

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

REPORT NUMBER 158 OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD

October 2, 2008

To the Governing Council,
University of Toronto

Your Board reports that it held a meeting on Thursday, October 2, 2008 at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall at which the following were present:

Professor Michael R. Marrus, Chair	Professor Luc F. De Nil	Ms Carole Moore
Professor Brian Corman	Professor Charles Deber	Mr. Andrew Ngo
Professor David Naylor, President	Professor Guy Faulkner	Professor Linda Northrup
Professor Cheryl Misak, Interim Vice-President and Provost	Professor Jane Gaskell	Professor Donna Orwin
Professor Jonathan Freedman, Deputy Provost	Professor Meric Gertler	Mr. Roger P. Parkinson
Professor Safwat Zaky, Vice- Provost, Planning and Budget	Professor Robert Gibbs	Professor Ito Peng
Professor Stewart Aitchison	Professor Avrum Gotlieb	Ms Sheron Perera
Professor Varouj Aivazian	Ms Pamela Gravestock	Mr. Jeff Peters
Professor Jan Angus	Ms Jacqueline Greenblatt	Professor Susan Pfeiffer
Professor Gage Averill	Ms Emily Gregor	Professor Judith Poe
Professor Ronald Beiner	Ms Anne Guo	Professor Jolie Ringash
Ms Patricia Bellamy	Professor Rick Halpern	Mr. Paul Ruppert
Ms Marilyn Booth	Professor Wayne K. Hindmarsh	Miss Pamela Santora
Professor Ragnar Buchweitz	Professor Ellen Hodnett	Ms Maureen Simpson
Mr. Ryan Campbell	Mrs. Bonnie Horne	Mr. Shane Smith
Dr. Christena Chruszez	Ms Jenna Hossack	Professor Tattersall Smith
Professor Will Cluett	Ms Tharsni Kankesan	Professor Elizabeth M. Smyth
Professor David Cook	Professor Shashi Kant	Ms Lynn Snowden
Professor Elizabeth Cowper	Professor Pamela E. Klassen	Miss Maureen J. Somerville
Professor Gerald Cupchik	Dr. Chris Koenig-Woodyard	Mr. Olivier Sorin
Professor Gabriele D'Eleuterio	Mr. Joseph Koo	Professor Suzanne Stevenson
Professor Christopher Damaren	Professor Hy Van Luong	Professor Romin Tafarodi
	Professor Douglas McDougall	Mr. Daniel Taranovsky
	Professor Mark McGowan	Ms Rita Tsang
	Mr. Andrew Mintz	Dr. Robert S. Turnbull
	Professor John R. Miron	Professor Donald Wiebe
	Professor Faye Mishna	

Regrets:

Professor Cristina Amon	Professor Russell Hartenberger	Professor David Mock
Professor Christy Anderson	Professor Gregory Jump	Professor Michael Molloy
Professor George Baird	Dr. Allan S. Kaplan	Professor Mayo Moran
Professor Sylvia Bashevkin	Professor Bruce Kidd	Professor Sioban Nelson
Professor Denise Belsham	Dr. Young M. Kim	Professor Janet Paterson
Professor Katherine Berg	Professor Audrey Laporte	Professor Ato Quayson
Professor Sujit Choudhry	Dr. Lesley Ann Lavack	Professor Cheryl Regehr
Professor Alister Cumming	Professor Louise Lemieux- Charles	Dr. Wendy Rotenberg
Professor Joseph Desloges	Professor Robert Levit	Miss Charlene Saldanha
Professor Miriam Diamond	Professor Rhonda Love	Professor Andrea Sass-Kortsak
Professor Wendy Duff	Dr. Gillian MacKay	Professor Kim Strong
Professor Dickson Eyoh	Professor Jens-Erik Mai	Professor Njoki Wane
Mr. John A. Fraser	Professor Roger L. Martin	Dr. Donald A. Wasylenki
	Ms Michelle Mitrovich	Professor Catharine Whiteside
		Dr. Cindy Woodland

