

**UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO**  
**THE GOVERNING COUNCIL**

**Thursday, April 26, 2007**

MINUTES OF THE GOVERNING COUNCIL meeting held on Thursday, April 26, 2007 at 4:30 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall.

**Present:**

Ms Rose M. Patten, (Chair)  
Mr. John F. (Jack) Petch, (Vice-Chair)  
Professor C. David Naylor, President  
Professor Varouj Aivazian  
Ms Diana A. R. Alli  
Mr. P.C. Choo  
Professor Brian Corman  
Mr. Kristofer T. Coward  
Dr. Claude S. Davis  
The Honourable William G. Davis  
Mr. Ken Davy  
Miss Saswati Deb  
Dr. Alice Dong  
Miss Coralie D'Souza  
Ms Susan Eng  
Dr. Shari Graham Fell  
Professor Jonathan Freedman  
Professor Vivek Goel  
Mr. Robin Goodfellow  
Professor William Gough  
Dr. Gerald Halbert  
Professor Ellen Hodnett  
Professor Glen A. Jones  
Dr. Joel A. Kirsh

Professor Louise Lemieux-Charles  
Mr. Joseph Mapa  
Professor Michael R. Marrus  
Mr. Geoffrey Matus  
Mr. George E. Myhal  
Mr. Richard Nunn  
Ms Jacqueline C. Orange  
Mr. Tim Reid  
Professor Arthur S. Ripstein  
Mr. Stephen C. Smith  
Miss Maureen J. Somerville  
Ms Estefania Toledo  
Ms B. Elizabeth Vosburgh  
Mr. Larry Wasser  
Professor John Wedge  
Mr. Robert S. Weiss  
Ms Johanna L. Weststar  
Mr. Patrick Wong

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

**Secretariat:**  
Mr. Henry Mulhall  
Ms Mae-Yu Tan

**Absent:**

The Honourable David R. Peterson, Chancellor  
Ms Florence Minz  
Professor Douglas Reeve

Ms Marvi H. Ricker  
Professor Barbara Sherwood Lollar  
Mr. W. David Wilson

**In Attendance:**

Mr. Alex Rascanu, Vice-President, Operations, Scarborough Campus Students' Union,  
Member-Elect of the Governing Council  
Ms Oriel Varga, Past-Member of the Governing Council, Administrative Assistant,  
Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students (APUS)  
Ms Rivi Frankle, Interim Vice-President and Chief Development Officer  
Professor Angela Hildyard, Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity  
Professor Cheryl Misak, Acting Vice-President and Principal of the University of Toronto at  
Mississauga (UTM)

**In Attendance (cont'd)**

Ms Susan Addario, Director, Student Affairs  
Ms Marian Awad, (UTM)  
Mr. Jason Bechtel, Counsel, Office of the Vice-President, Research and Associate Provost  
Mr. Robin Breon, Vice-President of the United SteelWorkers Local 1998  
Mr. Jim Delaney, Associate Director and Senior Policy Advisor, Student Affairs  
Professor David Farrar, Deputy Provost and Vice-Provost, Students  
Mr. Neil Dobbs, Deputy Secretary of the Governing Council  
Ms Sheree Drummond, Assistant Provost  
Mr. Vlad Glebov, Vice-President of the University of Toronto Mississauga Students' Union  
Dr. Anthony Gray, Special Advisor to the President  
Professor Charles Jones, Acting Dean, UTM  
Professor Bruce Kidd, Dean, Faculty of Physical Education and Health  
Mr. Anthony Kola-Olusanya, President of the Graduate Students' Union  
Ms Anne Lewis, Manager, Student Accounts, Department of Financial Services  
Ms Bryn MacPherson White, Director, Office of the President and University Events  
Dr. Tim McTiernan, Assistant Vice-President, Research  
Mr. Steve Moate, Senior Legal Counsel  
Professor Kumar Murty, Chair of the Department of Mathematical and Computational Sciences  
Ms Cristina Oke, Assistant Secretary of the Governing Council  
Mr. Jeff Peters, Vice-President, Internal, APUS  
Ms Emily Shelton, Vice-President, External, of the University of Toronto Students' Union  
Ms Meredith Strong, Interim Special Assistant to the Vice-President, University Relations  
Ms Linda Vranić, Director, Operations, Office of the Vice-President, Research and Associate Provost  
Professor Safwat Zaky, Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget

**1. Chair's Remarks**

**(a) Welcome**

The Chair welcomed members and guests to the meeting. She also welcomed Mr. Ken Davy, a new part-time, undergraduate student governor, to his first meeting.

**(b) Vice-Chair of Governing Council, 2007-08**

The Chair announced that Dr. Alice Dong had been acclaimed as Vice-Chair of the Governing Council, for the period July 1, 2007 to June 30, 2008. She noted that Dr. Dong had been an active member of the Business Board and the Senior Salary Committee. Dr. Dong expressed her thanks to the members of Governing Council for their support.

**(c) Audio Web-cast**

The Chair reminded members that the meeting was being broadcast on the web, and that private conversations might be picked up and broadcast. She asked all members, senior administrators, and guests who were invited to speak during the meeting to use a microphone, so that their comments could be heard by those listening to the audio web-cast.

**1. Chair's Remarks (cont'd)****(d) Co-opted Positions**

Mr. Charpentier informed members that a memorandum had been distributed to the University community on April 5, 2007 to encourage applications for membership on the Boards and Committees of the Governing Council. While positions were available on the Academic and University Affairs Board for non-Governing Council (co-opted) members, places on the Business Board were usually filled by members of the Governing Council and by external lay members. The Striking Committee of each Board would review the applications received and recommend appointments to the Board in May, 2007.

