

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

MAY 17, 2012

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE GOVERNING COUNCIL held on May 17, 2012 at 4:30 p.m. in the Council Chamber, University of Toronto Scarborough.

Present:

Ms Judy Goldring (In the Chair)
The Honourable David R. Peterson, Chancellor
Professor C. David Naylor, President
Ms Diana A.R. Alli
Mr. Donald Andrew
Professor Robert Baker
Ms Celina Rayonne Ceasar-Chavannes
Mr. P. C. Choo
Mr. Chirag Variawa
Professor Elizabeth Cowper
Mr. Ken Davy
Miss Maria Pilar Galvez
Professor William Gough
Professor Hugh Gunz
Professor Ellen Hodnett
Ms Shirley Hoy
Mr. Nykolaj Kuryluk
Mr. Aly-Khan Madhavji
Professor Michael Marrus
Professor Cheryl Misak
Professor Andrea Sass-Kortsak
Professor Elizabeth M. Smyth
Mr. Howard Shearer
Miss Maureen J. Somerville
Mr. W. John Switzer
Mr. W. Keith Thomas
Professor Steven J. Thorpe
Ms Rita Tsang
Professor Franco J. Vaccarino
Ms B. Elizabeth Vosburgh

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

Absent:

Mr. Brent Belzberg
Mr. Cary Ferguson
Mr. Steve (Suresh) Gupta
Mrs. Zabeen Hirji
Professor Edward Iacobucci
Ms Paulette Kennedy
Professor Louise Lemieux-Charles
Mr. Gary P. Mooney
Mr. Richard B. Nunn
Ms N. Jane Pepino
Mr. Manveen Puri
Ms Melinda Rogers
Professor Janice Gross Stein
Ms Morgan Vanek
Dr. Sarita Verma
Mr. W. David Wilson

Secretariat:

Mr. Anwar Kazimi
Ms Cristina Oke

In Attendance:

Professor Scott Mabury, Vice-President, University Operations
Mr. David Palmer, Vice-President, Advancement
Professor Jill Matus, Vice-Provost, Students
Ms Gillian Morrison, Assistant Vice-President, Divisional Relations and Campaigns
Mr. Steve Bailey, Director, Office of Space Management
Mr. David Curtin, Office of the President
Mr. Jim Delaney, Director, Office of the Vice-Provost, Students
Ms Sheree Drummond, Assistant Provost
Mr. Jason Dumelie, Executive-at-Large, Graduate Students' Union (GSU)
Ms Sally Garner, Executive Director, Planning and Budget
Ms Nora Gillespie, Legal Counsel, Office of the Vice-President and Provost
Dr. Anthony Gray, Director, Strategic Initiative and Research, Office of the President
Dr. Jane Harrison, Director, Academic Programs and Policy, Office of the Vice-President and Provost
Mr. Steve Moate, Senior Legal Counsel, Office of the President
Mr. Munib Sajjad, Vice-President, University Affairs, Students' Administrative Council (SAC) which operates as the University of Toronto Students' Union (UTSU)
Mr. Andrew Ursel, Vice-President, University Affairs and Academics, University of Toronto Mississauga Students' Union (UTMSU)

In Camera Session

1. Senior Appointments

On motion duly moved, seconded and carried,

It was Resolved,

THAT Professor Franco J. Vaccarino be re-appointed to the position of Vice-President, University of Toronto, concurrent with his appointment as Principal of the University of Toronto Scarborough, for a five-year term beginning July 1, 2012 and ending June 30, 2017.

On motion duly moved, seconded and carried,

It was Resolved,

THAT, subject to approval of the terms and conditions of re-appointment by the Senior Appointments and Compensation Committee, Professor Paul Young be re-appointed to the position of Vice-President, Research for a three-year term effective July 1, 2012 and continuing until June 30, 2015.

2. Committee for Honorary Degree Membership

On motion duly moved, seconded and carried,

It was Resolved,

THAT the proposal for membership on the Committee for Honorary Degrees, 2012-2013, as outlined in the memorandum from the Secretary of the Governing Council dated, May 11, 2012, be approved.

