

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL
REPORT NUMBER 150 OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD
May 2, 2007

To the Governing Council,
University of Toronto

Your Board reports that it held a meeting on Wednesday, May 2, 2007 at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall at which the following were present:

Professor Michael R. Marrus (Chair)	Mr. Brian Beaton	Mr. Geoffrey Matus
Professor Brian Corman (Vice- Chair)	Professor Clare Beghtol	Professor Brenda Y. McCabe
Professor David Naylor, President	Professor Donald Brean	Professor Douglas McDougall
Professor Vivek Goel, Vice- President and Provost	Professor Ragnar Buchweitz	Professor John R. Miron
Dr. John R. G. Challis, Vice- President, Research and Associate Provost	Mr. Ryan Matthew Campbell	Professor David Mock
Professor David Farrar, Deputy Provost and Vice-Provost, Students	Dr. Christena Chruszez	Professor Mariel O'Neill-Karch
Professor S. Zaky, Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget	Professor David Cook	Professor Donna Orwin
Professor Stewart Aitchison	Mr. Joe Cox	Mr. Roger P. Parkinson
Professor Varouj Aivazian	Professor Alister Cumming	Professor Susan Pfeiffer
Professor Cristina Amon	Mr. Ken Davy	Professor Cheryl Regehr
Professor Christy Anderson	Professor Jane Gaskell	Mr. Paul Ruppert
Professor Jan Angus	Ms Bonnie Goldberg	Professor Andrea Sass-Kortsak
	Ms Pamela Gravestock	Professor Anthony N. Sinclair
	Professor Hugh Gunz	Professor J.J. Berry Smith
	Professor Rick Halpern	Professor Brian Cantwell Smith
	Mr. Billeh Hamud	Miss Maureen J. Somerville
	Professor Brad Inwood	Dr. Robert S. Turnbull
	Professor Charles Jones	Dr. Cindy Woodland
	Professor Gregory Jump	
	Dr. Lesley Ann Lavack	
	Professor Thomas Mathien	

Regrets:

Professor Derek Allen	Professor Jonathan Freedman	Professor Mayo Moran
Professor Gage Averill	Ms Linda B. Gardner	Ms Carole Moore
Professor George Baird	Professor Avrum Gotlieb	Professor Sioban Nelson
Professor Sylvia Bashevkin	Professor William Gough	Professor Janet Paterson
Professor David R. Begun	Mrs. Bonnie Horne	Ms Theresa Pazonis
Professor Reina Bendayan	Professor Yuki Mayumi Johnson	Professor Robert Reisz
Professor Katherine Berg	Mr. Mohammed Khan	Professor Richard Reznick
Dr. Terry Blake	Dr. Wajahat Khan	Professor Jolie Ringash
Ms Marilyn Booth	Mr. Umar Khan	Professor Gareth Seaward
Mr. Ewen Weili Chen	Professor Bruce Kidd	Professor Pekka Sinervo
Professor George Elliott Clarke	Dr. Joel A. Kirsh	Professor Tattersall Smith
Professor John Coleman	Dr. Chris Koenig-Woodyard	Professor Ron Smyth
Mr. Tim Corson	Professor Hon C. Kwan	Mr. Omar Solimon
Mr. Kristofer T. Coward	Professor Robert Levit	Professor Lorne Sossin
Professor Luc F. De Nil	Professor Lori Loeb	Professor Lisa Steele
Miss Saswati Deb	Dr. Gillian MacKay	Professor Suzanne Stevenson
Dr. Raisa B. Deber	Professor Roger L. Martin	Professor Kim Strong
Professor Miriam Diamond	Professor Diane Massam	Professor Rinaldo Wayne Walcott
Professor Dickson Eyoh	Professor Mark McGowan	Dr. Donald A. Wasylenki
Professor Guy Faulkner	Ms Vera Melnyk	Professor Catharine Whiteside
Dr. Shari Graham Fell	Mr. Matto Mildenberger	Mr. Patrick Wong
Mr. John A. Fraser	Professor Faye Mishna	
	Professor Michael Molloy	

Non-voting Assessors:

Professor Angela Hildyard, Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity
 Professor Edith M. Hillan, Vice-Provost, Academic
 Professor Cheryl Misak, Acting Vice-President and Principal, UTM
 Ms Catherine Riggall, Vice-President, Business Affairs
 Ms Elizabeth Sisam, Assistant Vice-President, Campus and Facilities Planning
 Ms Judith Wolfson, Vice-President, University Relations

In Attendance:

Ms Sheree Drummond, Assistant Provost
 Dr. Anthony Gray, Special Advisor to the President
 Professor Ann Lancashire, Vice-Dean, Academic, Faculty of Arts and Science
 Professor Daniel Lang, COU Academic Colleague

Secretariat:

Ms Cristina Oke, Secretary
 Ms Mae-Yu Tan

In this report, items 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10 are recommended to the Governing Council for approval and the remaining items are reported for information.

1. Approval of Report Number 149 of the Meeting held on April 5, 2007

The Chair reported that some errors in attendance had been brought to the attention of the Secretary, and the Report would be amended to correct them. Report Number 149 of the meeting held on April 5, 2007 was approved as amended.

2. Business Arising Out of the Report

The Chair recalled that, at the April meeting during the discussion of the Community Affiliation Template, a member had raised a question about Student Workplace Insurance. The Provost had spoken to the member and answered her question.

3. Report Number 137 of the Agenda Committee (April 17, 2007)

Members received Report Number 137 of the Agenda Committee for information.

4. Report from the Vice-President and Provost**(a) Premier's Summit Awards in Medical Research**

Professor Goel described the inaugural Premier's Summit Awards, which celebrated world-class research in Ontario and were the largest research prizes ever awarded in Canada. Each Summit Award winner would receive \$5 million over a five-year period [\$2.5 million from the program matched by \$2.5 million from the sponsoring institution]. The four recipients of the inaugural awards were University Professor Tak Mak of medical biophysics; University Professor Anthony Pawson of medical genetics and microbiology; University Professor Peter St. George-Hyslop of medicine and the Centre for Research in Neurodegenerative Diseases; and Professor John Dick of medical genetics and microbiology.

Professor Goel also reported that Professor Parham Aarabi of electrical and computer engineering had received a Premier's Catalyst Award as the best young innovator, and Professor Spencer Barrett of ecology and evolutionary biology and Professor Andreas Mandelis of mechanical and industrial engineering had each received a Premier's Discovery Award for individual research – Professor Barrett in the life sciences and medicine and Professor Mandelis in natural sciences and engineering.

President Naylor added his congratulations to those named above, and to all members of the University community who had recently won awards.

4. Report from the Vice-President and Provost (cont'd)

(b) Campus Security

Professor Goel observed that the campus shootings at the Virginia Polytechnic Institute (Virginia Tech) in Blacksburg, Virginia on April 16, 2007 were on the minds of many in the University community. He assured members that the University paid serious attention to security issues on its three campuses, and was constantly updating its crisis and disaster plans. Rapid communication was important, particularly in the University community of 90,000 members.

Professor Goel noted that a review of St. George student services was being conducted and a number of papers had been issued, including one on student health issues.¹

(c) The Role of the President in the Tenure Process

Professor Goel reminded members that the Academic Board was responsible for policies related to academic employment. He referred to the Association Grievance of the University of Toronto Faculty Association (UTFA) on the role of the President in the tenure process. Professor Goel recalled that the role of the President in the tenure process had been examined by the Grievance Review Panel in 1995. The *Policy and Procedures on Academic Appointments* provided that the Tenure Committee recommended that tenure be granted or denied. The President either approved or rejected the recommendation of the Tenure Committee. The role of the President in reviewing the tenure dossier was vital in order to ensure that the process and criteria for the granting of tenure were appropriately followed in each case and that the dossier was sufficient to demonstrate that appropriate standards had been achieved by candidates across the University.

President Naylor commented that out of those cases recommended for approval by departmental committees, the proportion of tenure cases not approved by the President had remained the same since 2000. The President emphasized his respect for divisional and disciplinary expertise and his positive impression of the overall quality of candidates for tenure.