Mr. Charpentier noted that, to date, not many applications had been received and asked members to assist in identifying individuals who were involved in the University community and encourage them to submit an application for a co-opted position. The deadline for the submission of application forms had been extended to Monday, April 30, 2007, 5:00 p.m. Information regarding the co-opting process and the online application form was available from the Office of the Governing Council's website.

**(e) Speaking Requests**

The Chair informed members that five speaking requests had been received. All five had been granted, and she would call on the speakers at the appropriate time in the meeting.

**2. Minutes of the Previous Meeting of March 29, 2007**

The minutes of the meeting of March 29, 2007 were approved.<sup>1</sup>

**3. Business Arising from the Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

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

**4. Report of the President****(a) Virginia Polytechnic Institute**

The President stated that the University of Toronto community extended its deepest sympathies to all those associated with the Virginia Polytechnic Institute in Blacksburg, Virginia. It was the hope of the community that everyone who had been injured in the attacks of April 16, 2007 would fully recover, and that the Virginia Tech community would be able to mourn, heal and continue to fulfill its three missions of learning, discovery and engagement.

Students from the University, with leadership from Saswati Deb, a student governor, had organized vigils to be held on all three campuses today. The St. George campus vigil would begin at 7:00 p.m. in the Multi-faith Centre. Governors, faculty members, students and staff were encouraged to attend and to sign a condolences book that would be sent to Virginia Tech on May 16, 2007.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Secretary corrected the minutes to reflect that Mr. Joseph Mapa had been present at the previous meeting.

**4. Report of the President (cont'd)****(a) Virginia Polytechnic Institute (cont'd)**University Values

The President then addressed the implications of the Virginia Tech tragedy for the University of Toronto. He spoke of the University's values with respect to safety and crisis management. There were two equally important and mutually reinforcing mandates: a mandate for safety and a mandate for discovery. Those mandates were interrelated. The University's mandate of discovery required an open environment. People on the campuses must be able to express themselves freely and to explore ideas and phenomena as they chose. Those freedoms were only bounded by ethical and legal guidelines. At the same time, personal security was an obvious prerequisite for discovery – an environment that afforded an individual the chance to explore without fear. It was important for the University to navigate the balance between personal safety and openness in an academic environment.

The University's Approach to Crises

The President had been asked at recent alumni gatherings how the University of Toronto would respond to a scenario similar to the one that had occurred at Virginia Tech. The President commented that each crisis was unique and the dynamics of a given scenario would vary widely from campus to campus. In the event of a sudden incident such as an explosion or an assault by an individual with firearms or other deadly weapons, the Toronto Police Services or Fire Services (or Peel regional services in the case of the University of Toronto at Mississauga) would take control of the situation, and the administration would place themselves at their disposal and follow their directives. That would mean an instant change in administrative culture and processes from a deliberative system to a command and control system in which police or fire service requests could be executed very quickly. That transformation had been drilled with key offices and individuals a number of times in table-top exercises, and would continue to be drilled with lessons learned from Virginia Tech.

Resources: Prevention and Mitigation

The President informed Governors that the University possessed a large number of resources to deal with a range of risks. The Virginia Tech tragedy had flagged the issue of mental health as a safety matter. The University had a number of highly skilled staff who worked with troubled students and the Employee Assistance Program had the resources to work with troubled staff. Referrals to external organizations were made when necessary, and individuals could be barred from the campus if required. As well, a small, multi-disciplinary group met monthly (or more frequently as needed) to help coordinate responses to individual situations that were noted as being particularly sensitive.

The President stated that the University of Toronto police represented another layer of prevention. They were a formal police service, accredited by the Province of Ontario, with sworn constables authorized to act as peace officers on a range of safety issues up to the level of a gun crime. As a community police force, they worked with the administration to identify risks and to help prevent them from becoming larger dangers to the community. In addition to the two resources described, each division had its own formal processes and bodies that worked daily to ensure a safe learning and working environment.

Crisis Management

The President informed the Council that in a crisis, the University's Crisis Manager (The Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity) would deploy a Crisis Management Team of senior administrators to coordinate and manage the whole course of the crisis. That team had been developed over the past two years. The team was supported by more specialized Emergency

**4. Report of the President (cont'd)****(a) Virginia Polytechnic Institute (cont'd)**

Response Teams on each campus. As well, Crisis Support Teams focused on providing various logistical and support services that community members would need as the crisis and subsequent recovery unfolded. In the event of a crisis, the University's campus police would support the Toronto or Peel Regional emergency services.

**Current Planning**

The University's Crisis Plans were constantly revisited. To that end, on April 27, 2007, key members of the Emergency and Crisis Teams would engage in a debriefing and identify specific lessons learned from Virginia Tech. An updated Crisis Plan would be brought forward in late May. A sub-group focused on internal communications had already met in the previous week, and it had developed some options for improving mass, internal communications within the first few minutes of a major crisis. The University had been considering text-messaging trees and broadcast voice and e-mail systems among other ideas and options. Those considerations would be brought forward to the senior administration for review. Meetings would also be held with the relevant counterparts in the Toronto Police to further ensure coordination in the event of a crisis that they might be called on to manage on campus.