Administrative Staff

Ms Judith Chadwick (Assistant Vice-President, Research Services)

Lay Members

Mr. Paul Huyer (Chair, Board of Regents, Victoria University)

Mr. Geoff Matus (past Lieutenant Governor in Council member of the Governing Council)

Mr. Carl Mitchell (Past President, University of Toronto Alumni Association)

Students

Ms Katie Dunlop, Faculty of Arts and Science

Mr. Chirag Variawa, Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering

Teaching Staff

Professor Anne-Emanuelle Birn, UTSC (Public Health)

Professor Thomas Keymer, Faculty of Arts and Science (English)

Professor Elizabeth Smyth, OISE (Curriculum Teaching, and Learning)

Professor Bryan Stewart, UTM (Biology)

3. Board and Committee Assignments 2012-13

On motion duly moved, seconded and carried,

It was Resolved,

THAT the proposal from the Chair for Boards and Committees assignments for 2012-13 be approved.

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL MOVED INTO OPEN SESSION.

Open Session

4. Chair's Remarks

(a) Welcome

The Chair welcomed members and guests to the meeting at the University of Toronto Scarborough (UTSC) and noted that it was a pleasure to spend time at UTSC.

The Chair reported on two decisions made *in camera*. She announced the extension of the terms for Professor Vaccarino and Professor Young, and congratulated Professor Vaccarino on the extension, and also expressed the Council's congratulations to Professor Young who was unable to attend.

(b) Speaking Requests

The Chair noted that speaking requests had been granted to the Graduate Students' Union (GSU), the University of Toronto Mississauga Students' Union (UTMSU), and the Students' Administrative Council (SAC) which operates as the University of Toronto Students' Union (UTSU).

5. Vice-President and Principal's Remarks

Professor Vaccarino thanked the Governing Council for its continued confidence noting that it was an honour and a privilege to serve the University.

Professor Vaccarino recalled that he had presented the Governing Council with the UTSC Master Plan in May 2009; this presentation would serve as an update on the outcome of the planning process at UTSC and would focus on the following:

- Academic Excellence
- Student Engagement
- Research and Innovation
- Campus Growth

The PowerPoint presentation made by Professor Vaccarino is attached as Appendix "A".

Members and guests applauded Professor Vaccarino for his presentation.

A member noted that UTSC had aspirations for continued growth. In the member's opinion, some parts of the University had suffered because of growth. He asked whether it would be better for the UTSC to concentrate on enhancing its existing programs rather than aiming to grow further.

5. Vice-President and Principal's Remarks (cont'd)

Professor Vaccarino replied that the growth in student numbers at UTSC had been achieved in a carefully planned manner. The faculty had been consulted at the departmental level and the evolving potential for a comprehensive campus with a focus on arts and sciences had been identified. To achieve this potential, it was important to increase student numbers and the UTSC campus would continue to be comfortable with its targeted growth of about 14,000 students by 2016-17.

6. Report of the President

The President also thanked Professor Vaccarino for his presentation and his continued leadership at the University of Toronto Scarborough.

(a) Awards and Honours

The President drew the attention of the members to the Awards and Honours list included with their agenda material. He highlighted the following:

- The list included the University of Toronto Alumni Association's Annual Awards of Excellence, recognizing an outstanding group of individuals for contributions at every level across the three campuses.
- University Professor Geoffrey Hinton, a world-renowned researcher in machine learning and artificial intelligence, had been awarded one of five 2012 Killam Prizes. The Killam Prize was the latest in the long list of prestigious honours that had been conferred upon Professor Hinton. In 2010, he had won the Gerhard Herzberg Canada Gold Medal for Science and Engineering.

The President noted that one of the Killam Prizes had been awarded to a University of Toronto researcher for the seventh year in a row.

- Mr. Wilkerson De Souza (undergraduate student, Woodsworth College), a Varsity Blues linebacker had been drafted by the Canadian Football League's (CFL) Calgary Stampeders. Mr. De Souza was a 2012 OUA First-Team All Star and had led Toronto to the province's top-ranked defense for three consecutive weeks.
- The winners of the 2012 President's Teaching Awards were:
 - Karen Reid, a senior lecturer in the Department of Computer Science, and Associate Chair for undergraduate studies.
 - Ivan Silver, Professor in the Department of Psychiatry and the inaugural Vice-President, Education, at the Centre for Addiction and Mental Health.
 - Jim Wallace, Professor in the Department of Mechanical and Industrial Engineering and Director of the Engine Research and Development Laboratory.

