

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

Wednesday, May 20, 2009

MINUTES OF THE GOVERNING COUNCIL meeting held on Wednesday, May 20, 2009 at 4:30 p.m. in the Council Chamber, University of Toronto at Mississauga.

Present:

Mr. John F. (Jack) Petch (In the Chair)
Dr. Alice Dong, Vice-Chair
Professor C. David Naylor, President
Professor Varouj Aivazian
Ms Diana A. R. Alli
Mr. P.C. Choo
Professor Brian Corman
Dr. Claude S. Davis
Mr. Ken Davy
Ms Judith Goldring
Mr. Grant Gonzales
Professor William Gough
Ms Shirley Hoy
Professor Ronald H. Kluger
Professor Louise Lemieux-Charles
Mr. Joseph Mapa
Professor Cheryl Misak
Mr. Gary P. Mooney
Mr. Richard Nunn
Professor Ian Orchard
Mr. Jeff Peters
Professor Doug W. Reeve
Mr. Timothy Reid
Professor Arthur S. Ripstein
Mr. Stephen C. Smith
Professor Elizabeth M. Smyth
Ms Maureen J. Somerville
Mr. Olivier Sorin
Mr. John David Stewart
Ms B. Elizabeth Vosburgh

Mr. Louis R. Charpentier, Secretary of
the Governing Council

Secretariat:

Mr. Neil Dobbs
Mr. Henry T. Mulhall

Absent:

Mr. David Asper
Mr. Ryan Matthew Campbell
Ms Susan Eng
Mr. David Ford
Dr. Gerald Halbert
Professor Ellen Hodnett
Dr. Joel A. Kirsh
Mr. Joseph Koo
Dr. Stefan Mathias Larson
Professor Michael R. Marrus
Mr. Geoffrey Matus
Ms Florence Minz
Mr. George E. Myhal
Miss Anna Okorokov
The Honourable David R. Peterson
Ms Melinda Rogers
Ms Rita Tsang
Dr. Sarita Verma
Mr. Larry Wasser
Mr. W. David Wilson

In Attendance:

Mr. Andrew Agnew-Iler, Member-Elect of the Governing Council
Mr. William Crothers, Member-Elect of the Governing Council
Ms Joeita Gupta, Member-Elect of the Governing Council
Ms Margaret Kim, Member-Elect of the Governing Council

In Attendance (Cont'd)

Mr. W. John Switzer, Member-Elect of the Governing Council
Mr. Gregory West, Member-Elect of the Governing Council
Ms Murphy Browne, Former Member of the Governing Council
Ms Oriel Varga, Former Member of the Governing Council
Ms Catherine Riggall, Vice-President, Business Affairs
Professor Edith Hillan, Vice-Provost, Academic
Dr. Tim McTiernan, Assistant Vice-President, Research, and Executive Director of the Innovations Group
Ms Christina Sass-Kortsak, Assistant Vice-President, Human Resources
Ms Elizabeth Sisam, Assistant Vice-President, Campus and Facilities Planning
Mr. Rob Steiner, Assistant Vice-President, Strategic Communications
Professor Safwat Zaky, Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget
Professor Gage Averill, Vice-Principal and Dean, University of Toronto at Mississauga
Mr. Adam Awad, Vice-President, University Affairs, Students' Administrative Council operating as the University of Toronto Students' Union
Ms Diane Crocker, Registrar, University of Toronto at Mississauga
Mr. Jim Delaney, Director, Office of the Vice-Provost, Students
Mr. Paul Donoghue, Chief Administrative Officer, University of Toronto at Mississauga
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
Dr. Anthony Gray, Special Advisor to the President
Ms Sandra Hudson, President, Students' Administrative Council, operating as the University of Toronto Students' Union
Professor Ulrich J. Krull, Vice-Principal, Research, University of Toronto at Mississauga
Dr. Glenn Loney, Assistant Dean, Faculty Registrar and Secretary, Faculty of Arts and Science
Professor Scott Mabury, Chair, Department of Chemistry, Faculty of Arts and Science
Ms Bryn MacPherson, Director, Office of the President and University Events
Ms Mary Ann Mavrinac, Chief Librarian, University of Toronto at Mississauga
Mr. Chris McGrath, Assistant Dean, Student Affairs, University of Toronto at Mississauga
Ms Penny Millen, Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students
Mr. Steve Moate, Senior Legal Counsel, Office of the President
Mr. Dale Mullings, Director of Student Housing, University of Toronto at Mississauga
Mr. Anton Neschadim, University Affairs Commissioner, Graduate Students' Union
Mr. Gavin Nowlan, President, Arts and Science Student Union
Mr. Mark Overton, Dean of Student Affairs, University of Toronto at Mississauga
Ms Vanessa Parlette, Social Sciences Divisional Steward, Canadian Union of Public Employees (CUPE) Local 3902
Ms Shahnur Saiyad, graduate student, University of Toronto at Mississauga
Mr. Andrew Stelmacovich, Executive Director, Advancement, University of Toronto at Mississauga
Ms Laurie Stephens, Director, Media Relations
Ms Jane Stirling, Director, Marketing and Communications, University of Toronto at Mississauga
Ms Karel Swift, University Registrar
Ms Mae-Yu Tan, Assistant Secretary of the Governing Council
Professor Anthony K. P. Wensley, Chair, Erindale College Council
Ms Tracey Wilson, undergraduate student, University of Toronto at Mississauga

IN ACCORDANCE WITH A DETERMINATION BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE PURSUANT TO SECTION 38 OF BY-LAW NUMBER 2, ITEMS 12, 13 AND 14 WERE CONSIDERED BY THE GOVERNING COUNCIL *IN CAMERA*.

1. Chair's Remarks

The Chair welcomed members and guests to the meeting at the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM). He expressed his pleasure at being at UTM, particularly at this time of expansion and renewal. Observing that the agenda contained a controversial item, he stressed that the Council's Rules of Order were designed to support the orderly transaction of business, enable respectful debate among members, and ensure that all members' views could be heard and presented fairly and openly. It was his duty as Chair to maintain an environment in which that would occur. Members and guests also had a duty to ensure that those intentions were respected, and that meetings were conducted with courtesy and mutual respect.

The Chair noted that four speaking requests had been granted to the following individuals: Mr. Adam Awad, Vice-President, University Affairs, Students' Administrative Council, operating as the University of Toronto Students' Union (UTSU); Mr. Anton Neschadim, University Affairs Commissioner of the Graduate Students' Union (G.S.U.); Ms Joeita Gupta, Vice-President, External of the Association of Part-Time Undergraduate Students (APUS); and Mr. Gavin Nowlan, President of the Arts and Science Student Union (ASSU). The guests would be invited to speak for a maximum of three minutes each to the Faculty of Arts and Science proposal to assess full-time student tuition fees by program. In light of the full agenda and the number of speaking requests received, the Executive Committee had agreed that while the representatives of the student governments be invited to speak, the three other groups be invited instead to provide written submissions. Those other groups were: the United Steelworkers of America, Local 1998, the Toronto Adult Student Association, and the Canadian Union of Public Employees (CUPE), Local 3902. Copies of the submission of CUPE Local 3902 had been placed on the table along with other submissions received by e-mail.

In the course of the Chair's remarks, a member asked that any member(s) of the Campus Community Police who were present identify themselves. The Chair ruled the member's request out of order. Pursuant to section 49 of By-Law Number 2, the member appealed the Chair's ruling. There being no seconder, the appeal failed.

In the course of the Chair's remarks, a member asked if he could make a motion that empty seats in the Council Chamber be made available to the students who were waiting to enter. The meeting should be an open and democratic one, and every student who wished to attend should be permitted to do so. The Chair replied that all remaining seats had been reserved for particular individuals, and they would be held for a limited further time. If those seats were not then taken, persons waiting to enter would be permitted to be seated on a first come – first served basis.

2. Vice-President and Principal's Remarks

The Chair thanked Professor Orchard and other members of the University of Toronto at Mississauga for hosting the Governing Council meeting. He invited Professor Orchard to introduce the senior UTM colleagues in attendance and to address the Governing Council.