Non-voting Assessors:

Professor Angela Hildyard, Vice- President, Human Resources and Equity	Ms Judith Wolfson, Vice- President, University Relations	Professor Edith Hillan, Vice- Provost, Academic
--	---	--

In Attendance:	Mr. Neil Dobbs, Deputy Secretary of the Governing Council	Ms Renu Mandhane, Assistant Dean, Faculty of Law
Dr. Claude Davis, Member of the Governing Council		Mr. Chris McGrath, Member of the University Affairs Board
Ms Judith Goldring, Member of the Governing Council	Ms Sheree Drummond, Assistant Provost	Mr. Henry Mulhall, Assistant Secretary of the Governing Council
Mr. John Stewart, Member of the Governing Council	Dr. Anthony Gray, Special Advisor to the President	Mr. David Stiles, Member of the University Affairs Board
Professor Sarita Verma, Member of the Governing Council and Deputy Dean and Vice-Dean, Postgraduate Medical Education, Faculty of Medicine	Ms Helen Lasthiotakis, Director, Policy and Planning, Office of the Vice-President and Provost	
Mr. Louis Charpentier, Secretary of the Governing Council	Mr. Ben Liu, Member of the University Affairs Board	Secretariat:
	Ms Bryn MacPherson-White, Director, Office of the President and University Events	Ms Mae-Yu Tan

In this report, items 6 and 7 are recommended to the Governing Council for approval. The remaining items are reported for information.

1. Welcome and Introductory Remarks by the Chair

The Chair welcomed new and continuing members to the first meeting of the Academic Board for 2008-2009. He introduced Professor Brian Corman, the Vice-Chair of the Board; Professor Cheryl Misak, Interim Vice-President and Provost and the Board's senior administrative assessor; and Ms Mae-Yu Tan, Secretary to the Board. The Chair also acknowledged the voting and non-voting assessors who were in attendance.

The Chair explained that the Academic Board was the largest of the Governing Council's Boards and Committees, with 121 members. Most of the business of the Board came from its Standing Committees, particularly the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs, and the Planning and Budget Committee. A third Standing Committee, the Academic Appeals Committee, occasionally reported items to the Board. Members of the Board were encouraged to attend meetings of the standing committees, as items forwarded to the Board for approval were thoroughly discussed in detail at the committee level.

The Chair introduced Professor Doug McDougall, Vice-Chair of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs and Professor Avrum Gotlieb, Chair of the Planning and Budget Committee.

The Chair noted that the Academic Board was the entry-level body for certain items, including divisional constitutions, policies on the nature of academic employment, policies and procedures with respect to academic discipline, and name changes of academic units.

Role and Conduct of Members of the Board

Members of the Board were expected to act in the best interests of the University of Toronto and not as an agent of a particular constituency. Meetings of the Board would be conducted in an atmosphere of respect and collegiality, but with some measure of formality. Members were asked to stand and introduce themselves when invited by the Chair to speak.

2. Approval of Report Number 157 of the Meeting held on June 3, 2008

Report Number 157 of the meeting held on June 3, 2008 was approved.

3. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting

There was no business arising from the Report.

4. Report Number 147 of the Agenda Committee (September 23, 2008)

The Chair drew members' attention to Report Number 147 (September 23, 2008) which contained the discussion of the Reviews of Academic Programs and Units on pages 4 and 5. He noted that the review process was a crucial component of accountability for the University.

5. Report from the Vice-President and Provost

(a) Academic Planning

Professor Misak stated that by now, the University would normally have been in the process of planning for the next academic cycle, as the current planning period was drawing to a close. However, given that the *Towards 2030 Framework* might soon be considered for approval by the Governing Council, it would be wise to await the directions that emerged from that long-term planning process before making decisions about the near future. For this reason, the University had adopted an interim and simplified procedure for academic planning which was currently under way. Divisions had been asked to provide the Office of the Provost with their five-year budget and to outline any deviations from their *Stepping Up* plan. The review of those submissions had begun and was proceeding smoothly.