The President noted that, as was the case in 2011, university teachers from the Department of Computer Science and the Department of Psychiatry had won the University's highest award for teaching. Also, for the third time in six years a member of the teaching staff from the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering had received this recognition.

6. Report of the President (cont'd)

(b) Convocation Season

The President reminded governors that the first of this spring's twenty-four convocations ceremonies was scheduled for Tuesday, June 5 when graduates from the Faculty of Medicine would receive their degrees. Governors would be receiving information about the convocation schedule and were encouraged to attend the convocation ceremonies as their schedules permitted.

The President commented that the convocation ceremonies were a highlight on the academic calendar and were occasions full of optimism, promise and celebration. The Convocation Plaza would return to serve as a space for gathering and celebrating the success of the University's graduates and honorary graduates.

The Spring ceremonies would mark the last convocation over which Chancellor Peterson would preside. The President expressed the University's gratitude to Chancellor Peterson for his extraordinary service to the University and for his inspiring presence at convocation ceremonies since 2006. He highlighted the following:

- The Chancellor had not missed a single convocation ceremony in six years.
- On June 21, 2012, the Chancellor was scheduled to preside over his 181st convocation ceremony. This was in addition to his role in numerous special ceremonies at the federated universities and in Hong Kong and elsewhere.
- By the end of his service, the Chancellor would have conferred degrees upon 94,973 students.
- Over 70,000 graduates had walked across the stage in Convocation Hall – the majority sharing a hand shake and receiving a quiet word of encouragement or congratulations from the Chancellor.

The President concluded by thanking the Chancellor for his unparalleled service to the University and its students. The President's remarks were greeted with applause by members and guests.

(c) Election of New Chancellor

The President announced that on May 14, 2012, the College of Electors had elected the Honourable Michael Wilson as the thirty-third Chancellor of the University, effective July 1, 2012.

Commending the choice of the College of Electors, the President said that it would be a privilege and an honour to have Mr. Wilson serve the University in the capacity of the Chancellor. The President referred to the communication to the University community announcing Mr. Wilson's election as Chancellor¹.

In closing, the President thanked Mr. Wilson for agreeing to serve his *alma mater* as Chancellor and invited members to join him at the first convocation ceremony in November 2012 at which time Mr. Wilson would be officially installed as Chancellor.

¹ <http://news.utoronto.ca/michael-wilson-new-u-t-chancellor>

7. Items for Governing Council Approval

(a) Towards 2030: The View from 2012 – A Framework

The Chair reminded members of the importance of *Towards 2030: The View from 2012 – A Framework*: it provided an assessment of the University's progress towards long-term goals while identifying the new and ongoing challenges and opportunities that lay ahead for the institution, and she encouraged members to have a full discussion.

Professor Hodnett provided the highlights of the document as they had been presented to the Academic Board at its meeting on April 19, 2012

Professor Misak said that the *Framework* was the product of the broad consultation and input received from the University community through three well-attended "town halls" and approximately 40 other meetings with stakeholders, including those with the Governing Council and its bodies. The feedback indicated that the University continued to make impressive progress towards many of its goals as outlined in *Towards 2030*, in spite of new and difficult economic circumstances Professor Misak affirmed the value of processes such as this and suggested that the University must regularly assess its progress towards its long-term goals.

Members' comments and questions included the following:

- **Orientation.** A member commended the administration for providing a valuable and honest 'state of the University' document. He concurred with the Executive Committee's suggestion that the document be used as an orientation tool for members new to the University community, e.g., new governors.
- **Equity and Student Life.** Clarification was sought on measures that had been taken with respect to the support of equity and student life offices on the UTM and UTSC campuses. The Provost noted that the need for more consistent equity-related support had been strongly expressed at "town halls". Consequently, an allocation had been made through the University Fund to address these issues.
- **Online Courses and Differentiation.** Recent essays in popular media had focused on digitalization (online courses) and differentiation of post-secondary institutions. Concern was expressed that the *Framework* document had not provided sufficient clarity on the University's position on differentiation and how evolving trends in higher education, such as online education, fitted with its long-term objectives. Would more online course offerings address the space challenges faced by the University, while assisting students who were unable to attend classes due to time constraints? Professor Misak noted that these questions had been much discussed and addressed in the document. The University recognized the flexibility for students afforded by online course offerings and would continue to add more courses as appropriate to those that had been offered through its successful pilot programs.
- **Community Relations.** It was suggested that the *Framework* document had not provided information on the University's engagement with the community, an area in which the University was very active. Professor Misak said that the University had identified the need to enhance awareness of its huge contributions to the community and engagement with the community in diverse ways. This was addressed in the detailed assessment report that had been provided along with the *Framework* document.
- **Research.** A member advocated for the inclusion of information on the University's progress in research-related activities through spin-off and commercial ventures. The member said that the University needed to provide a comparative and time-series analysis for research benchmarks in