After the introductions, Professor Orchard said that there had been enormous growth and development of the campus over the past nine years or more as the result of the efforts of the faculty, staff and students who formed the UTM community. There were currently about

2. Vice-President and Principal's Remarks (Cont'd)

11,000 students registered at UTM, both undergraduate and graduate students, which made UTM larger than five of Ontario's universities. UTM had become the College of choice for many secondary school students. In the current recruitment cycle, there had been 10,600 applications to UTM, including 2,100 applications where students had made UTM their first choice. The entering admission average of those students offered admission had been 83.5%. The university-age populations in the Peel and Halton Regions were projected to grow by 26% and 17% respectively, and UTM planned to grow to about 15,000 students, which would bring it to the same size as such Ontario universities as Queen's, Brock and Windsor. The emphasis in that growth, as reported in the *Towards 2030* synthesis document, was on undergraduate and graduate student growth. The emphasis in graduate growth was on professional master's degree programs as well as Ph.D. stream programs. To achieve that growth, UTM would have to recruit additional outstanding faculty and staff along with students. It would also have to provide additional space, and it was aiming to construct at least six new buildings. UTM planned to bring to the Governing Council over the next year a new campus master plan and plans for three new buildings. The first was a new Health Sciences Complex to accommodate the new Academy of Medicine. The second was a major Instructional Centre, for which funding had been requested from the Federal and Ontario governments through their infrastructure programs. The third was the proposed Science Complex, which had been presented to the Province as part of the University's capital request. Professor Orchard said that UTM was clearly a dynamic campus. It did aim to grow, but it aimed primarily to create an environment for the success of its members. Only if the individual members of the UTM succeeded would UTM as a whole succeed.

3. Minutes of the Previous Meeting of April 16, 2009

The minutes of the meeting of April 16, 2009 were approved.

4. Business Arising from the Minutes of the Previous Meeting

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

5. Report of the President

(a) First Year Experience Programs at UTM

The President invited Ms Shahnur Saiyad, Master of Biotechnology student, and Ms Tracey Wilson, fourth-year undergraduate student in Art and Art History, to give a presentation on the First-Year Experience Programs at UTM. He noted that the rezONE and utmONE programs assisted new students with their transition to university life.

Ms Saiyad and Ms Wilson said that the rezONE program and utmONE programs used peer educational models. The programs were delivered by students for students – something that made them unique. In most comparable programs, the delivery was led by faculty and staff members. The rezONE program reached over 700 first-year students living in residence. It had assisted over 3,000 students over the past five years. It was available to all first-year students living in residence. It began at the time of orientation and lasted throughout the academic year. The utmONE program was a comparable program offered to first-year commuter students, and

5. Report of the President (Cont'd)

(a) First Year Experience Programs at UTM (Cont'd)

it was planned to expand the program over the next few years to include all such students. In response to a question, it was noted that about 75 commuter students had participated in the utmONE program in the past year.

The rezONE program was delivered by peer academic leaders or PALs. All residence assignments were based on students' academic disciplines, and each rezONE community of about 25 students had a PAL who was a successful upper year residence student in that discipline with a cumulative grade point average of 3.0 or higher. That focus on the students' academic disciplines almost automatically created a learning community in which students could support each other and become more involved in their academic work. Seminars were scheduled on a weekly basis, dealing with such topics as: academic integrity, health and wellness, equity and diversity, library and research skills, and career exploration. The seminars were scheduled at the time of year when they would be most helpful. In addition rezONE provided about 150 Facilitated Study Sessions during the year, well received events in which students could work with others in learning and reflecting on course material. rezONE students also had the opportunity to participate in a Capstone Project related to their program, in which they would work as a team on a project. They would initially engage a Capstone Champion, a faculty or staff member or alumna/us working in the field to act as a project advisor. Ms Saiyad and Ms Wilson provided two examples. In one case, a group made and sold their own bubble tea, and they invested the proceeds in a small business operated by a third-world entrepreneur. A second example: students in forensic sciences wrote and performed their own murder mystery, inviting a Professor to play a role.

Ms Saiyad and Ms Wilson said that the impact of the programs had been measured, using tools developed by the program leaders specifically for the purpose. They included seminar evaluations and focus groups. The outcomes had been used to modify and improve the program. They had found that participants on average completed four courses per year, compared with 3.5 courses completed by non-participants. The grade point averages of participants were higher than the UTM student population in general. That positive impact had been consistent over the past two years. The program had also helped the PALs to develop their own leadership skills.

Several members complimented Ms Saiyad and Ms Wilson on the programs and on measuring their outcomes. They, along with Mr. Dale Mullings, Director of Student Housing, at UTM, responded to a number of questions.

(b) Awards and Honours

The President drew members' attention to the list of faculty, student and staff awards and honours that accompanied their agenda packages. While he always found it difficult to select from among the extraordinary recipients of awards and honours, he did highlight awards to four faculty members and two students. Professor Ernest Weinrib of the Faculty of Law had been awarded one of five Killam Prizes in recognition of his scholarly achievement throughout his career. Professor Douglas Stephan of Chemistry had received one of the nine Killam

5. Report of the President (Cont'd)

(a) Awards and Honours (Cont'd)

Research Fellowships, which were awarded across Canada, for his work in inorganic and organometallic chemistry, with a focus on applied research solutions. Professor Ray Jayawardhana of Astronomy and Professor Brendan Frey of the Edward S. Rogers Sr. Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering had been awarded two of the six Steacie Fellowships awarded nationally. The University's male and female athletes of the year had continued the achievements they had demonstrated throughout their careers at the University. Mr. Colin Russell had been named the Canadian Interuniversity Sport (C.I.S.) male swimmer of the year. Ms Megan Brown had once again been the Ontario and C.I.S. cross-country running champion.

(c) Advocacy Activities

The University was very pleased with the establishment of the Vanier Scholarships, which were highly prestigious awards for graduate students. The University's students had been recipients of substantially more than the University's notional share of those awards.

The University was actively seeking government aid in dealing with its infrastructure shortfall on all three campuses. The Governing Council would receive later on the agenda proposals for approval of three projects that had been submitted for funding to enable the University to move very quickly to complete the projects if they were successful in winning funding.

The University was continuing to press the Province with respect to Quality Enhancement Funding. The objective was to have that funding built into the base support provided. The Province had been very helpful recently in providing such funding during a very difficult period, but it had been provided on a one-time basis. In the meanwhile the University had continued to build up its number of underfunded or unfunded students, while the per-student grants were prorated or not provided. The stopgap funding had therefore resulted in a mismatch of resources and needs.

The University would also continue to press for the refreshing of the level of support provided through student aid programs – something that was clearly needed.

Members of the Governing Council would be familiar with the situation of the Federal research-granting councils. While the recent Federal budget had contained some very welcome investments in research and development, the basic budgets of the granting councils had been reduced. The University was concerned that at least the previous level of funding be restored, particularly in the light of the actions of the U.S. government to enhance its funding of basic research. The outcome was a real risk of a loss to the U.S. of some of Canada's leading researchers.

5. Report of the President (Cont'd)

(d) University of Toronto Asset Management Corporation

The President reported that the University was drawing up terms of reference for a review of the University of Toronto Asset Management Corporation. That would follow upon a previous review conducted approximately two years ago by Adjunct Professor Keith Ambachtsheer.

(e) Convocations

The President reminded the Council that the spring convocations would begin on Wednesday, June 3. Members of the Governing Council were very welcome to participate in those ceremonies, joining the academic procession and sitting on stage. The President acknowledged the extraordinary work of the Chancellor, the Honourable David Peterson, who had to date not missed a convocation ceremony.

6. Items for Governing Council Approval

(a) Tuition Fees: Faculty of Arts and Science, St. George Campus – Assessment of Full-time Tuition Fees by Program

The Chair said that a revised agenda, containing an amended motion for the program-fee proposal, had been distributed electronically to members on Thursday, May 14th, and copies had been made available at the door. At its meeting of May 12, the Executive Committee had decided to amend the motion in order to make explicit the administration's intention to monitor and report on the impact of the proposed program fee.

At this point, the status of the remaining empty chairs was queried. The Chair said that the matter was being monitored and the chairs filled with those who had reserved them or by those waiting outside the room. Another member expressed his disagreement, stating that in an open and democratic University any visitors should be permitted to enter the room and, if necessary to stand.