(b) Advisory Committee on Student Governments

Professor Misak announced that she was establishing an advisory committee on student governments that would be chaired by Professor David R. Cameron, a world-renowned expert on democratic governance. One of the goals of the committee would be to develop clear guidelines on the fair and democratic operation of student governments. The committee would consist of both student government representatives and faculty members who could contribute to the development of best practices.

6. University of Toronto and the Michener Institute for Applied Health Sciences: Memorandum of Understanding

The Chair said that the University of Toronto and the Michener Institute for Applied Health Sciences Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) had been considered by the Planning and Budget Committee (P&B) on September 17, 2008. If approved by the Board, the proposal would be considered for approval by the Governing Council on October 23, 2008.

Professor Gotlieb stated that the Faculty of Medicine and the Michener Institute for Applied Health Sciences proposed to enter into a formal agreement to further develop joint programs. They had been offering a joint Bachelor of Science (Medical Radiation Sciences) program for the past decade. The proposed MOU outlined the academic relationship and principles for the offering of joint programs, building on the existing Letter of Understanding. New program proposals would be brought forward for Governing Council approval as appropriate.

At the P&B meeting, it had been explained that the Michener Institute had a unique status; it was funded by the Ministry of Health to offer innovative programs that trained a variety of "paramedical" professionals.

Invited to comment, Dr. Sarita Verma, Deputy Dean and Vice-Dean, Postgraduate Medical Education, of the Faculty of Medicine, explained that the proposed agreement would facilitate

6. University of Toronto and the Michener Institute for Applied Health Sciences: Memorandum of Understanding (cont'd)

further collaboration in innovations in health sciences education. The proposed agreement would have no resource implications for the University's operating budget.

There were no questions from the Board.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the Memorandum of Understanding between the University of Toronto and The Michener Institute for Applied Health Sciences, a copy of which is attached hereto as [Appendix "A"](#), be approved, effective November 1, 2008.

7. Towards 2030: A Long-term Planning Framework for the University of Toronto

The Chair said that the *Towards 2030 Framework* had been considered by the Planning and Budget Committee (P&B) on September 17, 2008. If approved by the Board, the *Framework* would be considered for approval by the Governing Council on October 23, 2008. The Chair noted that speaking requests on the *Framework* had been anticipated from groups who had expressed an interest in it. However, none had been received by the Secretariat.

Professor Gotlieb informed the Board that the Planning and Budget Committee had been strongly supportive of the *Framework* document.

The President gave a presentation to the Board, highlighting the broad strategic directions outlined in the *Towards 2030 Framework* document. He drew attention to the importance of placing this long-term planning exercise in context. The *Framework* would help to shape but in no way replace University-wide academic planning at the divisional and departmental level, where the granular activities would occur. He also stressed that the document, which focused on academic and related financial issues, did not replace the University's *Statement of Institutional Purpose*.

The President outlined the process that had occurred, beginning with the dissemination of the *Towards 2030* background document in June, 2007, followed by the creation of the five Task Forces. After consulting extensively, the Task Forces had produced their reports, which were now public. The *Synthesis* document had drawn together common threads across the Task Force reports, identifying mutual, general themes. The Board was now being asked to approve the general directions presented in the *Framework*. The President commented that members would likely not be surprised by the content of the document.

The University's Distinctive Role

Despite significant financial challenges and difficult circumstances, the University of Toronto had managed to advance itself to a strong position internationally on the basis of academic excellence and research intensiveness. It continued to receive strong academic reviews and was favored by students because of its academic excellence and outstanding faculty and staff. The clear consensus was that these distinguishing features should be sustained.