(d) Memorandum of Understanding with Beijing University

The President reported that a Memorandum of Understanding between the University of Toronto and Beijing University had been signed recently. Beijing University included over 4,000 professors and associate professors, as well as additional teaching staff, with 30,000 students – 15,000 undergraduate and 15,000 graduate. The President also described his meeting with the Minister of Education for China. The Minister had indicated his high regard for the University of Toronto and his strong support for Chinese institutions partnering with the University of Toronto.

5. Report of the Council of Ontario Universities (COU) Academic Colleague

The Chair reminded members that each year, the Academic Board appointed an Academic Colleague and an alternate to the Council of Ontario Universities (COU). The Academic Colleague accompanied the President to COU meetings. The Chair then introduced Professor Dan Lang who had served as COU Academic Colleague for 2006-07.

¹ The report of the review of student services is available at:
<http://www.students.utoronto.ca/viceprovoststudents/restructuring/taskforce.htm>

The report on health services is available at
<http://www.students.utoronto.ca/viceprovoststudents/restructuring/taskforce/wgreports.htm>

5. Report of the Council of Ontario Universities (COU) Academic Colleague (cont'd)

Professor Lang explained that the full council of the Council of Ontario Universities (COU) had two members from each institution: the Executive Head and the Academic Colleague. During the course of a year, the full council, including both the Executive Heads and the Academic Colleagues, met four times.

Professor Lang noted that the structure of the COU had been reviewed in 2006-07. As a result of this review, the number of plenary meetings would be reduced to two, beginning in 2007-08. The Academic Colleagues would continue to meet four times annually.

The review had also resulted in the requirement that at least one Academic Colleague must be a member of each standing committee of the COU and its task forces. Although opinions differed among Academic Colleagues about some of the recommendations from the review, it was Professor Lang's opinion that this recommendation about the direct involvement of Academic Colleagues in the committee work of the COU was wise, made very good use of the Colleagues, and brought an important perspective to the work of the committees. Professor Lang informed members that, in 2006-2007 he had been a member of the Committee on Relationships with Other Post-secondary Institutions, of the Task Force on Student Assistance, and of the Joint Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities (MTCU)/COU Steering Committee on the Ontario Graduate Survey.

Professor Lang indicated that the Academic Colleagues annually produced working papers for discussion with the full COU council.² In 2006-2007 there had been two working papers of particular value and interest. Early in the year there had been a working paper on the role of universities. Although the debate about recognition of applied degrees for graduate admission had not been anticipated at the time that the paper on the mission of the university had been commissioned, it fortuitously provided a useful context for that debate. Later in the year the Academic Colleagues had begun to prepare a working paper on academic dishonesty. The final version of that paper would be presented for discussion at the last meeting of the full COU council in June. Drafts of the paper that had been reviewed and discussed by the Academic Colleagues so far indicated that the paper would be important to the development of institutional policy. Given the review of the COU, there was also a working paper underway about the future role of the Academic Colleagues.

During the past year, the Academic Colleagues had met with the incoming President of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, with Richard Van Loon, the former president of Carleton University who conducted both parts of the review of the COU, and with the President of the Ontario Council of University Libraries (OCUL) to discuss the Scholars' Portal.

Professor Lang explained that, at each meeting of the Academic Colleagues, there were reports from each of the Academic Colleagues who had been assigned to a committee or task force. In 2006-2007 that had included reports from the co-chair of the Academic Colleagues, who had been a member of the search committee for a new president of the COU. Some of the items that had been discussed extensively in 2006-2007 included:

- the COU position on applicants to university graduate programs from four-year applied degree programs;
- the research agenda of the newly formed Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario;
- e-learning;
- principles that should guide revision of the Student Access Guarantee;
- the proposed Ontario "credentials framework"; and
- the upcoming review of the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies.

² Academic Colleagues Working Paper Series Volume 5 2005-06 is available on the COU website at <http://www.cou.on.ca/bin/publications/onlinePublications.cfm>. Included in this volume is a paper on Internationalizing the Curriculum (page 26-32).