Mr. Nunn said that the Business Board recommended approval of the proposal that the tuition fee for full-time students in the Faculty of Arts and Science on the St. George Campus be a single program fee rather than a per-course fee. The practice was a common one, both in many programs at this University and elsewhere in Ontario. It would be introduced gradually. Current full-time students would be able to pay fees on the current basis for their enrolment in the next four years. The program fee for new students would be monitored carefully. The Faculty of Arts and Science Council and the Vice-President and Provost would observe the implementation of the fee, and there would be updates provided to the Governing Council during the implementation phase. The arrangement would be adjusted if required. The Business Board had engaged in a very good and extensive debate on the matter, receiving excellent presentations from the major student groups and from the Faculty Association. The report of that discussion had been distributed electronically to members and copies had been placed on the table for the meeting. The majority of the Board was, at the conclusion of the debate, convinced that the proposal was appropriate. Extra financial aid would be available for full-time students who would need it to

6. Items for Governing Council Approval (Cont'd)**(a) Tuition Fees: Faculty of Arts and Science, St. George Campus – Assessment of Full-time Tuition Fees by Program (Cont'd)**

take a full course load. The program fee was used elsewhere, with no negative effect on academic engagement or extra-curricular involvement. Both program quality and faculty workload would benefit from the additional faculty hiring enabled by the financial benefits of the proposal.

It was duly moved and seconded,

Subject to the understanding that there will be regular review and scrutiny of the model, with regular reporting to the Arts and Science Council and to the Vice-President and Provost, with updates to the Governing Council during the implementation phase, and adjustments as required,

THAT the proposal to charge tuition fees for full-time Arts and Science students on the St. George Campus on the basis of a program fee instead of a per-course fee be approved.

The Chair invited the Vice-President and Provost and the Dean of Arts and Science to provide further background. Professor Misak emphasized that the proposal was not a radical one. On the contrary assessing full-time student fees by program was very common, with half the universities in Ontario doing so and with many other programs of the University of Toronto doing so. Keeping that fact in mind was very important to see the proposal in its proper perspective. There were a number of very good reasons to assess fees in that manner. First, it would encourage students not to think of courses as piecemeal commodities that were purchased singly but rather to think of a year's studies as a stable, coherent whole. Second, it would encourage full-time students to complete their programs in the usual four years. That would be of considerable economic benefit to them. More important, it would also benefit them in connection with any applications to graduate and professional programs, where admission committees did take into account whether or not applicants had managed a normal course load. Third, approval of the proposal would lead to an increase in revenue for the Faculty of Arts and Science, which was one of the finest such faculties anywhere. The Faculty was currently an outlier in the manner in which it assessed fees. The absence of the incremental revenue that would be generated by the program-fee model had impeded its efforts to offer more in-depth first-year transitional experience programs, such as that described earlier in the meeting, which programs in fact assisted students in mastering the normal course load. An increase in revenue would enable the Faculty to provide, in general, an even better education than it now did. Fourth, with the current assessment of fees on a per-course basis, full-time students who registered for the normal course load subsidized other full-time students who took less than a normal load. That was the case because there were certain fixed costs for each full-time student. Fifth, the assessment of full-time student fees on a program basis would likely lead to a situation where there was less "shopping around" for courses. Students at present could register for as many as six or even seven courses and then drop some of them to a load less than the normal load before the deadline for so doing. The outcome, however, was that other students were left on waiting lists and were then too late to register for the courses when finally the shoppers dropped their extra courses.

6. Items for Governing Council Approval (Cont'd)**(a) Tuition Fees: Faculty of Arts and Science, St. George Campus – Assessment of Full-time Tuition Fees by Program (Cont'd)**

Professor Misak said that she, like other members, had received a substantial number of e-mail messages opposing the proposal. She wished to clear up a number of misconceptions that were prominent beliefs in those messages. First, current full-time students would not be affected. Second, part-time students would not be affected. Their fees would continue to be assessed on a per-course basis. Third, accessibility for persons with disabilities would not be affected. Any student with a special need, who could not for that reason complete the normal course load each year, and who registered with the Accessibility Services office, would be exempted from the program fee. Fourth, accessibility for students with financial need would not be affected. The University of Toronto placed a very high value on the guarantee, contained in its Policy on Student Financial Support, that “no student offered admission to a program at the University of Toronto should be unable to enter or complete the program due to lack of financial means.” The University’s position had been made abundantly clear in the recent budget which, despite severe financial constraints, preserved the large amount of money budgeted for need-based student aid as one of the University’s highest priorities. The University had also set aside an additional amount, of at least \$1.5-million, to ensure that needy full-time students would not be prevented from entering the University and completing their programs because of the assessment of the proposed standard program fee. Fifth, current applicants to the Faculty would be able to take into account the proposed new manner of assessing fees in making their decision about which university to attend. Students were not required to respond to their offers of admission until May 28. If the proposal was approved, an e-mail message would be sent to all applicants to alert them – if they were not already aware owing to media coverage - of the different model that would be used to assess full-time student fees. They would, therefore, be able to take that factor into account in making their decision.

Professor Misak noted that many of the opponents of the proposal had urged that the University take more time to make its decision on the matter. In fact, the Faculty of Arts and Science had been considering the matter for some ten years. The *Towards 2030* Task Force on Resources had recommended that the Faculty look seriously at the program-fee model. There was a great deal of data and evidence available about the effect of the program-fee model. For example, the University of Western Ontario and the University of Guelph used the program-fee model without adverse outcomes on student engagement. The best evidence was, however, available at the University of Toronto, where students in such first-entry programs as Music, Physical Education, and Engineering were assessed fees on a program basis, as were students in the Commerce and Computer Science program in the Faculty of Arts and Science. In all of those programs, there were very high levels of student engagement, retention and graduation. Professor Misak had consulted with the relevant Deans and had been advised that there had been no expressions of concern or unwanted outcomes arising from the program-fee model. The evidence in favour of the model was, therefore, clear.

Dean Gertler outlined the Faculty of Arts and Science’s plans for the use of the anticipated incremental revenue that was expected from implementation of the program-fee model. Foremost, the Faculty planned to use the anticipated additional revenue to reinvest in enriching

6. Items for Governing Council Approval (Cont'd)**(a) Tuition Fees: Faculty of Arts and Science, St. George Campus – Assessment of Full-time Tuition Fees by Program (Cont'd)**

the learning experience of its undergraduate students. First, a significant portion of the incremental income would be reserved for additional financial aid to ensure that the access of full-time students to the Faculty was not impeded by the new tuition-fee model. Second, the Faculty would establish more small-group learning experiences. They would include more tutorial sections, an expansion of the first-year learning community program, and the addition of more courses with smaller class size. The Faculty knew that such small-group experiences had a dramatic positive impact on the learning of undergraduate students. The improvements would also mean the hiring of more teaching assistants, which would be of benefit to the Faculty's graduate students. Third, the Faculty would be able to hire more faculty members to help to move the faculty/student ratio in the right direction and to reverse some of the erosion that had taken place in recent years. Fourth, the Faculty would provide additional opportunities for international experiences – something that was becoming increasingly important to many undergraduate students. Fifth, the Faculty would be able to increase research-opportunity courses. The Faculty was well aware from the results of the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) that many students very much wanted the opportunity to participate in research projects, working with leading scientists and scholars in many disciplines in the Faculty. Sixth, the Faculty hoped to be able to increase its support of a variety of different initiatives through the Dean's Initiatives Fund. Each year that Fund received many applications from students for funding to organize conferences, symposia and workshops. While a number of highly successful events had been sponsored, many others worthy of support could not be funded for reason of lack of resources. Seventh, the Faculty would use the incremental funding to assist with curriculum renewal. A number of initiatives had been proposed by Departments. Again, some had been funded and had been very successful, but others that were entirely worthy of support had not been aided because of a lack of resources. Eighth, the Faculty hoped to be able to increase its support to students in the area of writing and communications skills, areas that had been a focus in recent years. Ninth, the Faculty hoped to provide its students with more opportunities for experiential learning – something that was regarded by many students as highly desirable.

Professor Gertler said that while those initiatives were the foremost objective of the faculty in seeking to earn extra funds from the program-fee model, it was also important to acknowledge that the incremental funds would assist the Faculty in dealing with its current financial situation and would help to place the Faculty on a more stable and sustainable financial basis. It was well known that the Faculty currently had a significant structural deficit, and the proposal would help to close the gap between its annual revenue and its annual expense. That would be of benefit to all members of the Faculty. As a result of the financial pressures over the past few years, the Faculty had been forced to reduce the operating budgets of its Departments by some \$14-million per year out of about \$180-million. Continuing with the status quo would require a further reduction of about \$7-million. Therefore, the consequence of inaction would be very serious. That having been said, Professor Gertler stressed that the primary goal of seeking additional funding was to make a reinvestment in improving the quality of the learning experience of the Faculty's undergraduate students.

