

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO  
**THE GOVERNING COUNCIL**

**Monday, November 1, 2004**

MINUTES OF THE GOVERNING COUNCIL meeting held on Monday,  
November 1, 2004 at 4:30 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall.

Present:

Ms Rose M. Patten (In the Chair)  
The Honourable Frank Iacobucci, Interim  
President

Ms Holly Andrews-Taylor  
Professor Mary Beattie  
Dr. Robert M. Bennett  
Professor Philip H. Byer  
Professor Pamela Catton  
Dr. John R. G. Challis  
Mr. Shaun Chen  
Mr. P.C. Choo  
Professor Brian Corman  
Professor W. Raymond Cummins  
Mr. Brian Davis  
Dr. Claude S. Davis  
The Honourable William G. Davis  
Dr. Alice Dong  
Ms Susan Eng  
Professor Vivek Goel  
Dr. Gerald Halbert  
Ms Shaila R. Kibria  
Dr. Joel A. Kirsh  
Ms Françoise Dulcinea Ko  
Mr. Ari David Kopolovic  
Mr. Joseph Mapa  
Professor Michael R. Marrus

Professor Ian R. McDonald  
Mr. George E. Myhal  
Mr. Stefan A. Neata  
Dr. John P. Nestor  
Ms Jacqueline C. Orange  
Mr. Andrew Pinto  
Mr. Timothy Reid  
Ms Marvi H. Ricker  
Professor Arthur S. Ripstein  
Professor Barbara Sherwood Lollar  
Mr. Stephen C. Smith  
Miss Maureen J. Somerville  
Ms Oriel Varga  
Professor John Wedge  
Mr. Robert S. Weiss  
  
Mr. Louis R. Charpentier,  
Secretary of the Governing Council

Secretariat:

Mr. Neil Dobbs  
Ms Cristina Oke

Absent:

Dr. Shari Graham Fell  
Dr. Paul V. Godfrey  
Mr. Richard Nunn  
Mr. John F. (Jack) Petch

Professor Jake J. Thiessen  
The Honourable David R. Peterson  
The Honourable Vivienne Poy  
Mr. W. David Wilson

In Attendance:

Dr. Jon Dellandrea, Vice-President and Chief Advancement Officer  
Professor Angela Hildyard, Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity  
Professor Ian Orchard, Vice-President and Principal, University of Toronto at Mississauga  
Ms Catherine Riggall, Interim Vice-President, Business Affairs  
Professor Carolyn Tuohy, Vice-President, Government and Institutional Relations  
Dr. Beata Fitzpatrick, Assistant Vice-President and Director, Office of the President

In Attendance (cont'd):

Professor Edith Hillan, Vice-Provost, Academic  
Professor Ronald Venter, Vice-Provost, Space and Facilities Planning  
Professor Safwat Zaky, Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget  
Professor Rona Abramovitch, Director, Transitional Year Program, and Provost's  
Advisor on Outreach and Access  
Mr. John Bisanti, Chief Capital Projects Officer  
Mr. Brian Burchell, President, University of Toronto Alumni Association  
Mr. Andrew Drummond, Assistant Secretary of the Governing Council  
Ms Sheree Drummond, Assistant Provost  
Ms Liz Finney, Director of Government Liaison, Offices of the Vice-President, Government  
and Institutional Relations, and the Vice-President, Research and Associate Provost  
Ms Connie Guberman, Status of Women Officer  
Professor George Luste, President, University of Toronto Faculty Association  
Ms Bryn MacPherson-White, Director of University Events and Presidential Liaison  
(Advancement)  
Ms Margaret McKone, Administrative Manager, Office of the Governing Council  
Mr. David Melville, Secretary, Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students  
Mr. Sam Rahimi, Vice-President, External, Students' Administrative Council  
Ms Christina Sass-Kortsak, Assistant Vice-President, Human Resources  
Mr. Mahadeo Sukhai, President, Graduate Students' Union  
Mr. Howard Tam, Vice-President, University Affairs, Students' Administrative Council

## **1. Chair's Remarks**

### **(a) Welcome**

The Chair welcomed members and guests to the meeting. She announced that she would call a five-minute recess at 5:10 pm, to accommodate the breaking of the Ramadan fast.

### **(b) Update on Presidential Search**

The Chair stated that, as part of her commitment to keeping the University community appropriately informed, she would provide regular updates on the Presidential Search at meetings of the Governing Council.

The Chair reported that the Presidential Search Committee had met three times. Each member of the Committee had signed an acknowledgement and affirmation of commitment to the *Policy Respecting the Appointment of a President* and to the Charter of Expectations.<sup>1</sup> The Committee was in the process of selecting a consultant to assist it with its work.

