) – Tuition Fee Schedule for Self-Funded Programs, 2006-07

Mr. Nunn reminded members that self-funded programs received no government funding, and their fees were set to recover their costs, at least their direct costs.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation

THAT the proposed tuition-fee schedule for self-funded programs for 2006-07, which is Table 1 of Attachment “B” to Report Number 148 of the Business Board, be approved.

Item 5 – Budget Report, 2006-07

Professor Cummins reported that the Provost had given a PowerPoint presentation of the highlights of the Budget Report at the Academic Board meeting on March 30, 2006, which had been followed by a thorough question and answer session. Members were referred to pages 7 and 8 of Report Number 142 of the Academic Board for a summary of that discussion.

Mr. Nunn reported that the Business Board was responsible for advising the Governing Council on the financial prudence of the Budget Report. It needed to satisfy itself that the budget, as part of the longer term budget framework, would allow the University to manage its deficit. The University had to be able to bring the deficit back to 1.5% of operating revenue by the end of the planning period on April 30, 2010. It also had to bring in a balanced annual budget at that time. The Board, finally, had to be satisfied that the budget assumptions were realistic, and that the level of risk was prudent. The Board had also received a full presentation of the Budget Report from Professor Goel. In addition, it had received the President’s assessment of the budget. While the 5% reduction would be onerous, divisions had had time to plan for it and would be able to achieve it. While details concerning one element of revenue, funding for graduate expansion, were still to be received from the Provincial Government, the President was confident that that matter would not be sufficient to place the budgetary framework in question. Following its discussion, the Business Board had voted to concur 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 for 2006-07” dated March 13, 2006, including the revisions to the long-range budget assumptions and the Contractual Obligation and Policy Commitments list, be approved.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 142 of the Academic Board as Appendix “A”.

9. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to Governing Council (cont'd)

(b) Arising from Report Number 142 of the Academic Board (March 30, 2006)

Item 6 – Academic Initiative Fund (AIF) Allocations - Round 3

Professor Cummins reported that members of the Academic Board had been referred to Report Number 107 of the Planning and Budget Committee for highlights of the recommended allocations, and a summary of the questions that had been raised. No questions had been raised at the Board.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation

THAT the Third Round of the Academic Initiative Fund be allocated as per the table (Appendices 2 & 3) attached to the Memorandum from the Vice-President and Provost dated March 3, 2006, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 142 of the Academic Board as Appendix “B”.

Item 7 – Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto: Concurrent Teacher Education Program

Professor Cummins reported that members of the Academic Board had been informed that the Concurrent Teacher Education Program (CTEP) would be a collaborative partnership of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto (OISE/UT) with the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM), the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC), the Faculties of Music and Physical Education and Health, and two federated universities, the University of St. Michael's College and Victoria University. There had been strong support for the program at both the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs and the Planning and Budget Committee. There had been no discussion of the program at the Academic Board.

Noting that the program would begin during the 2007-08 academic year, a member asked if it would only be accessible to those entering first year that year, or if upper year students would also be eligible. The President responded that this would be a first-entry program for most of the divisional partners, but that entry from second year would be possible at UTM and UTSC.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation

THAT the Concurrent Teacher Education Program (CTEP), as described in the documentation dated February 3, 2006 and attached to Report Number 142 of the Academic Board as Appendix ‘C’, be offered at the University of Toronto, subject to approval of the University Faculties involved, and pending OISE/UT initial accreditation of CTEP by the Ontario College of Teachers and effective for the academic year 2007-2008.

9. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to Governing Council (cont'd)***(b) Arising from Report Number 142 of the Academic Board (March 30, 2006) (cont'd)******Item 8 – Affiliation Agreement between the Governing Council of the University of Toronto and the University of Toronto Schools, July 1, 2006 to June 30, 2021***

Professor Cummins reported that the Academic Board had been informed that the interim agreement was being extended for a two-month period to allow the proposed affiliation agreement to begin on July 1, 2006, the beginning of the fiscal year of University of Toronto Schools (UTS). The proposed affiliation agreement was intended to provide financial support when it was needed; to establish UTS on a financial model that clarified the actual operating costs of the school and provided explicit subsidies and an operating line of credit; and to set a repayment schedule that was reasonable and would encourage the school to achieve financial self-sufficiency. The recommendation had been passed unanimously at the Planning and Budget Committee, and no questions had been raised by members of the Academic Board. Mr. Nunn added that the Business Board had also reviewed the proposed agreement carefully, and it had concurred with the recommendation of the Academic Board. Subject to Governing Council approval, it had also approved the termination of UTS' being designated as an ancillary operation of the University.