5. Report of the Council of Ontario Universities (COU) Academic Colleague (cont'd)

Dean Pfeiffer commented that the COU Executive Heads had mandated an external review of the appraisal processes and operations of the Ontario Council for Graduate Studies (OCGS).³ The deadline for submissions was September 1, 2007, and the report was scheduled to be available on October 15, 2007.

Professor Goel indicated that the University was working to find the appropriate balance in its relationships with the provincial government, colleagues in Ontario universities and colleges, and international partners. The University Relations portfolio was playing a key role in this initiative.

6. Publication Policy - Revisions

The Chair explained that this *Policy* had been considered by the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs at its meeting on March 28. The policy required the approval of the Governing Council on the recommendation of the Academic Board, and it would be considered by the Council at its meeting on May 30, 2007.

Professor Sass-Kortsak explained that the proposal to update the Publication Policy was a further outcome of the broad review of all research policies led by Vice-President Challis. It also reflected the work being done to harmonize the University's policy, the Faculty of Medicine's 2006 *Guidelines on Protection of Intellectual Freedom and Publication Rights*, and the publication policies of the affiliated teaching hospitals.

Professor Sass-Kortsak highlighted the two key changes in the revised *Policy*. There was a reduction in the time research sponsors might delay publication of research results to protect their intellectual property rights. That delay would normally be 90 days, and, in exceptional circumstances, no more than six months. For research with human subjects, where disclosure of research results was necessary to protect the health of the subjects and to maintain their informed consent, a sponsor would not be able to prevent disclosure of research results to the subjects, to the study steering committee, to the relevant research ethics boards, and to regulators.

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the proposed revised *Publication Policy*, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "A", be approved, replacing the *Policy* approved by the Governing Council on February 27, 1975.

7. Copyright Policy - Revisions

The Chair explained that this *Policy* had been considered by the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs at its meeting on March 28. The policy required the approval of the Governing Council on the recommendation of the Academic Board, and it would be considered by the Council at its meeting on May 30, 2007.

Professor Sass-Kortsak informed members that a provision for review had been included in the *Copyright Policy* when it had been approved in 2002. That review had been completed as part of the broad review of research policies.

³ The Terms of Reference and Call for Submissions for the external review of OCGS are available at <http://ocgs.cou.on.ca/bin/home/review.cfm>.

7. **Copyright Policy – Revisions (cont'd)**

The only substantive change in the revised *Policy* was the enhancement of the dispute-resolution process to require the use of mediation before going to arbitration.

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the proposed revised *Copyright Policy*, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "B", be approved, replacing the *Policy* approved by the Governing Council on June 3, 2002.

8. **I'Anson Fund Terms of Reference: Rescinding**

The Chair explained that this item had been considered by the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs at its meeting on March 28. The item required the approval of the Governing Council on the recommendation of the Academic Board, and it would be considered by the Council at its meeting on May 30, 2007.

Professor Sass-Kortsak informed members that upon Mary Gertrude I'Anson's death in 1968, her estate had been bequeathed to the University, with the specification that the largest part of her bequest be used to support the medical research of the Connaught Laboratories. Following the sale of the Connaught Laboratories, the Governing Council had decided to use the endowed fund to support medical research in the tradition of that carried out by the Connaught Laboratories.

The I'Anson Fund at one time had amounted to approximately \$20-million. For many years the Connaught Committee, on behalf of the University, had awarded research grants from the I'Anson Fund. In 1999, the Governing Council had approved the use of the income from \$18-million of the Fund to provide matching funds for Chairs in the Health Sciences. With approximately \$3.25-million in the fund left to provide income for research grants, it had become unnecessary to have special terms of reference approved at the level of the Governing Council.

The income from the \$3.25-million remainder of the fund would continue to be used to support medical research, as specified in the bequest. The Connaught Committee would continue to award those grants. Administrative terms of reference for the Fund, subject to change under administrative authority, had been included for information in the documentation for this item.

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

That the Terms of Reference of the Mary Gertrude I'Anson Fund approved by Governing Council on June 6, 1988 Fund, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "C", be rescinded.