The Chair reminded members that, as the initial step in the consultation phase of the search, a formal call for input and advice on the position of President had been issued to the University Community on October 29, 2004. The Committee would also be holding three town hall meetings – one on each of the three campuses – as well as meeting with various groups of faculty, staff and students. The Chair emphasized that the Committee welcomed input and encouraged written submissions at any time.

---

<sup>1</sup> The documents are available on the Governing Council web-site at <http://www.utoronto.ca/govcncl/pap/policies/appres.html> and <http://www.utoronto.ca/govcncl/expectations.html>

**1. Chair's Remarks (cont'd)****(c) Audio web-cast**

The Chair reminded members that the meeting was being broadcast on the web. She asked any guests who were invited to speak during the meeting to use a standing microphone so that their comments could be heard by those listening to the audio web cast.

**2. Minutes of the Previous Meeting: September 23, 2004**

A member reiterated her request to have the remarks that she had made at the end of the *in camera* portion of the meeting reported in the minutes of the August 16 meeting. The Chair repeated her ruling that the comments were included in the *in camera* minutes of August 16, and would not be included in the minutes of the open session of that meeting.

The minutes of the meeting held on September 23, 2004 were approved.

**3. Business Arising****(a) Notice of Motion**

The Chair explained that there had been one item of business arising from the previous meeting: a notice of motion had been given. The Executive Committee had considered this notice of motion and had decided that the motion not be placed on the agenda of the Governing Council meeting. The discussion concerning the notice of motion was included on pages 3 and 4 of Report 381 of the Executive Committee.

The Chair noted that a written communication from the Student Caucus of the Department of Sociology and Equity Studies in Education at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto (OISE/UT) concerning the notice of motion had been distributed to members on October 28.

The member who had brought forward the notice of motion expressed her disappointment that the motion had not come forward to the meeting. In her view, it was a critical time during which the University needed to work proactively with the community to gain support for increased public funding of universities. The Chair reminded the member that the Executive Committee had recognized that the spirit of the motion was understandable, but that the direction to the administration was not appropriate.

**4. Report of the President**

The President reported on some of the administration's initiatives with the provincial and federal governments.

**(a) Provincial Government**

The President reminded members that, at the previous meeting of the Governing Council, he had reported the University's concern that the Ontario Innovation Trust (OIT) would not continue to be funded. He was very pleased to report that, at a recent Ontario Chamber of Commerce Economic Summit, the Premier had announced funding of \$300 million over the next four years for equipment and other research infrastructure. This amount would be matched by \$450 million from the federal government and other partners.

**4 Report of the President (cont'd)****(a) Provincial Government (cont'd)**

The President explained that, although the OIT was being discontinued, the provincial government had proposed the creation of the Ontario Research Fund (ORF) to distribute funding for research. This Fund would combine the OIT with several other provincial funds in support of research. University Vice-Presidents of Research, including Professor Challis, were working with the Ministry to develop the terms of the ORF. However, one concern about the ORF was that it not be limited to supporting only research that could be linked to commercialization.

The President indicated that members of the senior administration had written to the Premier, to the Honourable Joe Cordiano, Minister of Economic Development and Trade, and to the Honourable Mary Anne Chambers, Minister of Training, Colleges, and Universities, to express their gratitude for the continuation of funding for research. Researchers in the University were being encouraged to write to the Premier and to the Ministers to explain the impact that the funding would have on research.

The President also informed members that he and Professor Tuohy had met with Minister Chambers and had had a full discussion on a variety of issues.

**(b) Federal Government**

The President reported that the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC) had held its fall meeting in Ottawa during the week of October 25. A major challenge for universities was to ensure that the federal government maintained the priority and support that it had given in the past to University research. Three federal government officials had met with the AUCC. The Honourable David Emerson, Minister of Industry, had met with the AUCC Board, while the Honourable Joe Volpe, Minister of Human Resources and Skills Development, had given a lunch time address to AUCC members. Mr. Art Carty, the National Science Advisor, had also spoken to the AUCC.

The President also reported on his meetings with the Honourable Ujjal Dosanjh, Minister of Health, Dr. Ian Green, Deputy Minister of Health, and Mr. Alex Himelfarb, Clerk of the Privy Council. The President had conveyed to Dr. Green the University's concerns for the Canadian Institutes for Health Research (CIHR), career scientists awards, Canada Research Chairs, and related initiatives, and expressed the need to ensure that all the initiatives were taken together coherently to create a comprehensive strategy.

The President indicated that he had learned from the meetings he had described that research was a priority of the federal government, as reflected in the Throne Speech, and that there was a need to structure the various research instruments coherently. Issues of evaluation and performance assessment were being raised to determine how effective the research initiatives had been. A review of federal spending in all portfolios was now underway. The challenge for the future would be how to maintain the momentum of research funding in light of competing claims on federal expenditures.