A member asked if the intention of the agreement was that UTS would remain affiliated with the University until at least 2021. The President responded that the agreement was intended to establish a long-term relationship with UTS similar to that which the University had with its teaching hospitals, and in the process, UTS would acquire governance autonomy and financial independence. The member asked for clarification regarding plans for redevelopment of the site currently occupied by UTS. The President responded that the ideal outcome would be a joint redevelopment of this valuable site to include new facilities for UTS and OISE/UT, as well as a commercial and/or residential development.

A member noted that the *Affiliation Agreement* would grant legal autonomy to UTS, and that it would be important to ensure that communications by all parties to the agreement made this apparent, rather than giving the impression that little had changed in the relationship between these two institutions.

A member congratulated the administration for having negotiated an outstanding resolution to what had been a challenging issue for many years. He expressed the hope that the affiliation of these two fine institutions would continue for many years to come.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation

1. THAT the Interim Agreement between the University and the University of Toronto Schools (UTS) be extended from April 30, 2006 to June 30, 2006;
2. THAT the Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity be given authority to execute an Affiliation Agreement between the Governing Council of the University of Toronto and the University of Toronto Schools, for the period July 1, 2006 to June 30, 2021, that is essentially in accordance with the principles and terms outlined in the Term Sheet (Appendix 1), a copy of which is attached to Report Number 142 of the Academic Board as Appendix "D".

9. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to Governing Council (cont'd)***(b) Arising from Report Number 142 of the Academic Board (March 30, 2006) (cont'd)****Item 9 – Capital Project: Energy Efficiency Project on Lighting Retrofit and Chiller Replacement, St. George Campus: Project Planning Report*

Professor Cummins reported that members of the Academic Board had been informed that the proposed project would reduce energy use, energy costs and the demand on the University's near-capacity electrical distribution system. There had been no discussion at the Board. Mr. Nunn reported that, prior to considering this project, the Business Board had received a full and helpful presentation on the University's utilities infrastructure and on plans for its renewal. Subject to Governing Council approval of the project, the Business Board had approved its execution.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation

That the Project Planning Report for the St. George Campus Cooling Infrastructure Upgrade and Major Lighting Retrofit Project, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 142 of the Academic Board as Appendix "E", be approved in principle at an estimated total project cost of \$19.87 million, with sources of funding as follows:

NRCan grant	\$ 0.25-million
Toronto Hydro grant	0.68-million
Facilities Renewal funds	2.00-million
Interest-free loan from the City of Toronto Better Buildings Partnership to be repaid by the operating budget from energy savings	2.74-million
Debt financing to be repaid by the operating budget from energy savings	14.20-million

Item 10 – Capital Project: University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC) Infrastructure Upgrades Phase V: Project Planning Report

Professor Cummins reported that the Academic Board had been informed that the construction of several new buildings at UTSC had resulted in the identification of several potentially critical conditions and deficiencies in the existing electrical and mechanical infrastructure. The original projected total cost of \$17.351 million had been reduced to \$15.255 million, because Phase 5C had made Phase 6 unnecessary. The motion had passed unanimously at the Board. Mr. Nunn reported that the Business Board had also reviewed this project, and the next two on the agenda, and had approved their execution, subject to Governing Council approval.

9. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to Governing Council (cont'd)***(b) Arising from Report Number 142 of the Academic Board (March 30, 2006) (cont'd)****Item 10 – Capital Project: University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC) Infrastructure Upgrades Phase V: Project Planning Report (cont'd)*

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation

THAT the Project Planning Report for the Electrical and Mechanical Infrastructure Upgrades at the University of Toronto at Scarborough, Phase 5, comprising the replacement of the existing electronic controls for the two existing boilers, the replacement of the existing 200 kW diesel generator, and the replacement of the 6 existing PCB transformers, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 142 of the Academic Board as Appendix “F”, be approved in principle at an estimated total project cost of \$4.530 million, with the sources of funding as follows:

Funding for the new UTSC Science Building provided by the UTSC operating budget	\$ 3.785-million
Enrolment Growth Fund	.320-million
Deferred Maintenance Funds	.425-million

Item 11 – Capital Project: University of Toronto at Scarborough: East Arrival Court: Project Planning Report

Professor Cummins reported that, as a result of intensive development at UTSC in recent years, the conditions of pedestrian pathways, the east parking lots, open space and roadways had deteriorated, creating unsafe conditions. The East Arrival Court would provide a new entrance to the campus from Military Trail. The parking area would be re-organized to provide twenty-one barrier free spaces for patrons with disabilities and increased visitor parking capacity. The motion had passed unanimously at the Academic Board.

A member expressed concern about the risk of injury that could exist as a result of the "unsafe conditions" cited in the documentation, and the consequent liability of the University and of members of the Governing Council. He asked for assurances that all appropriate steps had been taken to ensure safety pending the completion of the project. If such steps were unnecessary, he suggested that the wording of the documentation be revised appropriately. Professor Cummins undertook to look into the question.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation

9. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to Governing Council (cont'd)***(b) Arising from Report Number 142 of the Academic Board (March 30, 2006) (cont'd)****Item 11 – Capital Project: University of Toronto at Scarborough: East Arrival Court: Project Planning Report (cont'd)*

THAT the Project Planning Report for the East Arrival Court at the University of Toronto at Scarborough, at an estimated total project cost of \$3,112,642, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 142 of the Academic Board as Appendix “G”, be approved in principle, with the sources of funding as follows:

Cash allocation from carry-forward	
Funds in the UTSC operating Budget	\$ 232,763
Capital investment by the	
UTSC ancillary operations budget	249,961
Debt financing to be provided by the	
UTSC operating budget and repaid	
by the UTSC ancillary operations budget	2,629,918

Item 12 – Capital Project: University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC) New Science Building: Change in Scope

Professor Cummins reported that in June 2005, the Project Planning Report for the UTSC Science Building had been approved in principle, with a \$3 million cash allocation to be used for the completion of detailed planning through to the concept design and detailed costing. A new proposal was being presented to increase the space program to approximately 3000 net assignable square metres (nasm) from the originally approved 2543 nasm. This would increase the cost of the new building by approximately \$1.59 million.

A member asked if the fact that internal sources of funding were being used to finance this project indicated that fund-raising efforts for the new building had been unsuccessful to date. The President responded that a major CFI grant application had been made, which, if successful, would substantially offset the cost of the building. The building also remained a fund-raising priority for UTSC. The member asked if fund-raising efforts were equally successful at UTSC and UTM compared to those on the St. George campus. The President responded that philanthropic activity on the suburban campuses was lower on a per student basis, but was increasing.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation

1. THAT the February 2006 revisions change in scope for the Science Building at UTSC, approximately 2982 nasm and 6041 gross increasing the total project cost to \$33,089,000, be approved in principle.
2. THAT the additional sources of funding identified below be approved:
 - a. An allocation of \$10,089,000 from the UTSC operating budget;
 - b. Debt of \$20 million to be repaid by UTSC from its operating budget.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 142 of the Academic Board as Appendix “H”.

9. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to Governing Council (cont'd)

(b) Arising from Report Number 142 of the Academic Board (March 30, 2006) (cont'd)

Item 13 – Policy on Official Correspondence with Students

Professor Cummins reported that the Academic Board had been informed that the purpose of this new *Policy* was to specify students' responsibilities with respect to both postal mail and electronic communications. After considerable discussion, wording in the third paragraph of the *Policy* had been revised to include a phrase concerning a standard of service for student email accounts.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation

THAT the proposed *Policy on Official Correspondence with Students*, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 142 of the Academic Board as Appendix "I", be approved, effective September 1, 2006.