6. Items for Governing Council Approval (Cont'd)**(a) Tuition Fees: Faculty of Arts and Science, St. George Campus – Assessment of Full-time Tuition Fees by Program (Cont'd)**

A member stressed that the proposal related to a Faculty of over 25,000 students, representing about half of the enrolment on the St. George Campus. The proposal did, therefore represent a major, material issue for the University. The member noted that the proposal would be implemented in two phases. In the first phase, students (registering in 2009-10 and thereafter) who registered in four courses or more would be regarded as full time and required to pay the program fee. In the second phase, beginning in 2011-12, students registered in three courses or more would be regarded as full time and required to pay the program fee. The member urged that there be a full evaluation of the impact of the change in the first phase before proceeding to the second, and that Governing Council approval be sought before proceeding to the second phase in 2011-12. The motion before Council stated that there would be “regular review and scrutiny of the model.” The member was concerned that the provision was not sufficiently specific. Rather, the Council should require a comprehensive, in-depth evaluation of the impact of the proposed model on the student body. For example, the University should know the differences between the 3,500 students registered for three courses per year compared to the 1,500 students registered for more than the normal load of five courses. Was it the case that many students taking only three courses had significantly lower family incomes and had to work part-time, or that they had to spend a great deal of time commuting to campus, or that they had a disability that prevented their taking the normal full-time course load? The member noted a paradox in the proposal. With the implementation of the second phase in 2011-12, students taking three courses would pay the fee for the usual five course load. However, students taking more than five courses would also pay that same fee. Therefore, students taking only three courses would in effect be subsidizing those who took more than five. That represented a serious equity issue – the creation of winners and losers within the student body. In addition, there would be a loss of about \$1-million per year of revenue that could be used to hire more faculty members and teaching assistants. The member urged that an additional fee be applied to students who registered for more than five courses, at least until the completion of the review prior to any implementation of the second phase of the proposal in 2011-12.

It was duly moved and seconded

THAT the first clause of the motion be amended to read,

Subject to the understanding that prior to 2011-12 an evaluation of the impact of the model be done by the Arts and Science Council, in consultation with the Vice President and Provost, and reported to Governing Council to enable consideration of revision of the implementation plan, if such is required,

The Council proceeded with substantial discussion both on the motion to amend and on the main motion. Early in the discussion, a member asked whether it was in order for the Governing Council to amend a proposal that had been approved in its original form by a divisional council and that had been recommended by the Business Board. Would it not be more appropriate to consider a motion to refer the matter back? Professor Misak said that in her view

6. Items for Governing Council Approval (Cont'd)**(a) Tuition Fees: Faculty of Arts and Science, St. George Campus – Assessment of Full-time Tuition Fees by Program (Cont'd)**

the proposed amendment of the “subject to . . .” clause was very similar in its intention and effect to the original “subject to . . .” clause in the main motion before Council, and the University’s administration would be prepared to accept the amendment. Another member asked whether the University of Toronto would be unique in defining a full-time students as, and charging a full-time student program fee to, students taking 3.0 courses or 60% of the usual full load. Professor Misak replied that other universities that used the program-fee model defined full-time students as those taking 3.5 or 4.0 courses, compared to the proposed University of Toronto definition of 3.0 after 2011-12. It was for that reason that the amendment proposed to subject the Faculty of Arts and Science proposal to special scrutiny. She noted that the definition of full-time students used by the Canada Revenue Agency for income tax purposes was 3.0 as was the definition used by the Ontario Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities.

The vote was taken on the motion to amend the main motion, and the motion was CARRIED. A member asked that his opposition to the motion be noted.

In the course of discussion, there were a number of questions for clarification and other points were raised by members relevant to the proposal.

(i) Rationale for the earlier abandonment of the program fee. A member noted that some thirty or forty years ago, all students were required to pay a program fee, but that arrangement had been abandoned in favour of a per-course charge. He asked why that change had been made and whether the rationale for that change remained in effect. A member, who had been a student at the time, replied that the program fee had been applied because all full-time students at the time were required to register for the full course load for the year, and failure to meet an appropriate academic standard meant that students were required to repeat the entire year’s work. The per-course fee was implemented when full-time students in the Arts and Science divisions were no longer required to register for a full year’s program and were permitted to register in fewer courses than the normal load.

(ii) Use of anticipated additional revenue. A member noted that Dean Gertler had advised the Council that additional revenue would be used, among other things, to engage additional faculty. While that would be an entirely appropriate thing to do, it should also be remembered that the outcome of approval of the proposal would be the need to appoint additional administrative staff members such as admission and financial aid counsellors.

Another member observed that it was proposed that a significant part of the anticipated additional revenue be used to deal with the Faculty’s accumulated debt, which now stood at \$40-million and which had been growing at a rate of about \$5-million per year. However, another part of that revenue was to be used to hire additional faculty. The member cited Government of Ontario figures, which showed that the number of University employees earning \$100,000 or more per year had grown by 45% over the past ten years, including 10% for the past year alone. While the member recognized that it was important to pay such salaries to attract and retain the best faculty,

6. Items for Governing Council Approval (Cont'd)**(a) Tuition Fees: Faculty of Arts and Science, St. George Campus – Assessment of Full-time Tuition Fees by Program (Cont'd)**

the use of additional funding to hire additional faculty and to pay their annual salary increases would not enable the Faculty to deal with its debt; instead, it would likely prove to be a vicious circle, sinking the Faculty even further into debt. Its business model was, in his view, broken. Rather than seeking extra tuition fee revenue by the proposed fee model, having students bear the cost of increased salaries, the Faculty should reduce its costs. Instead of raising its salary obligations, the Faculty should spend more on purposes that would benefit students, making them feel like more integral parts of the University. The University might, for example, provide athletic scholarships to attract first-class athletes and rally students around the University's sports teams, or it might improve its technology infrastructure to provide students with an improved e-mail service.

Another member observed that the Faculty had been clear on potential uses of anticipated additional revenue. However, he noted that there had been no discussion of the budget reductions that would take place if the proposal did not succeed in achieving additional funding.

(iii) Government funding for students taking a low course load but defined by the University as full-time and paying the program fee. A member asked about the outcome in terms of Government funding for students defined as full-time, and paying fees as full-time, who were registered for only 3.0 courses.

(iv) Definition of full-time students in other Faculties. A member asked about the cut-off for the definition of full-time studies in other Faculties at the University of Toronto. It was his understanding that the cut-off in the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering, for example, was 4.0 courses.

(v) Outcome in the event of a general reduction of course load. A member observed that it was possible or even likely that a large proportion of the 3,000 students who currently registered for 3.0 or 3.5 courses would reduce rather than increase their course load to 2.5 to avoid having to pay the program fee, which would be equivalent to the fee for 5.0 courses. Did the University have in place sufficient resources to provide financial assistance to the larger number of part-time students who would require it? Was the University prepared to deal financially with the outcome of a reduction rather than an increase in course load?

(vi) Option of a positive financial incentive for students to take the normal full load. A member, observing that the University offered funding packages to attract the best possible graduate students, proposed consideration of a positive financial incentive for undergraduate students who completed their programs in the usual four years. Rather than imposing a program fee, seeking to force students who could not realistically do so to take a full course load, the University might offer an incentive rebate of a small but significant part of students' tuition fee payments for students who did complete their program in four years.

(vii) Current distribution of course loads. A member asked, in order to understand better the consequences of the proposal, to know the current distribution of course loads in the Faculty of

6. Items for Governing Council Approval (Cont'd)**(a) Tuition Fees: Faculty of Arts and Science, St. George Campus – Assessment of Full-time Tuition Fees by Program (Cont'd)**

Arts and Science. Another member cited the following distribution for the current year: 1,546 students were registered in 3.0 courses, 1,914 for 3.5 courses, 4,264 for 4.0 courses, 4,331 for 4.5 courses, 8,002 for 5.0 courses, 1,410 for either 5.5 or 6.0 courses, and 64 students for more than 6 courses.