**5. School of Graduate Studies: Proposed new One-year Master's Degree in Environmental Science (M.Env.Sc.)**

Professor Cummins stated that members of the Academic Board had been informed that this would be the first graduate program offered at the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC). At the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs, the discussion about the proposed degree program had been positive. The Planning and Budget Committee had revised the motion to include the sources of funding for the program.

**5. School of Graduate Studies: Proposed new one-year Master's Degree in Environmental Science (M.Env.Sc.) (cont'd)**

At the Academic Board, questions had been raised concerning the consultation process, and accessibility to the program, since guaranteed funding for graduate students did not apply to professional master's programs.

A member asked whether the proposed program would compete with any other programs in the province. Professor Goel replied that the University of Waterloo offered a Master's degree in Environmental Science. A member commented that the program was campus-based, and UTSC would provide synergies that would support the program. Another member noted that many students were interested in the environment, and were enrolled in programs in Environmental Studies, Environmental Science, and Environmental Engineering. In addition to classroom programs, students wanted to experience opportunities for influencing environmental change. The member suggested that the University should be at the leading edge of the study of environmental change.

A member expressed her concern that the surveys undertaken during the program's development were oriented towards the market and industry. She asked what would be done to make sure that the program was broadly focused, and that it was accessible to all students who wished to pursue it. Professor Goel replied that consultations during the development of the program involved all sectors, including not-for-profit organizations. He also stated that student financial aid would be provided by UTSC to ensure accessibility.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT the proposed Master's degree program in Environmental Science (M.Env.Sc.) at the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC), a copy of which is attached to Report Number 129 of the Academic Board as Appendix "A", be approved. This program will be supported by resources from UTSC and by a share of enrolment growth revenue.

**6. Capital Project: Terrence Donnelly Centre for Cellular and Bio-Molecular Research (CCBR): Project Planning Report - Update**

Professor Cummins observed that members of the Academic Board had been informed that this project had been approved in 2001 at a planned cost of \$85.1 million. This amount had allowed five floors to be shelled-in but not completed. Recently, additional funding had been received which allowed the five floors to be finished before the construction was completed in June 2005. The cost to complete the project was now \$96.6 million, rather than the \$105 million total estimated cost in 2001.

Ms Orange explained that, subject to Council's approval of the motion on the floor, the Business Board had approved the spending of \$96.6-million to complete this project. The Business Board had received this proposal as good news. The cost of completing the full project – including the shelled-in floors and an enhanced atrium - was \$8.4-million less than the original estimate. The saving was the outcome of four factors: first, completing the project in one phase rather than two; second, the reduced cost of long-term borrowing resulting from the enhancement of the Donnelly donation; third, escalation in construction costs that was lower than originally estimated; and fourth, the excellent work that had been done by Professor Ron Venter, Vice-Provost, Space and Facilities Planning, Mr. John Bisanti, Chief Capital Projects Officer, and their colleagues in controlling costs.

**6. Capital Project: Terrence Donnelly Centre for Cellular and Bio-Molecular Research (CCBR): Project Planning Report – Update (cont'd)**

A member asked how the cost of this project fit into the University's borrowing capacity, and what the impact of this project would be on other projects. Ms Orange replied that the \$8 million of short-term financing required for this project was well within the borrowing range of the University.

A member expressed his delight that the building would be opening with all floors completed and operational. He noted that the partnerships that the University had created within the health sciences had placed the University in an excellent strategic position.

A member spoke against the motion. In her view, it was inappropriate to spend \$96 million on a new building when older buildings were crumbling. The member stated that she would like the University to conduct a full ethical review of corporate funding. In her view, the area of cellular and biomolecular research was of particular concern because of the involvement of large corporations. Professor Goel replied that the funding sources for the project were outlined in the motion, and none of the funding was from corporate sources. More important, the facility would enable scientists with academic freedom to pursue and disseminate research in cellular and biomolecular medicine.

A member asked how this project fit into the growing demands of deferred maintenance at the University. Professor Goel replied that external funding for this project would accommodate existing faculty and graduate students and free up older space for renovation.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

1. THAT the Users' Committee Report [currently referred to as the Project Planning Report] for the Terrence Donnelly Centre for Cellular and Bio-Molecular Research previously approved in February 2001 be fully implemented to complete the atrium and the five shelled-in floors and make them fully operational.
2. THAT the Terrence Donnelly Centre for Cellular and Bio-Molecular Research be completed at a cost of \$96,600,000 with funding sources as follows:
  - a. \$30,800,000 from the Canada Foundation for Innovation [CFI]
  - b. \$30,000,000 from the Ontario Innovation Trust [OIT],
  - c. \$ 2,000,000 from the I'Anson Fund,
  - d. \$ 2,800,000 from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund,
  - e. \$ 1,275,000 from the interest on funds received,
  - f. \$11,500,000 contribution from Terrence Donnelly,
  - g. \$ 4,522,000 Matching from the McLaughlin Fund [OIT/ U of T]
  - h. \$ 2,500,000 Faculty of Medicine cash contribution
  - i. A mortgage in the amount of \$11,203,000 to be amortized over 20-25 years and to be repaid by collective contributions from the Faculty of Medicine, Leslie Dan Faculty of Pharmacy and the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering through Ph.D. enrolments and/or the operating budgets of these Faculties.