Tri-Campus Issues

The University had successfully evolved into a *de facto* tri-campus system, with distinctive programs and identities at the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM) and the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC). At this time there was a consensus that the transformation of UTM and UTSC into independent universities was neither desirable nor feasible, although the

7. *Towards 2030: A Long-term Planning Framework for the University of Toronto* (cont'd)

President expected that this position would likely be revisited over time. There was, however, a need to think carefully about the administration and organization of the institution. In continuing the process of strategic diversification, expanding opportunities for students, staff, and faculty, the emphasis on academic quality must not be lost nor efficiencies compromised.

Enrolment Plans, Institutional Balance, and Capital Plans

The University's disciplinary breadth was a great strength, and its role as a multi-disciplinary institution should be continued even as future enrolment planning was undertaken. Both UTSC and UTM had capacity for a combination of modest undergraduate and selective graduate growth; further graduate expansion on the St. George campus was possible, and, if funding permitted, a modest reduction in undergraduate enrolment. However, approval of any enrolment shifts for the University would depend on available capital and operating funds, as well as campus-specific academic plans and the numbers of appropriately-qualified students. There was an urgent need for strategic capital investments, particularly at the east campus, concurrently with any enrolment growth. All three campuses of the University were currently below the space standards established by the Council of Ontario Universities, with UTSC the lowest by a fair margin.

Student Recruitment and Experience

The University was committed to maintaining a diverse student body. It would be important in the increasingly competitive climate to recruit wisely, maximizing the pool of outstanding student talent. It would also be important to address concerns that the University's recruitment tactics in the past had been somewhat unclear and lacking strategic coordination.

The University would continue to focus on enhancing the student experience, broadly defined. It recognized the leading role that colleges on the St. George campus had played in fostering a positive experience for undergraduate Arts and Science students, and these and other divisional initiatives to create learning communities would continue to be supported. However, limited resources posed an ongoing obstacle to the University's ability to offer the same supports for student experience that public peer institutions in the US had been able to offer. Indeed, most universities in Ontario faced similar challenges due to the low per-student grant provided by the Provincial Government.

Resources

The University's current budget model took into account past academic decisions while providing for variations across programs in revenue-generating capacity and expenses. In moving forward, the model should be sustained and perverse incentives should be avoided.

Given the low per-student funding in Ontario, the University was fortunate to have received unprecedented levels of philanthropic support. Following a brief period of decline, benefactions had risen to a more appropriate level for the University in recent years. The emphasis on fundraising would continue, with particular attention to priorities such as the provision of student aid.

Taking these and other factors together, the Task Force on University Resources had considered a range of financial scenarios for 2030. While the most favorable model would provide for per-student provincial grants rising to the average level of the other nine provinces (an increase greater than 25%), the University recognized that such an outcome was unlikely in the current economic climate. The achievement of such a goal would require continued advocacy over the long term. The most plausible solution would be the continued use of a mixed revenue model, in which all sources of revenue were increased, combined with prudent fiscal planning.

Administration

Substantial changes in the administrative arrangements of the University would be required over the next two decades. Any new organizational structures and processes would need to provide a balance between divisional or campus-level autonomy and central coordination. Ways in which St. George

7. *Towards 2030: A Long-term Planning Framework for the University of Toronto* (cont'd)

campus-specific administrative mandates could be separated from University-wide responsibilities should be explored, while ensuring that maximum efficiency and accountability was maintained. With ongoing fiscal pressures and administrative changes, the quality of the University's academic programs would need to be carefully monitored to ensure that the University's degrees retained their luster.

A proposed editorial change to the Framework document was accepted by the Board. The phrase "under the Governing Council" was added to page 2 of the Framework document (Tri-Campus Issues, second paragraph, second sentence). The revised sentence now appeared as:

The University will support the development of three differentiated campuses under the Governing Council and a single University-wide administration with a strong overall identity and overarching academic standards.