The President concluded by stating that the University did not take its safety for granted. It possessed resources and plans, and those plans were constantly reviewed in light of the most recent lessons learned. One of the obvious lessons that had been learned was the importance of identifying the warning signs of serious mental illness. The University must ensure that the appropriate mechanisms were in place to identify and intervene where necessary in circumstances where an individual posed a serious threat to himself and others. At the same time, it should be recognized that the threshold for intervention must be high and in harmony with the principles of the University. All of the daily work that had been described belonged to the entire University across its three campuses. The President stressed that Governors had an important role to play in the consideration of such matters, and he encouraged them to share their thoughts with the administration.

**(b) University of Toronto at Mississauga Writing Development Initiative**

The President introduced Professor Cheryl Misak, Acting Vice-President and Principal at the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM), Professor Kumar Murty, Chair of the Department of Mathematical and Computational Sciences, and Ms Marian Awad, a mathematics student and recipient of the 2005-2006 Dean's Essay Prize. The guests would speak about the Writing Development Initiative at UTM, a widespread program aimed at promoting and developing writing skills across the undergraduate educational curriculum. It was an exciting model that demonstrated the focus on one of the University's campuses of building requisite skills in a range of undergraduate students.

Professor Misak provided a brief overview of UTM's Writing Development Initiative, explaining that there had been a desire at UTM to improve not only the extra-curricular student experience, but also the in-class academic experience. As the project had been developed, students had indicated that they wanted to be taught how to write. That input had been considered as each department had developed a set of pilot projects to improve student writing based on the objectives of their disciplines and teaching methods. This was the second year that the pilot projects had been offered. Approximately 5,000 students had participated in one of the classes, which was over one-third of the UTM undergraduate population. The projects had been carefully evaluated, and the feedback

**4. Report of the President (cont'd)****(b) University of Toronto at Mississauga Writing Development Initiative (cont'd)**

received had been very positive. Although they were quite costly and very labour-intensive, the writing projects were a success story.

Professor Murty spoke about the writing project offered by the Department of Mathematical and Computational Sciences. Seventeen students had participated in a third-year course, *Ideas of Mathematics*, which traced the evolution of mathematical ideas while teaching students to think about the communication process within mathematics. One theorem was chosen as the focus for the whole course, and the interconnected ideas that contributed to the development of that field were examined. Mathematics was presented as a language that had unique aspects. An effort had been made to engage every student in the classroom conversations while balancing the integration of quantitative material. Although less material may have been covered with that approach, the material was dealt with thoroughly. Students had reported developing feelings of intellectual empowerment; they were surprised at their ability to succeed at mathematics.

Professor Murty then introduced Marian Awad, who had won the Dean's Prize for an essay she had written in the *Ideas of Mathematics* course the first year it had been offered. Professor Murty noted that he had asked Ms Awad to develop the ideas from her essay into a senior thesis.

Ms Awad shared her experiences in the *Ideas of Mathematics* course with Governors. She stated that students were encouraged to communicate through writing and speaking, thinking about their goals in communication. Ms Awad had found that the process had assisted her in learning specific concepts, had revealed some misconceptions she had about the concepts, and had taught her about her own learning style. She had also discovered processes of thinking that were necessary in order to succeed in mathematics. Those experiences helped students to build their confidence, providing motivation for persistence – in her view, a necessary trait for doing mathematics. Ms Awad reflected on the benefits of the small class size, noting the resulting student engagement. Although less material had been covered in class because of time taken to teach useful attitudes to and perspectives on mathematics, the tradeoff had been worthwhile. The attitudes to learning that had been taught were applicable to fields other than mathematics. Ms Awad suggested that a similar course could be offered for students entering university, helping them to minimize problems in first-year mathematics courses.

The President thanked Professors Misak and Murty and Ms Awad for their presentation.

**(c) Trip to Hong Kong, China, Vancouver and Victoria**

The President noted that he had just returned from a tremendously successful trip to Hong Kong, Beijing, Vancouver and Victoria. He had met with alumni and friends of the University. The Hong Kong Foundation was very active with enormous volunteer participation. The Foundation was making progress in providing assistance and support to students selected by the Hong Kong alumni to study on scholarships at the University of Toronto. That development was most positive, helping to ensure the recruitment of students from that region on a merit basis, many of whom had substantial financial needs.

The President reported that during the trip to Beijing, he had had the privilege of meeting with the Minister of Education for China. There had been an important exchange of views on partnerships in higher education between China and Canada. Minister Zhou had been most positive in his views of the University of Toronto. During the discussions, it had been apparent that much common ground existed, as well as opportunities for joint advocacy. The University

**4. Report of the President (cont'd)****(c) Trip to Hong Kong, China, Vancouver and Victoria (cont'd)**

could advocate for more Chinese students to study in Canada by working with the Canadian government.

Announcing the signing of a Memorandum of Understanding with Beijing University, the President expressed his satisfaction with that milestone. The President commented that numerous opportunities for reciprocal learning between the University of Toronto and Beijing University existed. Beijing University was an impressive institution that had limited enrolment to 30,000 students who were supported by 4,000 professors and associate professors. Enrolment was evenly divided between graduate and undergraduate students. Beijing University had benefited from a differentiated system of publicly funded higher education in which some institutions were chosen to take a leading role in graduate education with specialized undergraduate programs, while others had different roles.

**(d) Awards and Honours**

The President drew Governors' attention to the list of Faculty and Staff Awards and Honours that had been included in the agenda package, commenting on the extraordinary achievements that were celebrated by the University. He noted that three University of Toronto faculty had been awarded the prestigious 2007 Guggenheim Fellowships - Professor Michael Goldstein of Mathematics and University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC), Professor Jerry Mitrovica of Physics, and Professor Peter Zandstra of the Institute for Biomaterials and Biomedical Engineering. They were among 189 scientists, artists and scholars who had been selected to receive a Fellowship from 2,800 applicants.