The Chair called a five-minute recess to accommodate the breaking of the daily fast for Ramadan.

**7. *Ontarians with Disabilities Act: University of Toronto Accessibility Plan, 2004-05***

Professor Cummins noted that each University was required to file an annual accessibility plan with the provincial government. He informed members that highlights of the University's 2004-05 plan had been presented to the Planning and Budget Committee and to the Academic Board, as well as to the Business Board and University Affairs Board. At the Academic Board, questions had been raised concerning the sustainability of initiatives, increased focus on issues of mental health, and the variety of ways in which the needs of individuals could be accommodated.

Dr. Bennett commented that, because of its responsibility for "equity issues and initiatives," the University Affairs Board had also reviewed the plan. The Board's response had been very favourable. Members had praised the level of consultation with student groups and had praised the new Student Centre at the University of Toronto at Scarborough as a model of accessibility. The Board had received additional information on the University's work to accommodate students with mental illness and learning disabilities.

Ms Orange observed that, since the Business Board was responsible for personnel matters with respect to administrative staff, it had also received a very helpful presentation on the Plan from Professor Angela Hildyard. The Business Board had been pleased to learn from Professor Hildyard that people with disabilities had been participating in the process and that they were satisfied that their concerns were being heard and their issues dealt with, to the best of the University's ability.

A member congratulated Professor Hildyard and her team for the way in which the University's plan celebrated inclusion.

A member remarked that many University buildings were still not accessible. The Plan did not include any financial commitments to address accessibility. In her view, it was important for students to have a way of raising their concerns about accessibility, and also important to involve community groups in the discussion of accessibility issues. A member replied that she had been a member of the Ontarians with Disabilities Act (ODA) committee, and she could assure the member that there had been consultation with students, faculty, staff and community groups in the development of the plan.

A member complimented Professor Hildyard on the Plan, and asked if dollar amounts could be included in the 2005-06 report.

A member commented that funding for capital projects involving renovations for purposes of accessibility came through the Accommodation Facilities Directorate (AFD). Professor Goel noted that all newly constructed buildings at the University were designed to include accessibility features and offered facilities that replaced those that were non-accessible. Invited to speak, Professor Venter described a number of projects that were underway, including the ramp at University College, the Lash Miller garden, and the renovation of the building housing the Department of Economics. He also indicated that the Awards and Admissions building was being examined for ways in which it could be made accessible.

7. ***Ontarians with Disabilities Act: University of Toronto Accessibility Plan, 2004-05*** (cont'd)

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT the *Ontarians with Disabilities Act: University of Toronto Accessibility Plan 2004-2005*, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 129 of the Academic Board as Appendix "B", be approved in principle.

8. **Policy: Statement of Commitment Regarding Persons with Disabilities**

Dr. Bennett explained that one of the initiatives identified in the Accessibility Plan was the proposed Statement of Commitment Regarding Persons with Disabilities. The Statement would replace an out-of-date Policy approved in 1987, which referred to an office that no longer existed.

The preparation of the Statement had begun with a study of best practices internationally. It was the outcome of the work of a broadly representative, forty-member committee, which had included people with professional expertise and people with disabilities. That Committee had consulted widely.

The Statement set out a broad vision and the means of achieving it. Goals included:

- establishment of a climate of understanding and mutual respect;
- support and accommodation of individuals with disabilities so that all could share the same level of access to opportunities;
- elimination or minimization of the adverse effects of barriers, including physical, environmental, attitudinal, communication and technological barriers;
- provision of information and education regarding disability and the University's policies on disability to all members of the University community.
- at the same time, protection of the individuals' privacy, confidentiality and autonomy.

The University would assist individuals with disabilities to satisfy the essential requirements of their programs of studies or employment. Where necessary, it would provide reasonable accommodations to enable them to do so.

The University Affairs Board had been assured that it would have the opportunity to monitor the implementation of the proposed Statement both through its annual review of the Accessibility Plan and through the annual report of the equity offices. Dr. Bennett invited members to attend the November 9 meeting of the University Affairs Board at which the reports of the University's equity offices would be presented.

A member spoke in support of the motion. She stated that it was important to stay in touch with disabled members of the community and to review policies on a regular basis.