(viii) Effect on the student experience. A member noted that proponents of the proposal had argued that charging a fee for registration in a program had worked very well in the professional faculties such as Applied Science and Engineering. In those Faculties, however, an entire structure had been developed to ensure the quality of the student experience outside of the classroom. Interaction among students was encouraged by administrative officers and by such means as intramural teams. Would there be a similar infrastructure put into place for the Departments of the Faculty of Arts and Science to ensure a strong co-curricular experience for students?

In the course of Council's discussion, several matters were raised in favour of the proposal. They included the following.

(i) Economic advantage to students of completing a full course load. A member expressed sympathy for the case against the proposal, but he stressed that students who took less than the full course load would require more time to complete their degree programs and would, in so doing, incur the far greater cost of living for that additional time. While some students might choose to register for a course load that was less than the normal load in order to seek a competitive advantage by devoting more time to each course and earning a better grade in each, the only students who could in fact afford to do so would be those who had the financial resources to extend their studies beyond the usual four years. The only benefit of a system that financially enabled students to proceed to their degrees more slowly would accrue to precisely those students who were best off economically and could afford the slower pace.

(ii) Decision-making and governance process. A member said that members of the Governing Council had two key responsibilities in considering proposals. The first was to be satisfied that the process for considering the proposal had been proper. In this case, concerns had been expressed that the expedited process had been too hasty. The member observed that such a concern was atypical. In almost all other cases, the Governing Council system was criticized for being too slow to reach a decision. In this case, the appropriate steps had been taken. There had been a thought process taking place over nearly a decade. There had been a substantial amount of consultation. The matter had been considered by the Council of the Faculty of Arts and Science. While a question had been raised about the procedures related to that Council's action, and while that question would receive the attention of the courts, the courts would likely look to the Governing Council decision for guidance, and the Council should proceed to debate the matter fully and to make its decision. The matter had received full and fair consideration in the Council's Business Board, which had recommended its approval. While there had been a change in the "subject to" clause of the motion, the effect of the change was minor. It did not affect the

6. Items for Governing Council Approval (Cont'd)**(a) Tuition Fees: Faculty of Arts and Science, St. George Campus – Assessment of Full-time Tuition Fees by Program (Cont'd)**

substance of the proposal, and it made implementation of the proposal easier to evaluate on a step-by-step basis. The substance of the proposal had not changed. Therefore, the member concluded that he was satisfied that his first criterion had been met.

(iii) Consistency with the University's mission. The member said that the second key criterion members should use in considering proposals was their consistency with the University's mission statement. The element that stood out in the mission statement in his perception was the goal of "equal opportunity, equity and justice." – objectives to which all members would subscribe. While it was very difficult in any situation to achieve those goals absolutely, he was satisfied that the proposal before Council would be generally consistent with those objectives. It was important to remember that, given the University's fixed costs associated with a student's registration in any full-time course load, the current system was not fully equitable. While the member was sympathetic to students who wished to reduce their course loads slightly for reasons of child-care responsibilities, he was satisfied that equality of opportunity and justice would not be eroded by replacement of the current system with the proposed one.

(iv) Student aid. A member said that the proposal should be assessed by members on its merits from the point of view of achieving and allocating resources for the University and its students. The question of student aid was a very important one, but a separate one that should be addressed separately to ensure that the University was meeting the guarantee contained in the Policy on Student Financial Support. Another member said that she had observed substantial fee increases over many years, but the University, while increasing fees for all students, had always guaranteed and provided financial aid to those students who clearly required it. That student aid guarantee would continue indefinitely, ensuring that no student in need would be unable to enter or complete an academic program for financial reasons.

In the course of Council's discussion, several matters were raised in opposition to the proposal. They included the following.

(i) Inappropriate view of the educational process. A member said that the stress on students' graduating and joining the workforce as soon as possible inappropriately implied that the Faculty of Arts and Science should be seen as little more than a factory, turning out a product.

(ii) Inadequate study of the effects of the proposal. A member noted that the average course enrolment in the Faculty of Arts and Science was only 4.5 courses, compared to the normal load of five. However, there had been no studies completed to determine the reason(s) for that fact. There had been no studies correlating course load with extra-curricular involvement, with time required for commuting, or with grade point averages achieved. While the Provost had stated that the idea of a program fee had been under consideration for ten years, there were still no answers concerning the reasons for students' taking less than the normal course load. The member was, therefore, not convinced that the proposal was right for students. Another member expressed the same view, wondering why no action had been taken when a structural deficit had been building

6. Items for Governing Council Approval (Cont'd)**(a) Tuition Fees: Faculty of Arts and Science, St. George Campus – Assessment of Full-time Tuition Fees by Program (Cont'd)**

up for ten years. A third member, characterizing the proposal as coming forward at “warp speed,” said that while the proposal may have been under consideration for ten years by the leadership of the Faculty of Arts and Science, there had been very limited time for broader consideration of the proposal and of alternatives. While he well understood the financial problems arising from the current economic situation and the long term Provincial Government underfunding, it was inappropriate to proceed without a fuller, broad discussion.

(iii) Definition of a full-time student. A member observed that a part of the rationale for the proposal was that it was common in other Universities. However, in no other University was the definition of full-time set so low as would this University’s definition beginning in 2011-12, at three courses or 60% of the normal full load.

(iv) Fairness of the proposal. A member, describing the proposal as absurd, said that it was like expecting a customer to buy three loaves of bread for the price of five. The proposal represented little other than looking at students as a source of cash. Rather than doing so, the University should put student needs first. Students registered for 3 or 3.5 courses were and would continue to be part-time students, notwithstanding the University’s definition. They were often parents or people from a minority community who could not for entirely understandable reasons register for a higher course load.

Another member noted that a general tuition fee increase to solve the Faculty’s financial problems would have a broad effect. This particular proposal would seek a solution to the Faculty’s financial problems by targeting a particular group of students, those taking between 3.5, 4.0 and 4.5 courses. That was not an equitable way of proceeding.

(v) Inappropriate model for Arts and Science fees. A member noted that proponents of the proposal cited other Faculties within the University such as Music or Physical Education and Health, which charged fees on a program basis. Those Faculties offered highly specialized programs where full-time students had to proceed as a cohort through similar patterns of courses each year. In the case of Arts and Science, however, there was a wide variety of programs and course types, and because of this diversity it was academically appropriate that students proceed through their programs at different paces. It was therefore not wise to use financial means to promote a uniform course load.

(vi) Notice to new students. A member said that eight days’ notice of the new fee model would be inadequate for new students who had planned to register for 4 or 4.5 courses. Such students would not have the time to earn the additional money required to cover their increased tuition fees. A member subsequently questioned whether potential new student and their parents were in fact aware of the proposed program fee with its resulting financial implications.

(vii) Damage to the goal of achieving excellence. A member was concerned about students who under the previous model would have registered for 4.0 or 4.5 courses for reason of family responsibility or financial hardship. They would now have a financial incentive to register for the

6. Items for Governing Council Approval (Cont'd)**(a) Tuition Fees: Faculty of Arts and Science, St. George Campus – Assessment of Full-time Tuition Fees by Program (Cont'd)**

full load for which they would pay fees, and they would not have the opportunity to pursue excellence in their studies. Similarly, students would have the incentive to take more courses than the normal load. Again, such students would not have the opportunity to achieve excellence in each of their courses, and they would clearly not have the opportunity to get the most out of their extra-curricular student experience.

(viii) Effect on applications to graduate programs. A member expressed doubt that a student who took less than the usual full load for justifiable reasons, such as family or economic needs, would be penalized in their applications for graduate studies. Graduate programs, in the light of special circumstances, would surely take into account the level of excellence achieved by such students rather than the rate at which it was received.

(ix) Economic consequences to students. A member appreciated the plan to use some of the revenue anticipated to flow from the adoption of the new model for purposes of student aid, but he was concerned that some poorer students would still need time to work part-time to support themselves. Even some students from middle-income families would not receive family support and would need to work part-time to pay for their educational costs. It was very common for highly active students, such as student athletes, to take a reduced course load in order to enable them both to succeed in their studies and to pursue their co-curricular interests. It was clear that students broadly shared this concern, as evidenced by the large number of e-mail communications from current students opposing this proposal, even though such students would not be personally affected.