9. **School of Graduate Studies / Faculty of Medicine: Master of Science Degree Program in Community Health (M.Sc.C.H.)**

The Chair noted that this item had been considered by the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs at its meeting on March 28 and by the Planning and Budget Committee at its meeting on April 16. The program required the approval of the Governing Council on the recommendation of the Academic Board, and it would be considered by the Council at its meeting on May 30, 2007.

9. School of Graduate Studies / Faculty of Medicine: Master of Science Degree Program in Community Health (M.Sc.C.H.) (cont'd)

Professor Sass-Kortsak explained that the proposed Master of Science in Community Health degree program was intended for practising health professionals who were in, or planned to assume, teaching or leadership positions. It was a non-thesis, professional program that would not lead to doctoral studies. The program would include both course and practical work. The program would be offered in a modular format, and it would include some electronic-learning components. It would require five full-course equivalents to be completed over 12 months of full-time study. To meet the needs of practicing professionals, the program would also be available on a part-time basis. In exceptional cases, where students found they could not complete the full program, they could work to meet the requirements of a Graduate Diploma in Community Health, which would require the completion of 3.5 full-course equivalents, including all of the core courses in their field.

Professor Mock advised members that the Planning and Budget Committee had considered the proposed degree program. A member of the Committee had asked whether the program would meet a doctoral program admissions requirement if a student pursued further studies. Professor Sass-Kortsak had explained that such a decision would be made by the department to which the student subsequently applied. The proposed degree would not normally be eligible for a University of Toronto doctoral program that included completion of a thesis as an admission requirement.

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

- (a) THAT the proposed Master of Science in Community Health (M.Sc.C.H.) Program at the Faculty of Medicine, Department of Public Health Sciences, a description of which is attached hereto as Appendix "D", be approved, effective September 2007; and
- (b) THAT the proposed Graduate Diploma in Community Health (Dip.C.H.) Program at the Faculty of Medicine, Department of Public Health Sciences, be approved, effective September 2007.

10. Long Range Budget Guidelines: 2007-08 to 2011-12 and Budget 2007-08

The Chair noted that the Long Range Budget Guidelines and the 2007-08 budget had been considered by the Planning and Budget Committee at its meeting on April 16. Long Range Budget Guidelines, including the 2007-08 budget, required the approval of the Governing Council on the recommendation of the Academic Board, and would be considered by the Council at its meeting on May 30, 2007.

By means of a Powerpoint presentation, Professor Goel highlighted the following key points of the long-range budget guidelines and the 2007-08 budget.

Fiscal Context

(a) External

- Provincial funding was no longer based on Basic Income Unit (BIU) corridors. Full average funding was provided for most students. Increases in funding were increasingly provided in special purpose envelopes for specific purposes and awarded on a competitive basis.

(b) Internal

- The new budget model was intended to make costs more transparent.
- Divisions were more exposed to fluctuations in expense and revenue.
 - Changes had differential impact on divisions.

10. Long Range Budget Guidelines: 2007-08 to 2011-12 and Budget 2007-08 (cont'd)**Budget Framework****(a) Revenue****i. Provincial Grants**

- Key assumptions included:
 - no inflationary increases to grant;
 - no additional funds for quality improvements;
 - full average funding for undergraduate enrolment growth;
 - funding for graduate enrolment expansion based on divisional plans.

ii. Tuition

- Key assumptions included:
 - Tuition fee increases averaging 4.28% for domestic students and 5% for international students, in accordance with Tuition Fee Schedule approved by Governing Council on April 26, 2007.
 - Similar increases were projected for future years.

iii. Enrolment Plans

- The enrolment plans determined the bulk of projected revenue.
- Undergraduate enrolment would be reduced by 1000 over the next 5 years:
 - the number of domestic undergraduate students would decrease by 2500;
 - the number of international undergraduate students would increase by 1500.
- Graduate student enrolment would increase by 4500 over the next 5 years.
 - This increase represented a significant portion of projected revenue in the next 5 years.
 - Significant expenses were associated with graduate expansion, including graduate student support, space and library resources.
 - A key assumption of graduate enrolment expansion was the availability of sufficient external scholarship and grant support.