At the invitation of the Chair, Professor Hildyard drew to the attention of members the posters that had been distributed to members. The posters featured students who had self-identified as disabled, and who had achieved remarkable accomplishments.

**8. Policy: Statement of Commitment Regarding Persons with Disabilities (cont'd)**

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT the proposed Statement of Commitment Regarding Persons with Disabilities, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 123 of the University Affairs Board as Appendix "B" be approved, replacing the Services to Disabled Persons Policy approved by the Committee on Campus and Community Affairs on December 9, 1987.

**9. University of Toronto Response to the Postsecondary Review (*Rae Review*)**

**Introduction**

The President observed that the Postsecondary Review (Rae Review) was the opportunity of a generation. The Honourable Bob Rae had not exaggerated the seriousness of the situation of postsecondary education in Ontario. The University had an important role to play in being part of a consensus with its sister universities while, at the same time, being effective in advancing the interest of the University.

The President acknowledged the response of the University community in helping to develop the response to the Rae Review. The administration was grateful for the input received at the three Town Halls that were held – one on the St. George campus, one at the University of Toronto at Mississauga and one at the University of Toronto at Scarborough. The President expressed his hope that the University would be able to engender a wide base of support for the position taken by the University.

**Presentation**

Professor Tuohy highlighted the key points of the draft outline of the University of Toronto's submission to the Rae Review. The following points were made in the presentation.

**(a) Background**

- (i) Higher education in Ontario was in serious jeopardy**
- Postsecondary education in Ontario was on the edge of choice between steady decline and great improvement.
  - Financial gridlock could not continue: a more productive formula based on public transfers, donor generosity and reasonable tuition fees was needed.
  - Government student aid was "broken".
  - One size would not fit all: each institution needed the autonomy to chart its course in the context of a coordinated and well-governed system.
- (ii) University of Toronto's consistent position:**
- Public funding for postsecondary education in Ontario should be at least at the national average.
  - Tuition fees, coupled with a financial aid guarantee, should be set by the Governing Council.
  - The mission and roles of postsecondary institutions should be differentiated:
    - the historic and distinctive mission and role of the University of Toronto should be recognized.
  - The needs of Ontario's research-intensive universities should be recognized.

**9. University of Toronto Response to the Postsecondary Review (*Rae Review*)(cont'd)****Presentation (cont'd)****(a) Background (cont'd)****(iii) University of Toronto's Policies****1. Tuition fees**

- **Assumptions:**
  - The tuition fees policy should reflect the mission of the University;
  - The principal funding support of public universities should come from the provincial and federal governments.
  - Student financial aid programs should be in place to maintain accessibility.
  - The tuition fee policy should be neutral with regard to enrolment levels.
- **Key elements:**
  - Advocacy
    - The University is to continue to advocate ongoing and substantial public investment in the university sector.
  - Fee Revenue
    - Tuition fee revenue is to be supplemental to public funding as necessary to attain a high quality standard.
  - Fee Differentiation
    - Tuition fees are to be differentiated across programs
  - Fee level commitment
    - The tuition fee level is to include a guarantee to each student upon entry as to the level of fees to be charged over the normal course of the full-time program of study.
  - Monitoring
    - The annual Report on Enrolment is to include commentary regarding the effects, if any, of changes in tuition fees upon changes in enrolment.

**2. Student Financial Aid**

- **Principle:**
  - 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.
- **Key elements:**
  - The Ontario Student Assistance Plan (OSAP) provides the first tier of student financial aid.
  - The University of Toronto meets need not met by OSAP through grants (first-entry programs) or a mix of grants and loans (second-entry programs).
  - The funding guarantee for doctoral-stream students is tuition plus minimum stipend.
  - Specific financial assistance is provided for part-time students and students with special needs.
  - An annual report on student financial aid is presented for information by the Vice-Provost, Students, to the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs.

## 9. University of Toronto Response to the Postsecondary Review (*Rae Review*)(cont'd)

### Presentation (cont'd)

#### (b) University of Toronto Submission Outline

##### (i) Introduction

- Postsecondary education in Ontario was a system in serious jeopardy.
  - Funding for research and for enrolment expansion had masked an underlying downward slide in operating funds per student;
  - Students and society as a whole needed and deserved better.
- The University of Toronto could play a leadership role in charting the course of improvement.
- The Rae Review had to make a difference.
  - There had been eight provincial reviews of postsecondary education between 1966 and 2001.
    - Their recommendations for increased investment had been similar, but funding continued to decline.
- Individuals and society benefited when universities were strong.
  - Universities were:
    - Portals of access to opportunity
    - Engines of economic growth and prosperity
    - Custodians and creators of cultural wealth
    - Contributors to building cities and communities
- Investing in postsecondary education was a matter of intergenerational equity.