Professor John Dick and University Professor Anthony Pawson of medical genetics and microbiology, University Professor Tak Mak of medical biophysics, and University Professor Peter St. George-Hyslop of medicine and the Centre for Research in Neurodegenerative Diseases were the winners of the inaugural Premier's Summit Award, which celebrated world-class research in Ontario. The Summit Awards were the largest research prizes ever awarded in Canada. Each recipient would receive \$5 million over five years to support their research.

Professor Parham Aarabi of Electrical and Computer Engineering had won the Premier's Catalyst Award as the best young innovator in the province. Professor Spencer Barrett of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology and Professor Andreas Mandelis of Mechanical and Industrial Engineering had been recognized with the prestigious Premier's Discovery Awards for individual research.

**(e) Student Achievements and Honours**

The President also highlighted some of the events that had occurred in recognition of student achievements and awards, including the Chancellor's Student Art Exhibit that had been featured in *The Bulletin* newspaper, and the Varsity Athlete's Luncheon, at which four hundred intercollegiate athletes, coaches and staff had been recognized. In 2006-2007, University of Toronto men and women had won seventeen provincial medals and three national medals in sports ranging from field hockey and squash to swimming and track.

The President had hosted the annual Student Leader lunch on April 12, 2007 in the Great Hall at Hart House. That event had provided four hundred student leaders with an opportunity for recognition and mingling with faculty and the senior administration. The President thanked the Chair, Chancellor and many Governors who had participated and contributed to that event.

**5. Items for Governing Council Approval****(a) Tuition Fee Schedule for Publicly Funded Programs, 2007-08**

Ms Orange reported that the Business Board had had a full discussion on the proposal for tuition-fee increases. Student representatives had addressed the Board, sharing their views on the proposal. A motion to refer the fees schedule back to the administration to reduce fees and to lobby with student leaders for full government funding for a tuition roll-back had been considered and rejected. However, the President had offered to work with the student leaders to advocate jointly for improved per-student funding provided there was no precondition of a tuition freeze or roll-back. The proposed tuition fee was fully consistent with the University's Tuition Fee Policy and complied with the Provincial Tuition Framework. Enrolment levels and the quality of the entering class remained strong and stable. As such, the Business Board had recommended that the proposal be approved by the Governing Council.

**Non-Members' Addresses to the Council**

At the invitation of the Chair, Mr. Robin Breon, Vice-President of the United SteelWorkers Local 1998, addressed the Council. He stated that students today were faced with more difficult circumstances than in the past due to the high cost of living, tuition fees, and the prospect of having to repay large student loans upon graduation. He pointed to the deregulation of professional programs in the early 1990's as having led to increased tuition fees over the ensuing years. In his view, the educational system as a whole was moving in the wrong direction, focusing on increasing revenue through tuition fees rather than seeking academic excellence. The United SteelWorkers Local 1998 supported the students in their protest of the proposed tuition fee increases. Mr. Breon disagreed with the suggestion by the administration that increased salaries and benefits of faculty and staff had contributed to the need for increased fees. Students should not have to bear such a burden. Educational institutions should not have to incur deficits; rather, a dedicated federal transfer payment for post-secondary education should be put in place.

Ms Emily Shelton, Vice-President, External, of the Students' Administrative Council [University of Toronto Students' Union (UTSU)], was also invited to address the Council. She stated that the University was proposing to increase tuition to the maximum level permitted in the Provincial Tuition Framework for most programs: 4.5% for entering students, 4% for continuing students, and 8% for students in professional programs. In her view, the fiscal responsibility of the Provincial Government was being downloaded to students. As well, in an effort to avoid an increase in the existing accumulated deficit of \$80 million, the University was downloading its debt onto students who already had large amounts of debt. According to Ms Shelton, the average debt for Ontario graduates from four-year programs was now approaching \$28,000 and she urged governors to consider the impact of increased tuition fees on students and to reject the proposal.

Mr. Vlad Glebov, Vice-President of the University of Toronto Mississauga Students' Union, addressed the Council. He remarked that while assisting with a UTM food distribution program over the last few evenings, he had an opportunity to speak with students about their views on the proposed tuition fee increases. Students had spoken of the need to hold part-time jobs to help cover their costs and had stated that while tuition fees increased each year, the services provided seemed to them to have remained the same or had decreased somewhat. Mr. Glebov also commented on the decreased funding from the Government and the downloading of debt to the University, which was subsequently downloaded to students. He stated that

**5. Items for Governing Council Approval (cont'd)****(a) Tuition Fee Schedule for Publicly Funded Programs, 2007-08 (cont'd)**

students and the administration could agree on the need to lobby for increased funding for post-secondary education. Mr. Glebov called for an end to the endorsement of the Government's "Reaching Higher" plan and asked governors not to approve the proposal for increased tuition fees.