The Chair invited Professor Misak to respond to the questions and the other matters raised by members in discussion. Professor Misak said she would deal first with the major questions that had been raised. She stressed, first, that student financial need would be met. Students who were in circumstances such that they could afford to meet the program fee, should meet it. But, many, many students in financial need would take advantage of the University's very strong need-based financial support program. An amount of \$90-million had been spent on student support in the current year, and that amount would be maintained and enhanced for 2009-10 to deal with any additional need arising from the program-fee model. Second, obtaining an education was not like buying loaves of bread. Education was not a commodity. Rather, it was a personal and a social good. Graduates of course would on the whole be more successful as a result of their education, but society also benefited from having a well educated citizenry. Were education to be merely a commodity, students would be required to pay the full cost, which would amount to something like \$40,000 per year. That was the case for students who attended private universities in the United States. Fees at the University of Toronto, however, were at the median of those levied by Canadian universities and were far below the median in a North American context. The per-course fee model, which encouraged students to regard an education as a commodity, was for that reason a wrong-headed model.

6. Items for Governing Council Approval (Cont'd)**(a) Tuition Fees: Faculty of Arts and Science, St. George Campus – Assessment of Full-time Tuition Fees by Program (Cont'd)**

Professor Misak then dealt with other matters that had been raised. First, it had been suggested that the funding model of the Faculty of Arts and Science was broken. If that were the case, one of the reasons would be the Faculty's not having used the program fee model, as did Faculties of Arts and Science at many other universities. The University of Toronto was becoming an outlier in not using the program-fee model; it was in the third wave of universities moving to adopt that model. The economics of University funding were such that there would no doubt be a fourth wave. The economic facts were not a manifestation of the current recession; rather the problems were on-going structural ones that forced the universities to do everything possible to use all available sources of government and tuition-fee revenue. In response to a member's query, Professor Misak said that the University did anticipate that government funding would increase as the result of the proposed change. While the Governing Council had repeatedly debated how it might encourage the Government to increase its per-student funding, the increment of government funding likely to arise from the program fee was now being "left on the table." Second, it had been said that incremental revenue would be used up in high faculty salaries. The fact was that the University had been successful in attracting outstanding faculty members to teach its students, and if it did not provide competitive salaries, it would lose those faculty members, and students would have a lesser education as a result. Third, it had been suggested that the use of the program fee model elsewhere in the University did not serve as an appropriate exemplar for the use of such a fee in the Faculty of Arts and Science because the other Faculties offered highly specialized programs. Many other Faculties of Arts and Science used the program fee model with considerable success. Fourth, it had been suggested that the use of the program fee model would reduce the level of student engagement in co-curricular activities. It was, however, very clear that participation in such activities was notably high in such divisions as Physical Education and Health, and Applied Science and Engineering, which assessed a standard program fee. While the University had seen no diminution of student engagement as a result of the fee model, the administration had committed the University to monitoring the effects of the proposed change very carefully. A reduction of student engagement in their academic activities or in their co-curricular activities, or an increase in students' financial problems in completing their education, were the last outcomes the University wished, and if those outcomes did appear, adjustments to the proposal would be made.

The Chair invited Mr. Adam Awad, Vice-President, University Affairs of the Students' Administrative Council (which operates as the University of Toronto Students' Union) to address the Governing Council. Mr. Awad prefaced his remarks by stating his concern about the presence of the Campus Community Police, who were not permitting students to enter the corridor leading to the Council Chamber and an adjacent classroom unless they were members of the class or had been admitted to the Governing Council meeting. Mr. Awad noted first that the proponents of the proposal had cited other universities that used a program-fee model. However, those universities included the University of Guelph, which had cut eight departments in the current year. Clearly that did not provide evidence of financial stability. Similarly, Brock University, which also used a program fee, had reinstated course fees for students taking six or more courses. It was important to be aware that less than one third of universities in Ontario charged a flat program fee

6. Items for Governing Council Approval (Cont'd)**(a) Tuition Fees: Faculty of Arts and Science, St. George Campus – Assessment of Full-time Tuition Fees by Program (Cont'd)**

for their Arts and Science students. Second, proponents had pointed out that other Faculties in the University of Toronto, such as Music, Physical Education or Engineering, used the program-fee model, and their students had not complained of it. However, it would be important to know how many potential students had decided that they could not accept offers of admission from those Faculties because of the program-fee model. Those Faculties were small and offered specialized programs, and their curricula often recognized that extra-curricular involvement formed an important part of students' undergraduate training. There was no such recognition in the Faculty of Arts and Science. Third, The Vice-President and Provost had cited higher education as a social good. That being the case, it was wrong to make higher education less accessible to students, who would for financial reasons be unable to take the time to become engaged with their course material and then to give back to society. Mr. Awad said that more than one half of the students currently registered in the Faculty, which was the largest Arts and Science Faculty in Canada, registered in fewer than five courses. The proposal would disadvantage more than half of its students. There was no guarantee that the additional funding anticipated from the adoption of the proposal would in fact be received and there was no budget for its use. The proposal would systematically discriminate against disabled students, part-time students and students who were forced to work to meet their costs. It was therefore an inappropriate policy that should be defeated. That was shown by the expressions of support from many alumni and others who said that they would not make donations to the University if the proposal were adopted.

The Chair invited Mr. Anton Neschadim, University Affairs Commissioner of the Graduate Students' Union (G.S.U.), to address the Governing Council. He said that the membership of the G.S.U. was in general opposed to the proposal. It was being forwarded in a hasty manner. It did not appear to provide sustainable additional revenue in the long term. To the best of students' knowledge, no alternative pricing models had been investigated. Moreover, there had been no dialogue with the people most affected – students taking 3.0 or 3.5 courses per year. The G.S.U. was concerned that the proposal could lead to the significant shrinkage of summer-course enrolment and hence appointments for teaching assistants during the summer. The proposal represented price discrimination against certain economically disadvantaged groups, limiting their accessibility to the University. Fees charged would become disproportionate to the services provided. There was a risk that the proposal would single out certain less popular programs, which would as a result be discontinued. While some students might gain financially as a result of the model, graduating one year earlier, many students would likely reduce their course load to a part-time one to avoid the program fee and to work under less stress, perhaps completing their degrees while working full-time. The outcome would be both the absence of financial gain for the University from the program fee and discrimination against students who were in effect forced to work full-time to earn the money needed to complete their degrees. While the G.S.U. recognized that the University had to achieve a higher amount of government funding, it should not do so by marginalizing particular groups of students. The G.S.U. proposed investigation of a proper marketing strategy to increase course enrolment over the long term by students who could afford to take more courses without discriminating against other students who were not as well off. For example, the University might reduce fees for registration in course

6. Items for Governing Council Approval (Cont'd)**(a) Tuition Fees: Faculty of Arts and Science, St. George Campus – Assessment of Full-time Tuition Fees by Program (Cont'd)**

loads above 3.0, if necessary offsetting per-student costs by increasing fees for other services. That would increase government funding while avoiding discrimination against already-disadvantaged students who were not financially able to complete higher course loads.

The Chair invited Ms Joeita Gupta, Vice-President, External of the Association of Part-Time Undergraduate Students, to address the Governing Council. Ms Gupta said that following the University's unilateral implementation of the definition of part-time students in 2003, students registered for 3.0 or 3.5 courses remained part-time students in the view of APUS. At the time, part-time students were assured that there would be no adverse financial consequences to them, but that had proven not to be true. Most part-time students were members of equity-seeking groups: members of racial minorities, persons with disabilities, and mature students with family responsibilities. The implementation of the proposed program fee would leave those students with very difficult choices. They might be forced to work excessive hours to pay the higher full-time student fee for courses they would not be able to take. Or, they might seek to handle more courses than they were able. Or, they might be forced to reduce their course load to below three. If they chose the latter option, they would require more time to complete their degrees, they would have to pay more over the years in ancillary fees, and they would be excluded from seeking support from the Ontario Student Assistance Program (OSAP). In addition, it was wrong to believe that OSAP would alleviate their financial burdens if they chose a higher course load. OSAP took the form of loans, which accumulated interest. That was the reason that so many students were unable to complete their degree. There were alternatives to the program fee. The University could save the multi-million dollar costs of such capital projects as the Centre for High Performance Sport on the St. George Campus, the aquatic and track and field facility at U.T.S.C. and the expansion of the Rotman School of Management. As an ideology, it was deeply flawed to expect students to pay for something that would not be used, comparable to a taxicab company charging a large, flat fee no matter what distance was travelled. The proposal manifested a further barrier to students, similar to the exclusion of part-time students from the University's financial-aid guarantee, the absence of affordable child care on campus, and the variety of academic and non-academic barriers facing students with disabilities.