##### (ii) Foundational Principles

###### 1. Objectives:

- Access to Quality
- Student Success
- Public Good

###### 2. System Design to achieve objectives:

- Distinctive and complementary institutional roles
- Institutional responsibility and accountability
- Sustainability

##### (iii) The Five Questions Asked by the Rae Review

###### 1. How could participation and success in higher education be increased?

#### University of Toronto's Experience

- The University provided an avenue of access for students to education at a major teaching and research university
- The University ensured that each entering student knew:
  - The maximum tuition costs for each year of the normal length of their program;
  - The student's financial need as assessed by the government's OSAP program, and:
  - The amount of that need that would be met by OSAP;

## 9. University of Toronto Response to the Postsecondary Review (*Rae Review*)(cont'd)

### Presentation (cont'd)

#### (b) University of Toronto Submission Outline (cont'd)

- The remaining unmet need, which would be fully covered by a University of Toronto grant (for first-entry students) or a mix of grant and loan (for second-entry students)

#### University of Toronto's Advice

- *reform the current governmental system of student financial aid to:*
  - simplify and streamline the currently complex system
  - extend eligibility to a broader income range
  - up-date needs assessment criteria
  - address the issue of post-graduation student debt through a repayment/relief mechanism related to income
- *expand university access and outreach programs to deal with non-financial barriers.*

## 2. How could the quality of higher education be improved?

#### University of Toronto's Experience

- The three spheres of university education were:
  - First-entry undergraduate
  - Second-entry undergraduate/ professional
  - Graduate
- Each had a different catchment, placement, pedagogy; and program peers
- The mission and identity of each university was defined by its mix of these three worlds and the intersections among them

#### Student Experience

- The fundamental marker of quality across all spheres was student:faculty ratio, which translated into student experience: exchange with faculty, writing assignments, small group discussion, etc.

#### Graduate/Professional Education and Research

- Under-investment in graduate education was a fundamental problem in Ontario, felt most keenly at the University of Toronto
  - Operating funding for graduate enrolment had been capped since 2001-02
  - Ontario lagged behind peer jurisdictions in the number of graduate degrees per 1,000 population
  - Ontario faced an imminent demand for graduate education from the double cohort
- The University of Toronto offered the broadest scope of professional programs and was the largest contributor of health professionals in the province.
- The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto (OISE/UT) was a major resource to educational system.
- Leadership in the professions required connection to the underlying research base, as well as the ability to make cross-professional and cross-disciplinary links

## 9. University of Toronto Response to the Postsecondary Review (*Rae Review*)(cont'd)

### Presentation (cont'd)

#### (b) University of Toronto Submission Outline (cont'd)

##### International perspective

- International experience for students was limited due to funding constraints
- International students received no funding from the government and faced work restrictions
- Recruitment activities were limited

##### University of Toronto's Advice

- *The ratio of students to professors at the University of Toronto should be improved by more than 25 percent.*
- *Each graduating student at U of T should have had an appropriately balanced mix of seminar- and lecture-based formats through his or her program of study*
- *Graduate education must be concentrated in centres of research and scholarship.*
- *The current cap on graduate enrolment must be immediately lifted.*
- *Providing students with international experience should be taken into account in resource allocation.*
- *The policy framework for postsecondary education in Ontario should encourage the participation of international students.*

### 3. How could it be ensured that postsecondary institutions constituted a coherent, coordinated system to meet Ontario's goals for higher education?

#### University of Toronto's Experience

##### College-university interface

- University of Toronto had several successful initiatives with joint programs:
  - University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM)
    - Sheridan: Art & Art History; Drama Studies; Communication, Culture and Information Technology (CCIT)
  - University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC)
    - Centennial: Journalism; New Media; Paramedicine; Environmental Science and Technology
  - University of Toronto, St. George campus
    - Michener Institute: Radiation Science
- Intersection of first-entry, second-entry and graduate education "One size does not fit all:"
  - Internationally, graduate education and research were concentrated in centres of excellence.
  - Professional education benefited from linkage to research base.
  - First-entry education had a distinctive character in research-intensive universities.