Mr. Anthony Kola-Olusanya, President of the Graduate Students' Union (GSU) addressed the Council. He disclosed that he hoped by speaking candidly, governors would be moved and agree that increased tuition fees were unnecessary. He stated that tuition fee increases were not in the best interest of any student and that graduate students, who already carried debt from their undergraduate studies, would be particularly affected. According to him, attrition rates and time to completion rates of graduate students remained alarmingly high with the main reason being lack of funding. Tuition fees for international students had become especially burdensome – in the Fall, 2005, average tuition fees had reached \$12,587, more than double that paid by domestic students. He emphasized the view that with increased tuition fees, international students who lacked scholarships would be negatively affected; even those students with admissions scholarships would have difficulty financing their education at the University. Increased fees would skew admissions towards students from wealthier countries, such as the United States, the United Kingdom, and Western Europe, impacting accessibility. The University should seek to attract the best, not the richest students. The GSU had expressed the need for joint lobbying for an increase of Provincial funds for post-secondary education, and they had received positive feedback from the President. They looked forward to fostering the relationship with the administration, as unified efforts between students and the administration would be too powerful for the Provincial and Federal Governments to ignore. Mr. Kola-Olusanya appealed to governors to vote for accessible education and not to allow an increase in the financial burden of students.

Mr. Jeff Peters of the Association of Part-Time Undergraduate Students (APUS) also addressed the Council. He stated that the proposed tuition fee increases were unacceptable and that part-time students were being forced to discontinue their studies due to financial difficulties. Mr. Peters questioned the efficacy of the University's *Policy on Student Financial Support* guarantee that "...no student offered admission to a program at the University of Toronto should be unable to enter or complete the program due to a lack of financial means." He stated that it did not apply to some of the most marginal and vulnerable students on campus and demanded that the guarantee and full University of Toronto Advance Planning for Students (UTAPS) funding be given to all students with financial need. In closing, and on a separate matter, Mr. Peters stated that the University had been given a letter from the legal counsel of APUS and the GSU regarding the increase of the Athletics and Recreation fee and their view that it was not legitimate.

**Discussion**

A number of members spoke in opposition to the proposal. A member referred to the Vice-President and Provost's explanation, given at a recent Business Board meeting, that the \$18.6 million in revenue to be generated by increased tuition fees would be used in part to provide enhancements to the student experience. The member disagreed, stating the view that the increase would have the opposite effect. Students had to work part-time while trying to balance their studies; some were forced to take private loans to finance their education. Studies had shown, including the 2006 National Survey on Student Engagement (NSSE), that financial pressures were one of the major obstacles to students' academic progress. If students' time was consumed by their financial obligations, it prevented them from participating in the University

**5. Items for Governing Council Approval (cont'd)****(a) Tuition Fee Schedule for Publicly Funded Programs, 2007-08 (cont'd)**

community. In the member's view, the proposal did not provide sufficient justification for the increases, and it lacked an explanation of how the revenue generated would be used. The member noted that average tuition fees had increased beyond the rate of inflation since the 1990's and called for increased funding of post-secondary education by the Government.

A member recalled that the Vice-President and Provost had previously announced a 30% increase in revenue at the University following the announcement of the Provincial Government's \$6.2 billion *Reaching Higher Plan*. He asked how much of that revenue had been used to limit tuition fee increases.

A member expressed his view of deficiencies in the University's *Policy on Student Financial Support* guarantee. He pointed out that some students, who might be good scholars, might be unwilling to accrue large amounts of debt to fund their post-secondary education. Other students, who might be unaware of the guarantee, might not apply to the University because of the high fees. The member indicated his agreement with Mr. Breon's view of post-secondary education as being market-driven. He was morally opposed to that idea and could not lend his support to such a position.

A member noted that many professional faculties at the University had been working in the community on accessibility issues. A number of students participating in the programs were from low socio-economic backgrounds. For them, the prospect of attending university seemed quite distant; the possibility of entering a professional program appeared even more unattainable. Although such students would not be denied entry, if they met admission requirements, how would they receive sufficient financial aid over time?

A member reiterated similar views expressed on the need for students to work and to take private loans when ineligible for OSAP, the impact that had on the student experience, and the importance of examining accessibility to the University. Students were concerned about ensuring a successful future, obtaining suitable employment, and having to repay large amounts of loans upon graduation. Due to increased tuition fees, students would have unfavourable memories of their time at the University. The member urged students and the administration to work together to lobby the Government for higher per-student funding.

A member thanked the representatives of student governments who had spoken and assured them that their views were important. The member emphasized that the issues raised were understood and carefully considered by governors who were concerned with the plight of students, pointing out that during the recent past period of tuition freeze, the University had not been compensated for the 30% of funds it had set aside for student aid. The member referred to the low per-student funding provided by the Government, and reminded students that along with tuition fees, government funding was the main source of revenue for the University. Students, the member suggested, should identify their targets and work with their allies to address the issues of concern. Governors did care about students; it was unfair to suggest that they did not appreciate or experience financial burdens in order to attend university. The member spoke of her personal experience as a student, recalling the sacrifices made by her mother to assist with the cost of tuition for her children. The member pointed out that she, and many others, had struggled with minimum wage jobs to pay for the costs of post-secondary education, so they understood first-hand the impact of decisions made by the Council. The

**5. Items for Governing Council Approval (cont'd)****(a) Tuition Fee Schedule for Publicly Funded Programs, 2007-08 (cont'd)**

member encouraged the President to formalize his position on lobbying with student representatives for increased per-student funding and to report back to the Governing Council on progress made.

A member suggested there appeared to be a circular argument - increases in tuition led to increases in student aid which led to a need to raise funds to increase the student experience. By increasing tuition, the University was relieving pressure on the Government to provide funding to maintain standards at this great institution. Perhaps the current model of enrolment needed to be readjusted and the number of students admitted should be contained, given the limited funds available for sustaining increased enrolment.