Members congratulated the President and all those who had worked on the *Towards 2030* initiative. During the discussion, a number of points were raised including the following.

a) Funding Models and Enrolment Plans

Members of various estates inquired about possible funding models and enrolment plans as well as the impact on student funding provided by the University. The President emphasized the difficulty of advocating a model that included a tuition freeze, particularly since there had been almost no gains in the provincial per-student grant, the other major source of core operating funds for the University. For example, this year approximately \$50-million would be required for increases in compensation costs alone in order to ensure there were no further pressures on the student-faculty ratios; salary and benefits accounted for the majority of the University's expenditures. In response to a suggestion that the University consider following the example of countries that offered free education, the President commented that some of those European countries were in fact implementing various forms of tuition fees, as their revenue generation had been insufficient to maintain academic excellence. A number of publicly-assisted North American and Asian universities with mixed revenue sources were better models for the University. The President added that, as the targeted growth of graduate and professional programs continued, greater funding per student would be required. While the growth in graduate fellowships and scholarships and other resources had not kept pace with the expansion, the University, through its funding guarantee to graduate students, was providing as much support as possible.

One member asked about the possibility of a dramatic decrease in undergraduate enrolment. The President stated that while there were a range of views on the matter of enrolment modification, there was agreement that no reductions could occur without new funding. The goal was to sustain the current complement of faculty and staff while modestly reducing undergraduate enrolment on the St. George campus. It was unclear if this would be feasible in the short term since rapid changes to the per-student grant were not expected, and it would be very difficult to make this shift based on tuition revenues. In that latter regard, the University wanted to ensure that access was maintained while recruiting the best and brightest students.

b) Consultation within Student Constituencies

Two members expressed their view that sufficient consultation had not occurred within the part-time-student and graduate-student constituencies. The President disagreed, noting that the 2030 Planning document had been released over a year ago, and members from all estates of the University community had been engaged for many months in the work of the task forces. There had been ample opportunity for student constituencies to offer input to the task forces. The points of disagreement with student unions, such as the role of tuition revenue in the University's finances, were also well-known. It was highly unlikely that additional consultation about broad strategic directions would reveal significantly different approaches that should be undertaken, particularly since this was a long-term

7. ***Towards 2030: A Long-term Planning Framework for the University of Toronto*** (cont'd)

planning framework. On the other hand, as had been the case in the past with departmental and divisional planning, students would be engaged in local planning and implementation exercises.

c) Future Directions for Divisions and Units

Some members asked about specific directions for divisions and units. The President explained that, in general, the *Framework* and *Synthesis* documents had not been designed to address such matters in detail. In general, the documents were oriented to longer-term and general planning issues. Responding to a question about the affiliation of other first-entry students with Arts and Science colleges, the President noted that such an option might be of interest to some students, but the *Synthesis* clearly left the onus with other first-entry divisions to make that determination in consultation with their students.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT "*Towards 2030: A Long-term Planning Framework for the University of Toronto*", attached hereto as [Appendix "B"](#), be approved in principle.

8. **Items for Information**

(a) **Appointments and Status Changes**

The Chair stated that the Appointments and Status Changes Report included the names of the recipients of the inaugural University of Toronto Distinguished Professor Awards as well as their biographies. The awards were developed out of a recommendation from *Stepping Up* that addressed faculty support and renewal. The prestigious awards were limited to no more than 3% of the tenured faculty in a Faculty.

Members received the following reports for information:

- (b) **Report on Approvals under Summer Executive Authority**
- (c) **Report Number 136 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs** (May 13, 2008)
- (d) **Report Number 125 of the Planning and Budget Committee** (May 14, 2008)
- (e) **Report Number 126 of the Planning and Budget Committee** (September 18, 2008)
- (f) **Calendar of Business 2008-09**

There were no questions arising from the reports.

9. **Date of Next Meeting**

The Chair reminded members that the date of the next meeting was Thursday, November 6, 2008, at 4:10 p.m.

10. **Other Business**

The Chair noted that members were responsible for shredding any confidential documentation received as part of their agenda packages. Members could leave confidential material behind in the Council Chamber and the Secretariat would arrange for their disposal.

11. Quarterly Report on Donations - May 1, 2008 – July 31, 2008

Members received this report for information. There were no questions.

The meeting adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

October 12, 2008