##### University of Toronto's Advice

- *The funding framework for postsecondary education should encourage, not discourage the establishment of joint university-college programs in areas of complementary strength.*
- *The University of Toronto was prepared to play a leading role in developing a new approach to credit transfer.*

**9. University of Toronto Response to the Postsecondary Review (*Rae Review*)(cont'd)****Presentation (cont'd)****(b) University of Toronto Submission Outline (cont'd)**

- *The overall financial and regulatory framework should respect and promote differences in institutional missions, and encourage collaboration and coordination.*

**4. How could higher education be funded to ensure opportunity and excellence?****University of Toronto's Experience**

- The University of Toronto's per-student grant in 2003/04, adjusted for inflation, was about two-thirds of what it was in 1992/93.
- Grant and tuition revenue per FTE student was 14.5% lower
- Total revenue per FTE student was 8.1% lower
- Deferred maintenance costs stood at \$315 million
- External borrowing had risen to more than \$415 million

**University of Toronto's Advice*****Tuition Fees and Financial Aid***

- *Tuition fee levels should be differentiated across spheres of higher education and across institutions.*
- *Tuition fees should be set within a stable, multi-year framework of mutual obligations, which was best done at the level of the governing bodies of universities themselves, within an overall framework of accountability for ensuring access.*
- *The reform of government student aid was essential.*
- *The Ontario Student Opportunity Trust Fund (OSOTF) program or one modeled on its principles should be maintained and enhanced.*

***Research***

- *Existing programs should be enhanced as they were consolidated within the new Ontario Research Fund. The full funding of the costs of research must continue to be a priority.*
- *Special recognition needed to be given to the importance of flagship resources such as the University of Toronto Library.*

***Physical Plant***

- *Bridging the gap in operating funding for Ontario universities had to include, as a corollary, provision of the funding necessary to build and maintain the accompanying physical plant.*

***Paying for Results***

- *One possible model would be a multi-year funding agreement with agreed-upon measures of performance in areas such as accessibility, quality of the learning environment, student success and research performance.*

**5. Were the right structures in place to know that the system was achieving the results that were wanted?****University of Toronto's Experience**

- The locus of accountability was Governing Council.
- Annual accountability reports from all portfolios were submitted to the Governing Council and/or its Boards and Committees.

**9. University of Toronto Response to the Postsecondary Review (*Rae Review*)(cont'd)****Presentation (cont'd)****(b) University of Toronto Submission Outline (cont'd)**

- The Governing Council received an annual *Performance Indicators for Governance* report.

**University of Toronto's Advice**

- *The appropriate locus of responsibility and accountability was the governing structure of each university.*
- *A body at the provincial level with a mandate for research and analysis could be considered.*

**External Speaker**

The Chair invited Mr. Sam Rahimi, Vice-President, External of the Students' Administrative Council (SAC) to address Council. Mr. Rahimi stated that SAC agreed with the principle of increasing provincial funding of post-secondary education to at least the national average. However, SAC did not agree with the University's support of deregulated tuition fees set by the Governing Council. Mr. Rahimi noted that tuition at the Faculty of Law had risen from \$3,808 in 1997 to \$16,000 in 2003-04.

Mr. Rahimi expressed SAC's opposition to income-contingent loan repayment programs (ICLRP), and requested that the University include in its submission a statement opposing such programs. It was SAC's position that ICLRP were inherently inequitable, because lower-income graduates would pay more in interest as their loans would be amortized over a longer period than those of graduates who received higher salaries. It was also SAC's position that, when tuition fees increased, accessibility declined. Mr. Rahimi encouraged members to read the SAC Submission to the Rae Review, which he had circulated to members at the meeting. He asked members to vote against the motion to accept the principles in the University's submission.

**Discussion**

A member suggested including measures of quality that might be used in addition to student/faculty ratio and class size. The measures included the number of award-winning faculty, the access of students to those faculty members, and the quality of students produced. The member requested that the submission showcase more ideas from the University and include more examples of current University practice and initiatives in response to the questions presented by the Rae Review.

A member thanked all those who had worked on the draft submission. He drew the attention of members to the section on student debt on page 7 of the University's context paper, and requested that the wording regarding student debt be strengthened. He expressed his concern about the influence of corporate donors on the University's research agenda, particularly in medicine. The member encouraged the administration to push the government towards better public funding of postsecondary education.

A member indicated that he would like the University's submission to be more specific when responding to such questions as who should pay for postsecondary education, what defines the quality of postsecondary education, and what constitutes the relationship of the University of Toronto towards other postsecondary institutions. He was concerned that a lack of specific recommendations would give the Rae Review a degree of latitude in its interpretation of the University's submission.

**9. University of Toronto Response to the Postsecondary Review (*Rae Review*)(cont'd)****Discussion (cont'd)**

A member suggested that the University's submission should propose creative and innovative recommendations concerning funding, and should include the views of those who opposed tuition increases.

A member expressed his support of earlier comments requesting more specific details and examples to be included in the submission. He noted that the Governing Council had developed sophisticated accountability measures, and suggested that the submission include a description of how quality improvements had been reflected by these measures.

Another member spoke in favour of strengthening the section on accountability in the submission. He also suggested that the recommendation that Ontario increase funding per student to the national average was only a preliminary step, as Ontario should provide higher than average funding per student for postsecondary education.