Referring to information presented at the recent Business Board meeting regarding the cost of hiring new faculty, a member expressed concerns about the impact of cost containment measures on part-time students. If classes were cancelled due to lack of instructors, it would be more difficult for part-time students to complete their programs. The Government must be pressured to provide the necessary funding. If the proposal to increase tuition fees was not approved, there might be a decrease in services provided due to the financial burdens of the University, causing students to suffer in the short term.

The President responded to questions and matters raised by members and others in the general areas of federal and provincial government funding, student support and enrolment growth.

**Federal and Provincial Government Funding**

The President commented, in response to statements regarding the post-secondary education (PSE) transfer, that the Federal Government had announced a new PSE transfer to the provinces in its recent budget to take effect in 2008. The University's share could be as much as \$40 million in base support. Significant advocacy efforts would be undertaken with both the federal and provincial governments to ensure that the funds flowed through to educational institutions rather than being used to offset other costs.

The President stated that even with the proposed tuition fee increases in the current budget, the University would still experience financial pressures. He acknowledged that the current levels of Provincial funding were less than desired, although funds that had been made available had been especially beneficial for graduate programs. The President had met with representatives of UTSU and had expressed an interest in continuing a dialogue to work towards proceeding with joint advocacy.

The President expressed sympathy with students' views with respect to the need for improvements in the student experience. There was no pleasure in using tuition fee increases to avoid cuts to the student experience. However steps were being taken to redirect funds to focus them more on the concerns of students. With respect to comments on fee differentiation, the President stated that there were various methods of achieving differentiation. He referred to the University of California's system as an example of an approach that was not associated with major fee differentiation. Instead, it reflected the state government's decision to support a two-tiered educational system based on the missions of the universities and the government funding rather than on the economic means of the students. If the Provincial Government could be convinced to embrace a similar model, such a system could be established without tuition fees serving as the driving force.

**5. Items for Governing Council Approval (cont'd)****(a) Tuition Fee Schedule for Publicly Funded Programs, 2007-08 (cont'd)**

The President responded to comments on recruitment, noting that the University of Toronto did not recruit students mainly from the United States, the United Kingdom or Western Europe. Rather, it believed that students from “less-developed” nations should receive special funding consideration and had repeatedly advocated for such funding. However, because international students were not provided with per-student funding by the Government, higher tuition fees were a necessity. The best students from around the world were desired and advocacy for financial support for international students was a common cause shared between the University and the GSU.

**Student Support**

The President noted that the University had dramatically increased its spending on student financial aid from \$7.7 million in 1991 to \$113.1 million in 2006-2007. That supplemented Government support which had improved considerably in 2005-2006. For over 60% of students, the cost of the proposed tuition fee increase would be \$200 per year or less. For students with financial need, higher fees would be taken into account in the provision of student aid from both internal and external sources.

The President remarked that broad data did support the view that tuition-based funding was helpful in maintaining capacity without compromising participation rates. While there might be some differential uptake across socio-economic class, at the same time the absolute growth in opportunity for those of lesser means would be greater and there would be an increase in participation rates across all groups. The President acknowledged that some might object to gradients in principle, but there was a pragmatic benefit with regard to the total number of lower-income students able to participate in post-secondary education when tuitions were not frozen.

The President stated that the University was committed to outreach programs that existed in the professional faculties, noting that many faculty members and administrators participated in initiatives such as the summer mentorship programs. Prospective students were advised that the University was dedicated to providing strong financial aid so that professional programs would remain open to all regardless of their background. The President encouraged Governors and others to continue to communicate that message.

**Enrolment Growth**

The President commented that it was difficult to determine what the appropriate undergraduate/graduate ratio should be, especially in light of the current financial model. Such questions would be debated as the University embarked on the Vision 2030 exercise. Continued enrolment growth had led to ongoing pressure on the institution, and it was time to examine reductions in undergraduate enrolment in the hope of relieving demands on staff and faculty. Graduate growth would allow the University to fulfill a more differentiated role in the educational system, but did add financial pressures given the funding guarantee for those doing research-based degrees.

Professor Goel provided the following additional information.

Professor Goel stated that without the revenue generated by increased tuition fees, the accumulated deficit would grow by an additional \$18 million from the projected \$80 million to almost \$100 million. He also explained that the University did not allocate funds from tuition fee increases, or any other revenue source, to specific line items in the budget. Funds were pooled and then allocated to academic and administrative divisions. He noted that without the additional

**5. Items for Governing Council Approval (cont'd)****(a) Tuition Fee Schedule for Publicly Funded Programs, 2007-08 (cont'd)**

tuition revenue, the 3% total expense containment required in 2007-2008 would double. Each unit would then make decisions about how to take those cuts. For illustrative purposes he had presented the equivalent number of faculty positions at average salary.

Professor Goel noted that various statistics had been mentioned by speakers, and he emphasized the importance of considering the full picture when making interpretations. He responded to an implicit reference to a Statistics Canada study that had been released in February, 2007. In that study, the author had identified income as a factor affecting student participation in Canadian universities. However, the main conclusion had been that, when the lowest and highest income quartiles were compared with respect to participation, 84% of the gap was attributable to non-income factors, such as test scores, parental influences, and high school quality.

In response to a member's question regarding increased revenue for the University resulting from the *Reaching Higher Plan*, Professor Goel stated that the 30% figure had been related to 2005 estimates of expected funding over a five-year period, which included among other items, graduate and double cohort growth funds. The remaining funds had almost all been allocated as part of special purpose envelopes and there had been very little change in the average per-student funding.