The Chair invited Mr. Gavin Nowlan, President of the Arts and Science Student Union, to address the Governing Council. Mr. Nowlan was concerned that the proposed program fee and its consequences to the Faculty and its students was not clearly understood. The outcome was one of the worst of Canadian compromises. The proposal was aimed at a very good outcome, but it would fail by a half. Following amendments to the proposal, the Faculty would remain in an accumulated deficit position. The idea had indeed been under consideration for ten years, and it had been rejected for ten years for very good reason. It had been asserted that students who would take a full course load for reason of the financial incentive to do so would benefit in their applications to graduate programs. However, graduate students were often permitted to take less than a full course load, and Mr. Nowlan was aware of at least one student who had taken less than a full load over the years in order to avoid debt and who had been very successful in applications to very good graduate programs. The proposal concerned the largest Faculty in the University

6. Items for Governing Council Approval (Cont'd)**(a) Tuition Fees: Faculty of Arts and Science, St. George Campus – Assessment of Full-time Tuition Fees by Program (Cont'd)**

and one of the largest in Canada. The matter was therefore an important one. Particularly because its financial goals would not be achieved in the coming year, the Council had time to re-evaluate the proposal and to fully understand its consequences. He urged the Council to send the proposal back for re-examination, and not to seek a poor compromise solution that could end in disaster.

Following the addresses from non-members, the Chair noted that section 11 of By-Law Number 2 specified that a meeting “shall be adjourned after two and one-half hours from its commencement . . . ,” and the Council was nearing this time limit.

On motion duly made, seconded, and carried with the necessary two thirds majority, it was RESOLVED to extend the time of adjournment to 7:30 p.m.

After further discussion by members (recorded above),

It was duly moved and seconded THAT the proposal be referred back to the Business Board to enable further debate and consultation.

The mover and seconder said that the public debate on the matter had been taking place for only one and one-half months, at a time when students were either engaged by final examinations or off campus. It would be much more appropriate to debate the matter further when students were available. The Vice-President and Provost said that the debate had been excellent, intelligent and very full, and she could see no benefit from referral back for further discussion.

The vote was taken on the motion to refer back, and the motion was DEFEATED.

Following further questions and discussion by members (recorded above), the Chair invited the Vice-President and Provost to respond to the questions and points that had been raised by members and to sum up the rationale for the proposal. She would be welcome to call on Dean Gertler to assist if she wished.

Professor Misak said that she would like to call on Dean Gertler to respond. She wished simply to assure the Council that the administration remained fully committed to the principle, contained in the Policy on Student Financial Support, that “no student offered admission to a program at the University of Toronto should be unable to enter or complete the program due to lack of financial means.”

Dean Gertler commented that the discussions in the Faculty of Arts and Science Council, the Business Board and the Governing Council had been very useful in highlighting legitimate concerns. None of the concerns, however, had been new. All had been addressed extensively in the Faculty’s consideration of the matter.

6. Items for Governing Council Approval (Cont'd)**(a) Tuition Fees: Faculty of Arts and Science, St. George Campus – Assessment of Full-time Tuition Fees by Program (Cont'd)**

Dean Gertler responded first to two specific questions. First, with respect to notification of applicants for admission who would be affected by the proposal and their families, they had to date been provided with the same information provided by the other universities to which they had applied: the amount of the fee for full-time students and the date the fee would be due. If the proposal before Council was approved, an e-mail message would be sent to those students describing the details of how the fee would be levied. It was important to understand that students were not required to make any irrevocable decision with respect to their choice of admission offer until May 28, 2009. Even students who had accepted an offer of admission to the Faculty of Arts and Science on the St. George Campus of the University of Toronto could go to the website of the Ontario Universities Application Centre and change a decision already made, if they wished to do so. At Dean Gertler's request, Ms Swift confirmed that fact. Second, Dean Gertler noted that the distribution of course loads for current students was contained in Appendix "B" to the Faculty's proposal. He stressed that the Faculty anticipated a significantly different distribution under the proposed new fee arrangement. Students would respond to price changes, and far fewer students would register in course loads between 3.0 and 4.5 courses. More would register for 5.0 or more courses and more would reduce their loads to part-time ones below the threshold of 3.0 courses. That had been demonstrated by the experience in Commerce and Computer Science and in the other first-entry Faculties in the University. The Faculty of Arts and Science would be very attuned to that fact and to the financial need that would arise. Needs that would arise would be addressed not only by the OSAP program, which provided student loans, but also by the University's own University of Toronto Advanced Planning for Students (UTAPS) Program that provided grants.

Dean Gertler then replied to comments concerning financial accessibility of students to Arts and Science programs. He noted that the new proposal, by encouraging students to complete their degrees in a shorter period of time, might well lead to a reduction of students' costs. By completing their degrees in one less year, students would save on the substantial living costs as well as the cost of ancillary fees, which could be as high as \$900 - \$1,200 per year, an amount approaching the cost of one and one-half courses. In addition, students who completed their degrees most expeditiously would be able to commence work and earning that much sooner. Dean Gertler recognized that the proposed arrangement would lead to financial barriers and cash-flow problems for some students. They would, however, be able to call upon the University's very strong system of need-based financial aid, with the University having provided grants of \$90-million per year to support needy students.

Dean Gertler said that the initiation of the new arrangement would be monitored very carefully by an implementation committee. The Dean had on three occasions invited the Arts and Science Student Union to speak with him about the expansion of that committee to provide more student representation as well as more places for teaching faculty and college registrars. The Faculty fully shared the concerns that had been expressed at the meeting. It would monitor very carefully to ensure that there was no reduction of student engagement or increase in student financial need arising from the proposed program-fee model. The Faculty had specific benchmarks in mind. It would monitor retention rates, class or section size, proportion of small-

6. Items for Governing Council Approval (Cont'd)**(a) Tuition Fees: Faculty of Arts and Science, St. George Campus – Assessment of Full-time Tuition Fees by Program (Cont'd)**

group learning experiences, and the student/faculty ratio. He stressed that the Faculty was facing significant financial challenges. It had been operating at a disadvantage relative to the Faculties of Arts and Science at many other universities as well as to other Faculties in the University of Toronto, which charged fees by program. The Faculty had been forced to strip \$14-million per year from its operating budget, and it would be forced to strip still further from its budget if the proposal for a program fee were not approved – something that would come at a great cost to the quality of students' educations. The use of a program fee had been observed in the Commerce and Computer Science programs within the Faculty of Arts and Science, and it had had not led to any reduction in student engagement. It would not come at any cost to student accessibility elsewhere in the Faculty, which remained fully committed to the financial aid guarantee in the Policy on Student Financial Support, that no student would be unable to enter or complete a program for reason of lack of financial means.

In the course of Dean Gertler's remarks, a member objected that other non-members had been restricted to speaking for no more than three minutes, and the same restriction should be applied to the Dean. The Chair ruled that the Dean had been, in part, responding to questions raised by members, and that it was therefore appropriate for him to take the additional time required to do so.

The Chair said that he would call the vote on the question. A member asked that the vote be taken by secret ballot. The Chair replied that section 74 of By-Law Number 2 stated that "members shall indicate their vote in such manner as the Chair may direct." The Council had considered the matter by open dialogue in a public meeting, and it was appropriate that the vote be taken publicly. A member asked that the vote be taken by a roll call. The Chair stated that the vote would be taken in the usual manner. The By-Law did provide that any three members could ask that a count of the votes for and against be recorded. Such a request was made by three members.

The vote was taken on the motion, with 23 members voting in favour, 5 voting against and 1 abstaining.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

Subject to the understanding that prior to 2011-12 an evaluation of the impact of the model be done by the Arts and Science Council, in consultation with the Vice President and Provost, and reported to Governing Council to enable consideration of revision of the implementation plan, if such is required,

THAT the proposal to charge tuition fees for full-time Arts and Science students on the St. George Campus on the basis of a program fee instead of a per-course fee be approved.