(b) Expense**i. Expense Projections**

- In 2007-08 expenses would include:
 - allocations to priority service areas, including the library, information technology, and facilities and services.
 - allocations to academic funds including the Academic Initiative Fund (AIF), Student Experience Fund (SEF), and Transitional Fund;
 - Increased compensation costs;
 - utilities infrastructure renewal.
- In the period 2008-09 to 2011-12, cost estimates were for modeling purposes only, pending completion of the new process for reviewing expenses.

10. Long Range Budget Guidelines: 2007-08 to 2011-12 and Budget 2007-08 (cont'd)**Budget Framework****(b) Expense****ii. Cost Bins**

- The new budget model included 12 cost bins:
 - Occupancy 25%
 - Library 18%
 - Student services/support 8%
 - University-wide general 8%
 - University-wide academic 7%
 - Pension 7%
 - Information Technology 6%
 - Advancement 5%
 - Human Resources 5%
 - Research Administration 5%
 - University Management 4%
 - Financial Management 2%

iii. Significant Expense Increases in 2007-08

- **Utility Infrastructure Reserve**
 - \$1 million would be added per year over three years and be set aside to fund renewal of the University's utility infrastructure.
- **Caretaking and Maintenance**
 - Increases in expense resulted from new space and improvements in caretaking services.
- **Increased Debt service** costs had resulted from additional capital projects, including the Varsity Centre, Multi-faith Centre, and the St. George Exam Centre.
- Spending on **Library services and acquisitions** was being increased;
- The re-establishment of the **University Relations** portfolio and related communications and advertising allocations had resulted in increased expense.

Budget Impact in 2007-08

- The projected increased revenue (\$40.2 million) less the sum of the projected increased expense (\$31.1 million) and the projected increase in compensation costs for academic divisions (\$26.3 million) had resulted in a shortfall of \$17.3 million, or 3% under the old budget model.
 - In order to balance the budget, cost containment measures totaling \$17.3 million must be found.
 - Under the new budget model, divisions would identify appropriate cost containment measures, while \$4 million would be absorbed by the administrative service divisions.

10. Long Range Budget Guidelines: 2007-08 to 2011-12 and Budget 2007-08 (cont'd)**Long-Range Budget Guidelines Cycle**

- A new budget cycle from 2007-08 to 2011-12 was being proposed to:
 - facilitate the implementation of the new budget model;
 - help to address the \$80 million accumulated deficit, which was \$15 million greater than had been anticipated for 2006-07 in the previous budget cycle;
 - annual payments of \$11.5 million would be made to reduce the accumulated deficit to 1.5% of gross revenue at the end of the budget cycle, as required by Governing Council policy.
 - provide flexibility in dealing with the significant uncertainties of revenue and expense over the next few years.
- Each year of the proposed new budget cycle would have a balanced budget.

2007 Federal and Provincial Budgets

- Highlights of the March 19, 2007 federal budget relating to post-secondary education included:
 - An \$800 million increase to the post-secondary education (PSE) transfer beginning in 2008-09;
 - \$85 million new funding for research plus \$15 million for indirect costs;
 - 1,000 new graduate scholarships;
 - \$70 million per year for five years for the Canada Foundation for Innovation (CFI).
- The provincial government was providing one-time-only (OTO) funds of \$40 million to the University from the province's 2007-08 budget to address cost pressures faced by the University.
 - These funds were regarded as an in-year transfer and did not address on-going base funding issues;
 - Academic divisions could apply these funds in a manner most appropriate to their needs.

Advocacy Efforts

- The University's advocacy efforts were focused on the following issues:
 - Allocation of post-secondary education transfer;
 - Federal funding of indirect costs of research;
 - Graduate scholarships;
 - Per student funding for quality enhancements;
 - Infrastructure.

Conclusion

- The budget context continued to be a period of significant uncertainty.
- Expenses continued to grow faster than revenues.
- Without additional unrestricted revenue, the outer years of the budget cycle would require even greater cost containment.
- The proposed budget framework was fiscally prudent.
- The new budget model created a framework for more informed decision making based on academic priorities, and provided incentives to generate revenue and contain costs.