Professor Goel responded to a member's comments on the need for students to work, noting that the NSSE data had shown that the majority of students who had reported working were employed on average for less than ten hours per week. He noted that over the past twenty years there had not been a shift in the amount of hours that students worked; rather there had been a shift to work during the academic year as opposed to the summer. Finally, although there was a concern that students who had to work were less engaged in activities on campus, such a relationship had not been found with the NSSE data.

Invited to comment, Professor Farrar spoke about support provided for part-time students, informing members that there was no provincial student loan program available for part-time students that was equivalent to the Ontario Student Assistance Program (OSAP). Together with APUS, the University had developed the Noah Meltz Program of Financial Assistance many years ago. That program provided tuition fees to a maximum of one credit and other educational-related costs; part-time students were able to take up to 2.5 credits during the fall/winter session. Professor Farrar acknowledged that the demographic of part-time students was changing. Although he was unaware of attrition rates of part-time students having increased, he would look into that matter<sup>2</sup>.

A member asked for, and it was accepted that there be, a recorded voted.

---

<sup>2</sup> Secretary's Note: The number of part-time students was virtually unchanged between 2002 and 2006. Applying the current definition of part-time (less than 60 per cent courseload) consistently, the November 1 total has remained constant at about 6,500. In 2006, at 6,672, it was actually about 1 per cent higher than in 2002.

**5. Items for Governing Council Approval (cont'd)****(a) Tuition Fee Schedule for Publicly Funded Programs, 2007-08 (cont'd)**

On motion duly moved and seconded

It was Resolved

THAT the Tuition-Fee Schedule for Publicly Funded Programs in 2007-08, as described in Professor Goel's March 14, 2007 memorandum to the Business Board, and the tuition fees in 2007-08 and 2008-09 for the special programs identified in Table 2 of Appendices B and C of the memorandum, be approved.

The Secretary noted that there were twenty-nine votes in favour of the motion, eight against, and no abstentions.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 156 of the Business Board as Appendix "A".

**(b) Tuition Fee Schedule for Self-Funded Programs, 2007-08**

Ms Orange reported that the self-funded programs received no government funding, and their fees were set at levels to recover their direct costs.

A member asked for, and it was accepted that there be, a recorded voted.

On motion duly moved and seconded

It was Resolved

THAT the proposed Tuition-Fee Schedule for Self-Funded Programs for 2007-08, a copy of which is attached to Professor Goel's March 14, 2007 memorandum to the Business Board as Table 1, be approved.

The Secretary noted that there were twenty-seven votes in favour of the motion, seven against, and no abstentions.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 156 of the Business Board as Appendix "B".

**(c) Policy on Research Agreements and the Recovery of Indirect Costs of Research**

Professor Marrus reported that the *Policy on Research Agreements and the Recovery of Indirect Costs of Research* had been considered at a meeting of the Academic Board on April 5, 2007.

The proposal was a further product of the major review of research policies that had been led by Professor Challis, Vice-President, Research and Associate Provost. The research policies had been brought into alignment with the new budget model. The three significant areas of change in the proposed Policy were:

- the principle that the University should seek to recover the indirect costs of all research agreements – grants as well as contracts;
- the removal of the distribution formula for payments for indirect costs, as the new budget model provided that all overhead revenue flowed to the academic division of the principal investigator;
- the clear requirement for the review of research agreements and for their approval by the Vice-President, Research and Associate Provost.

**5. Items for Governing Council Approval (cont'd)****(c) Policy on Research Agreements and the Recovery of Indirect Costs of Research (cont'd)**

On motion duly moved and seconded

It was Resolved

THAT the proposed revised *Policy on Research Agreements and the Recovery of Indirect Costs of Research*, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 149 of the Academic Board as Appendix "B", be approved, replacing the *Policy on Research Contracts and the Recovery of Indirect Costs of Research* approved by the Governing Council on January 25, 1999.

**(d) School of Graduate Studies / Ontario Institute for Studies in Education / UT: Doctor of Education Program in Curriculum Studies and Teacher Development – Program Closure**

Professor Marrus informed the Council that in 2005, the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto (OISE/UT) had introduced a flexible-time option for its doctoral program in Curriculum Studies and Teacher Development. Most new students had elected to apply to the Ph.D rather than to the Doctor of Education (Ed.D.) program. Given the overlap with the existing Ph.D. program, the proposal for the closure of the Ed.D. Program in Curriculum Studies and Teacher Development had been put forward and approved at a number of levels. Students currently enrolled in the Ed.D. program would be able to complete that program if they so chose, rather than transferring into the Ph.D. program.

On motion duly moved and seconded

It was Resolved

(a) THAT the proposal from the School of Graduate Studies and the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto to cease admission to the Curriculum Studies and Teacher Development Program, Ed.D., a copy of which is attached to Report Number 149 of the Academic Board as Appendix "C", be approved, and

(b) THAT the closure of the Ed.D. program be approved when no students are registered in it. The entry for the program will be removed from the School of Graduate Studies calendar on a permanent basis, effective September 2007.

**(e) Academic Initiative Fund: Allocations**

Professor Marrus stated that recommendations for the Academic Initiative Fund (AIF) allocations had been considered by the Planning and Budget Committee at its meeting on March 6, 2007 and by the Academic Board on April 5, 2007. Thirty-two proposals had been submitted in the fourth round of the AIF with total requests of \$22 million. Fourteen proposals totaling \$4.2 million were being recommended to the Council for approval. No questions had been raised by members of the Academic Board.