6. Items for Governing Council Approval (Cont'd)

- (a) **Tuition Fees: Faculty of Arts and Science, St. George Campus – Assessment of Full-time Tuition Fees by Program (Cont'd)**

[Documentation is attached to the excerpt from Report Number 174 of the Business Board as Appendix "A".](#)

- (b) **Capital Project: Project Planning Report for the Expansion of the John H. Daniels Faculty of Architecture, Landscape and Design**

Professor Corman reported that three capital projects had been presented to the Academic Board for approval at its meeting of April 30, 2009. They were three of the six projects which the University had carefully selected for submission to the Federal and Provincial infrastructure funding programs. The others included large projects at the University of Toronto at Scarborough and the University of Toronto at Mississauga, as well as one smaller project on the St. George campus. Those proposals would be presented for governance approval in the near future. The proposed projects could be initiated and completed quickly in order to meet the governments' requirement that projects be materially complete by March, 2011. All three projects were recommended for approval by the Academic Board on the understanding that their execution was contingent on the provision of government funding. Professor Corman said that the proposal for the expansion of the John H. Daniels Faculty of Architecture, Landscape and Design would provide additional space for research offices and design studios, at an estimated cost of \$20-million. If the project were not selected for government funding, the Project Planning Report would remain approved in principle, until other funding or a private benefaction could be obtained.

Ms Vosburgh reported that the Business Board had approved the execution of Phase I of the proposed project, subject both to Governing Council approval in principle and subject to the confirmation of funding. The cost of the project was high at almost \$700 per square foot, but that was accounted for by two important factors. First, the work would be completed on a heritage building erected in 1909. Second, the Faculty wished to have a building that would exemplify what it taught: excellent design and an exemplary standard of environmental sustainability.

A member asked whether students had been involved in the design of the project. Ms Sisam replied that the project had not yet been designed, but students had been members of the Project Planning Committee.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

1. THAT the Project Planning Report for the John H. Daniels Faculty of Architecture, Landscape and Design be approved in principle to accommodate the activities and functions described for the expansion of the Faculty's programs at its present location, 230 College Street.

6. Items for Governing Council Approval (Cont'd)**(b) Capital Project: Project Planning Report for the Expansion of the John H. Daniels Faculty of Architecture, Landscape and Design (Cont'd)**

2. That the project scope for Phase 1, comprising an addition of approximately 1250 net assignable square metres or 2023 gross square metres be approved at a total project cost of \$20,000,000, subject to funding.
3. THAT the project scope for subsequent phases of renovations be brought forward to implement through the Accommodation and Facilities Directorate for components valued at less than \$2 million, and those exceeding \$2 million in accordance with the *Policy on Capital Planning and Capital Projects*.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 161 of the Academic Board as Appendix "C".

(c) Capital Project: Utilities Infrastructure Renewal for the St. George Campus

Professor Corman reported that the proposed project consisted of a number of components which had been combined into one proposal and submitted through the governments' infrastructure programs. Under those programs, physical infrastructure, including utilities infrastructure, was eligible for funding. The individual components ranged from electrical upgrades to an improved chiller plant and a strengthened cogeneration facility which would ensure that any damage to buildings and research was minimized in the event of a power failure. All parts of the project were important for the continuing operation of the University over the long-term.

Ms Vosburgh reported that the Business Board had approved the execution of this group of projects, again subject to Governing Council approval in principle. The matter of deferred maintenance and renewal had been an on-going concern of the Business Board, and the receipt of the government infrastructure funding for this work would be very welcome.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

THAT the Utilities Infrastructure Renewal program of projects be approved, at a total cost not to exceed \$15.9 million, and assuming receipt of funding from the government economic stimulus program:

- Government of Canada \$8.0M
- Government of Ontario \$7.9M

Documentation is attached to Report Number 161 of the Academic Board as Appendix "D".

(d) Capital Project: Interdisciplinary Design Studios within the Department of Civil Engineering and the Lassonde Institute - Project Change of Scope

Professor Corman noted that the proposed project within the Mining Building had originally been approved by the Governing Council in 2008. At that time, the estimated total cost

6. Items for Governing Council Approval (Cont'd)**(d) Capital Project: Interdisciplinary Design Studios within the Department of Civil Engineering and the Lassonde Institute - Project Change of Scope (Cont'd)**

of the project had been \$12,150,000 and it had included high priority roof renovations. Since that time, the project had been reviewed, and it had been determined that external deferred maintenance items should be added, along with a proposal for photovoltaic panels to increase the energy efficiency in the building. The project would also improve the building's accessibility with the addition of an interior elevator. The additional items, together with the price escalation over time, had increased the total project cost to \$20-million.

Ms Vosburgh reported that the Business Board had considered this project and had approved its execution, subject to Governing Council approval in principle. The Board had been advised that the provision of government infrastructure funding for the project would be of considerable value in encouraging the anticipated \$9-million of donations.

A member observed that the renovation of old buildings had a far higher cost than the construction of new ones. While there were very good reasons for the preservation and renovation of older historic buildings, the University should bear in mind the cost of so doing and consider where possible the alternative of new buildings to house its activities.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

1. THAT the Project Planning Report for the Civil Engineering Interdisciplinary Design Studios be approved in principle.
2. THAT the project scope, comprising renovations to approximately 630 net assignable square meters and 1,130 gross square meters be increased to a total project cost of \$20,000,000, subject to funding, to include high priority repairs, maintenance and restoration and items addressing sustainability.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 162 of the Academic Board as Appendix "C".

Following the adoption of this resolution, the Chair noted that the Governing Council was nearing its extended time of adjournment, and he invited a motion to further extend the time of the meeting.

On motion duly made, seconded, and carried with the necessary two thirds majority, it was RESOLVED to extend the time of adjournment to 7:45 p.m.

7. Reviews of Academic Units and Programs 2007-08: Annual Report

The Chair commented that the Guidelines for the Review of Academic Units and Programs stated that the “Governing Council is responsible for ensuring that the University administration is monitoring the quality of academic programs and units and is taking the necessary steps to address problems and achieve improvements.” Members had received in their agenda packages a two-part summary of the reviews completed in 2007-08 and the administrative responses to those reviews. Members had also received copies of Reports Number 139 and 140 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs. That Committee had considered the reviews in detail at two meetings in March. The heads of the relevant academic divisions had been in attendance at those meetings to answer questions. That same documentation had been reviewed by the Agenda Committee of the Academic Board.

Professor Corman reported that the Agenda Committee had considered the report on reviews at its meetings of March 17 and April 14, 2009. The Committee had agreed that there were no matters arising from the reviews that required discussion by the Academic Board. However, members had considered the importance of assessing the review process. Professor Misak had assured the Committee that such an evaluation would be one of the priorities of the incoming Vice-Provost, Academic Programs, Professor Cheryl Regehr.

The Chair invited any questions or comments on the process for monitoring the quality of academic programs and units, or about the Reviews themselves and the administrative responses. There was no discussion of the matter.

8. Reports for Information

The Governing Council received the items for information in the following four reports:

- (a) Report Number 162 of the Academic Board (April 30, 2009)
- (b) Report Number 151 of the University Affairs Board (March 17, 2009)
- (c) Report Number 152 of the University Affairs Board (April 22, 2009)
- (d) Report Number 422 of the Executive Committee (May 12, 2009)

9. Date of Next Meeting

The Chair reminded members that the final meeting of the Governing Council for the governance year was scheduled for **Tuesday June 23, 2009**, at 4:00 p.m. in the Council Chamber. He alerted members that the meeting was scheduled for one half hour earlier than usual.

10. Question Period

There were no questions for members of the senior administration.

11. Other Business

The Chair thanked the members of the staff at the University of Toronto at Mississauga for their excellent work in preparing for and hosting the meeting.

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL MOVED IN CAMERA.

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

On the recommendation of the President, the Governing Council confirmed a recommendation from the University Tribunal for the expulsion of a student who had had committed an academic offence under the Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters. The recommendation was outlined in the memorandum and supporting documentation from the Secretary of the Governing Council, dated May 13, 2009.

13. Board and Committee Assignments, 2009-2010

On motion duly made, seconded and carried,

It was Resolved

THAT the proposal from the Chair for Board and Committee assignments for 2009-10, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "A", be approved.

14. Senior Appointment

On motion duly made, seconded and carried,

It was Resolved

THAT Ms Catherine Riggall's appointment as Vice-President, Business Affairs, be extended for an additional year, effective July 1, 2009 and continuing to June 30, 2010.

The meeting adjourned at 7:40 p.m.

Secretary

May 28, 2009

Chair