A member expressed her concern about the submission's recommendation concerning tuition differentials across programs. In her view, this was a request to enshrine deregulated tuition fees. There was research indicating that increased tuition fees resulted in decreased accessibility for students. She also observed that private sources of funding, such as individual and corporate donations, resulted in institutional disparities. As well, it was her view that income-contingent loan repayment programs (ICLRP's) also restricted student accessibility.

It was moved and seconded

THAT debate be adjourned.

The motion was defeated.

A member observed that it would be unfortunate if students concentrated only on recommendations concerning tuition. It was necessary to examine the University as a whole. The member suggested that the section on internationalization could be strengthened. His academic colleagues were often in situations involving international co-operation and co-ordination. The University sometimes lacked the resources to be internationally significant. The University could provide a wider vision on internationalization.

A member suggested that the University's submission provide two funding scenarios – one at the national average and one at the highest national level – and illustrate what could be done at each funding level. Another member suggested that the discussion of OSOTF and post-graduate debt remission programs be expanded.

A member spoke against income-contingent loan repayment programs, and noted the effect of deregulated tuition on part-time students. Another member asked that the administration respond to the points that had been raised concerning income-contingent loan repayment programs. He also observed that the issue of quality of education outside the classroom had been raised at the Town Hall meeting which he had attended.

A member suggested that the submission highlight the accomplishments of the access and outreach programs which the University had developed.

A member suggested strengthening several sections of the submission. The University's unique combination of research and teaching, and the resulting impact on undergraduate programs could be highlighted. Ways in which business could work with universities

**9. University of Toronto Response to the Postsecondary Review (*Rae Review*)(cont'd)****Discussion (cont'd)**

could be included. The University's interface with colleges could be more fully described. The impact of universities on the economy of Ontario and of Canada could be used to put forward the case of funding of postsecondary education at a level above the national average.

**Response to issues raised in discussion**

The President thanked members for their comments, and reiterated that the document being considered was a draft outline that reflected current University policies. It was important for the University to take this opportunity to build on the recognition of its place in the postsecondary system, and to build on the University's achievements. There was agreement within the University community about the goals of the University's submission to the Rae Review, but disagreement about the means of achieving those goals.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT the meeting be extended by ten minutes.

At the invitation of the Chair, Professor Tuohy thanked members for the discussion. She indicated that additional measures of quality would be developed. She acknowledged that funding at the national average was a bare minimum in terms of the University's aspirations, and that increased funding for research and for graduate students was also being sought. She agreed to expand the section on internationalization.

On the matter of income-contingent loan repayment programs, Professor Tuohy commented that there was a difference of opinion between student groups and the administration. However, to the extent that loans were a part of student financial aid, it would seem appropriate to explore programs for repayment and remission. A multi-year framework for tuition fees could be developed by the Governing Council.

In conclusion, Professor Tuohy encouraged members to send comments and suggestions to her, either by email or through the interactive web-site.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED

THAT the Governing Council accept and reaffirm the principles and directions outlined in the *University of Toronto submission to the Honourable Bob Rae, Advisor to the Premier and the Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities on Postsecondary Education* dated October 28, 2004.

**10. Reports for Information**

Members received the following reports for information:

- Report Number 129 of the Academic Board (September 27, 2004 )
- Report Number 136 of the Business Board (October 6, 2004)
- Report Number 123 of the University Affairs Board (September 28, 2004)
- Report Number 379 of the Executive Committee (September 20, 2004)
- Report Number 380 of the Executive Committee (September 23, 2004)
- Report Number 381 of the Executive Committee (October 13, 2004)

**11. Date of the Next Meeting**

The Chair reminded members that the next regular meeting of the Governing Council was scheduled for **Thursday December 16** at 4:30 pm.

**12. Question Period**

A member noted that a group of individuals from the union local representing Sodhexco workers had been distributing information outside Simcoe Hall concerning the situation of two employees who had been suspended. The member asked what the current status was. Invited to respond, Ms Riggall explained that she and Professor Hildyard had met with representatives of Sodhexco earlier in the day. The employees had been suspended with pay by the company while an investigation had taken place under company policy. A reprimand had been given and accepted, and the employees had returned to work.

A member asked for an update concerning the status of the complaint that had been reported by a former member of the Governing Council concerning the treatment of the member by the campus police just before a convocation. Invited to reply, Ms Riggall stated that the complaint had been referred to the Metro Police, as required by policy. The Metro Police had referred the complaint back to the campus police, and an investigation was underway.

**13. Other Business**

A member congratulated the Faculty of Arts and Science for the Arts & Science Review entitled *idea&s* which had been distributed with the Globe and Mail newspaper on November 1, 2004, and commented on the importance of such communications in informing the community about the University.

The meeting adjourned at 7:15 p.m.

---

Secretary

---

Chair

November 25, 2004