**5. Items for Governing Council Approval (cont'd)****(e) Academic Initiative Fund: Allocations (cont'd)**

On motion duly moved and seconded

It was Resolved

THAT the Fourth Round of the Academic Initiative Fund be allocated as per the table in Appendices 2 and 3 to the Memorandum from the Vice-President and Provost dated February 26, 2007, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 149 of the Academic Board as Appendix "D".

**(f) University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM) Professional Graduate Program Centre Extra-Departmental Unit B (EDU:B): Establishment**

Professor Marrus reported that the proposal for the establishment of the Professional Graduate Program Centre (PGPC) as an Extra-Departmental Unit B had been considered by the Planning and Budget Committee on March 6, 2007 and had been unanimously endorsed by the Academic Board on April 5, 2007. The proposed PGPC would serve as an administrative and academic centre for campus-based cross-disciplinary professional graduate master's degree and diploma programs located at the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM). Extensive consultation had taken place and the proposed Centre had the support of the Dean of the School of Graduate Studies and many others.

On motion duly moved and seconded

It was Resolved

THAT the Professional Graduate Program Centre, as described in Appendix "E" to Report Number 149 of the Academic Board, be established as an Extra-Departmental Unit B within the University of Toronto at Mississauga, effective July 1, 2007.

**(g) Community Affiliation Template Agreement between the University of Toronto and 15 Community Hospitals/Centres**

Professor Marrus informed members that the community affiliation template agreement between the University of Toronto and fifteen community hospitals was similar to the full affiliation template agreement that had been approved by the Governing Council in February, 2007. The main differences, which were not substantive, were:

- Not all of the community hospitals were recognized as teaching hospitals.
- In the proposed agreement there was recognition that not all hospital medical staff had university appointments.
- Since not all clinical faculty members would have academic appointments, there would be less need for the University policy framework to be recognized in these hospitals than in the fully affiliated hospitals.

A member asked whether the William Osler Health Centre was one of the hospitals with which an agreement was being established. Professor Goel responded that it was not included at present. However, the Centre could be considered when the list of affiliated community hospitals was expanded in the future.

**5. Items for Governing Council Approval (cont'd)****(g) Community Affiliation Template Agreement between the University of Toronto and 15 Community Hospitals/Centres (cont'd)**

On motion duly moved and seconded

It was Resolved

- (a) THAT the template for community affiliation agreements between the University of Toronto and the current community hospitals/centres, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 149 of the Academic Board as Appendix "F", be approved, effective immediately;
- (b) THAT the President, or designate, be authorized to sign such agreements on behalf of the Governing Council, provided that the agreements conform to the approved template; and
- (c) THAT the agreements signed under the provisions of this resolution be filed with the Secretary of Governing Council.

**(h) Capital Project: Project Planning Report – St. George Examination Facility**

Professor Marrus informed Council that members of the Academic Board had expressed much interest in the St. George Examination Facility to be located at 255/257 McCaul Street at the Board meeting of April 5, 2007. The proposed dedicated examination facility would have a capacity of over 1,000 seats, with 105 specialized accessible writing facilities for students. A number of questions had been raised with respect to the use of the facility when not in use for exams. It had been explained that there were plans to rent it as a general testing facility to outside users to generate revenue for the University.

Professor Marrus noted that the motion being considered for approval reflected a total borrowing amount of \$9.1 million - \$750,000 to be repaid by the Office of Space Management over twenty years and \$8.35 million to be borrowed and amortized over 20 years.

Invited to comment, Ms Orange stated that the Business Board had also considered the project at its meeting of April 11, 2007, and had approved its execution, subject to Governing Council approval.

On motion duly moved and seconded

It was Resolved

- (a) THAT the Project Planning Report for the St. George Campus Central Examination Facility to be located at 255/257 McCaul Street, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 149 of the Academic Board as Appendix "G", be approved in principle.
- (b) That the project scope, having a space allocation of 2700 nasm at a cost of \$10.6 million in January 2007 dollars be approved with funding provided as follows:
  - i) Woodsworth College \$ .50 million
  - ii) Facilities and Services (FRP) spread over two years \$1.00 million
  - iii) Borrowing \$9.10 million

**6. Reports for Information**

Members received the following reports for information.

- (a) Report Number 149 of the Academic Board (April 5, 2007)
- (b) Report Number 156 of the Business Board (April 11, 2007)
- (c) Report Number 140 of the University Affairs Board (March 13, 2007)
- (d) Report Number 404 of the Executive Committee (April 12, 2007)

**7. Date of the Next Meeting**

The Chair reminded members that the next regular meeting of the Governing Council was scheduled for Wednesday, May 30, 2007 at 4:30 p.m.

**8. Question Period**

Members had no questions for members of the senior administration.

**9. Other Business**

There were no items of Other Business.

IN ACCORDANCE WITH A DETERMINATION BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE  
PURSUANT TO SECTION 38 OF BY-LAW NUMBER 2, ITEM 10 WAS CONSIDERED BY THE  
GOVERNING COUNCIL *IN CAMERA*.

**10. Senior Appointment**

On motion duly moved and seconded

It was Resolved

**THAT** the position of Assistant Vice-President, International Relations be established;  
and

**THAT** Ms. Lorna Jean Edmonds be appointed to the position of Assistant Vice-President, International Relations effective June 1, 2007, or as soon as possible thereafter.

The meeting adjourned at 6:45 p.m.

---

Secretary

---

Chair

May 14, 2007