Professor Mock informed members that Professor Goel had provided to the Planning and Budget Committee a similar detailed briefing on the highlights of the Long Range Budget Guidelines and the 2007-08 Budget. The Committee had thoroughly discussed the Long-range budget guidelines, and the following points had been raised.

10. Long Range Budget Guidelines: 2007-08 to 2011-12 and Budget 2007-08 (cont'd)

- A member had asked whether divisions would be able to support anticipated costs associated with graduate expansion without incurring a deficit.
 - Professor Goel had replied that while there were associated costs, some expenses were fixed and would not vary with changed enrolment. However, continued advocacy for enhanced graduate student funding was critical.
- Members had praised the transparency of the new budget model, but had suggested that the detailed information could lead to disagreements over University-wide costs.
 - Professor Goel had commented that, with the new model, there was now a focus on all costs and clear processes for deliberation on the different services.
- A member had observed that some of the flexibility to reallocate funds seemed to have been lost with the new budget model.
 - Professor Zaky had explained that the University Fund Reference Level would assist in maintaining the historical integrity of divisional budgets, avoiding sudden changes during the transition. This would serve to ensure academic priorities would drive allocations.
- A member had asked how the cost containment measures for the service divisions had been generated.
 - Professor Goel had explained that the cost-containment measures had been assigned for 2007-08 following consultations with an ad hoc committee. Year-over-year increases and across-the-board reductions had been applied.
- A member had asked whether the budgets of the federated universities had been included in the Budget.
 - Professor Goel had indicated that the Federated Colleges Block Grant of \$10 million had been included in the Contractual Obligations and Policy Commitments (COPC) list. As the federated universities had their own budgets, creating a consolidated budget would be a complex task.

Discussion

A member asked whether a gap between divisions with many available resources and those with limited resources was emerging, given the differential impact of the budget on divisions. Professor Goel replied that the new budget model provided a better understanding of inter-divisional variability, and contingency funds were available to assist divisions that had limited resources.

A member asked whether larger class sizes would result from cost containment measures. Professor Goel replied that cost containment measures could have results other than increased class size, including the slowing down of capital projects, and reduction of OTO expenses. However, if such measures were sustained over time, there would inevitably be an impact in the classroom.

A member noted the reduction in the real value of the provincial operating grant that had resulted from the fact that the amount of the grant had not been increased to cover inflation for several years.

10. Long Range Budget Guidelines: 2007-08 to 2011-12 and Budget 2007-08 (cont'd)

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the “University of Toronto Long Range Budget Guidelines: 2007-08 to 2011-12”, dated April 16, 2007, including the 2007-08 Budget, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix “E”, be approved.

11. Items for Information

(a) Employment Equity Report 2006

The Board received the report for information. No questions were raised.

(b) Report Number 129 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs (March 28, 2007)

The Board received the report for information. No questions were raised.

(c) Report Number 118 of the Planning and Budget Committee (March 6, 2007)

The Board received the report for information. No questions were raised.

(d) Status Changes: Tenure and Promotion

The Board received the report for information. No questions were raised.

12. Date of Next Meeting

The Chair reminded members that the final meeting of the Board for the current governance year was scheduled for Monday, June 4, 2007 at **1:00 p.m.**

13. Other Business

Members did not raise any items of other business.

The Board moved *in camera*

14. Appointment of University Professors

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT Professor Brad Inwood and Professor Dwayne Miller be appointed as University Professors, effective July 1, 2007.

15. President's Teaching Award Recipients

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT Professor Marion Bogo, Professor David Dunne, Senior Lecturer Corey Goldman, Professor Susan McCahan, and Senior Lecturer Judith Poë receive the President's Teaching Award for 2006-07.

16. Appointment of the Secretary of the University Tribunal

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT Ms Nancy Smart be appointed Secretary of the University Tribunal effective immediately.

17. Report of Striking Committee

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the President's Academic Colleagues on COU for 2007-2008 be:

Professor D. Lang, OISE/UT
Professor P. Thompson, IHPST (Philosophy) (alternate)

The meeting adjourned at 5:55 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

May 28, 2007