Item 15 – Committee on Academic Policy and Programs: Terms of Reference

Professor Cummins reported that the change to the Terms of Reference of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs (AP&P) had been proposed in the interest of streamlining the governance process for graduate programs, and reflected the changes in the revised School of Graduate Studies Constitution.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation

Subject to approval of amendments to the Statute of the School of Graduate Studies (i) to devolve certain responsibilities for graduate education to the Faculties and other divisions offering graduate degree programs, and (ii) to identify the School of Graduate Studies Council as the Graduate Education Council,

(a) THAT, effective July 1, 2006, section 4.1 of the Terms of Reference of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs be amended to add the following second paragraph:

Proposals from divisional councils to approve changes to admission requirements to graduate programs, and to approve the establishment of direct admission options for existing PhD programs, may be approved by the Graduate Education Council.

(b) THAT, effective July 1, 2006, the "Committee on Academic Policy and Programs: Guidelines Regarding levels of Approval" be amended to add the following statement in the row entitled "Admission policies" in the column headed "Received by AP&P for information"

9. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to Governing Council (cont'd)***(b) Arising from Report Number 142 of the Academic Board (March 30, 2006) (cont'd)****Item 15 – Committee on Academic Policy and Programs: Terms of Reference (cont'd)*

Changes to admission requirements for graduate programs and approval of direct entry options to existing PhD programs, as approved by the Graduate Education Council, are included in an annual report of changes to graduate programs submitted to the Committee for information

(c) THAT, effective July 1, 2006, section 3 of the Terms of Reference of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs, Function, be amended to replace the following third and fifth paragraphs:

The Committee is responsible for reviewing and, at times, approving, changes to admission and program regulations, curriculum, degree requirements and academic regulations. Much of the Committee's work concerning curriculum and regulations arises from deliberations of divisional councils. The Committee will not normally amend such a proposal forwarded by a divisional council unless the amendment(s) is (are) deemed by the Chair or the senior Presidential assessor to be minor. Rather, a proposal requiring amendment will be referred back to the divisional council.

In order to carry out its mandate, the Committee receives for its consideration proposals from the academic divisions of the University which have been approved by the relevant divisional councils. Proposals may be accepted, rejected, or referred back to the originating body by the Committee. If accepted by the Committee, the proposal may be received for information, approved by the Committee, or recommended to the Academic Board for approval, depending on the nature of the proposal.

With a new third paragraph as follows:

The Committee is responsible for reviewing and, at times, approving, changes to admission and program regulations, curriculum, degree requirements and academic regulations. Much of the Committee's work in those areas arises from proposals from the academic divisions, which have been approved by the relevant divisional councils. The Committee will not normally amend proposals forwarded by a divisional council unless the amendment(s) is/are deemed by the Chair or the senior Presidential assessor to be minor. Such proposals may be accepted, rejected, or referred back to the divisional council. If accepted by the Committee, the proposal may be received for information, approved by the Committee, or recommended to the Academic Board for approval, depending on the nature of the proposal.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 142 of the Academic Board as Appendix 'K'.

10. Reports for Information

Members received five reports for information.

- (a) Report Number 142 of the Academic Board (March 30, 2006)
- (b) Report Number 147 of the Business Board (February 27, 2006)
- (c) Report Number 148 of the Business Board (March 27, 2006)
- (d) Report Number 133 of the University Affairs Board (February 14, 2006)
- (e) Report Number 134 of the University Affairs Board (March 21, 2006)

11. Date of the Next Meeting

Members were reminded that the next regular meeting of the Executive Committee was scheduled for Thursday, May 11, 2006 at 5:00 p.m.

12. Other Business

The Chair reported that one speaking request to address the Governing Council at its meeting on May 1, 2006 had been received. Ms Jen Hassum, the incoming Chairperson of SAC, the Students' Administrative Council, had asked to speak on the issue of tuition fees. It was determined that the request would be granted.

There was no other business.

The meeting adjourned at 1:40 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

May 1, 2006