7. Items for Governing Council Approval (cont'd)

(a) Towards 2030: The View from 2012 – A Framework (cont'd)

relation to the major research universities in the world as well as its Canadian peer institutions. Professor Misak acknowledged the value of such information noting, though, that the University would be better served to compare its data with that of its international peers. However, those data had not always been easily obtained.

- **Government Funding.** A member noted the need for continued advocacy for increased government funding was emphasized as Ontario continued to be ranked last on the per-student funding scale. The Provost concurred, adding that after the *Framework* document had been drafted, the provincial government had withdrawn funding for many programs including the Ontario Work-Study Program. The University had recognized the importance of the Work-Study Program for its students and had sought alternate means to ensure its continuation. The President reminded members that the per-capita cost of the University's student access guarantee remained the highest among the provincial universities, and the Government's decisions were putting additional pressure on the University's financial aid programs. A member called for periodic reviews of the University's long-term goals particularly in a climate where the government had withdrawn funding for research-related activities at universities. He added that this would allow the University to redefine its priorities. Professor Misak said that the need to advocate for greater funding from the provincial government remained a major priority for the University. She also explained that under the University's budget model an examination of revenue and expenses for each division was done on an annual basis. This allowed the University to be nimble in its response to challenges that could result from the withdrawal of any funding.
- **Graduate Education.** A member expressed concern that the University had been unable to recruit and fund qualified international graduate students and that some international students who were able to self-fund their program could not to be accepted to programs. A member also suggested that ways be found to allow well qualified alumni to return to the University to pursue further studies at the graduate and doctoral level on a self-funded basis. Professor Misak said that the University continued to seek creative ways to accept international graduate students into its programs.

At the invitation of the Chair, Mr. Jason Dumelie addressed the Council on behalf of the GSU. He stated that two related challenges to graduate education had warranted further attention in the *Framework* document. First, some graduate students had expressed concerns about the delivery of their programs and had called for more pro-active oversight related to test structures, course quality and curricula. In the opinion of Mr. Dumelie, while the University was undertaking world-class research, it must be more attentive to the balance between resources for research per se and funding for graduate education. In her response, Professor Misak said that while the University was always trying to improve graduate education, surveys indicated that the University continued to outperform its Canadian peers on most graduate student satisfaction indices. She also noted that research and graduate education were intertwined at the University and investments in research were also investments in graduate education.

On motion duly moved, seconded and carried

It was Resolved

THAT *Towards 2030: The View from 2012 – A Framework*, dated March 28, 2012, be approved in principle.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 195 of the Academic Board as Appendix "A".

CONSENT AGENDA

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

THAT the consent agenda be adopted and that the items be approved.

- 8. Proposal to Disestablish the Existing Centre for Environment (EDU: B) and to Establish the School of the Environment as an EDU: B**
(Arising from Report Number 179 of the Academic Board (April 19, 2012))

Be It Resolved,

- (a) THAT the Centre for Environment be disestablished, effective July 1, 2012; and
- (b) THAT the School of the Environment be established as an Extra-Departmental Unit B (EDU: B), effective July 1, 2012.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 179 of the Academic Board as Appendix “B”.

- 9. Report of the Previous Meeting of April 11, 2012**

The minutes of the April 11, 2012 meeting were approved.

- 10. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting**

There was no business arising from the previous meeting.

- 11. Reports for Information**

The Council received for information the following reports:

- (a) Report Number 179 of the Academic Board (April 19, 2012)
- (b) Report Number 196 of the Business Board (April 2, 2012)
- (c) Report Number 169 of the University Affairs Board (April 17, 2012)
- (d) Report Number 446 of the Executive Committee (May 7, 2012)

- 12. Date of Next Meeting**

The next meeting of the Governing Council was scheduled for Thursday, June 25, 2012 at 4:00 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall.

13. Update on the Implementation of the Program Fee in the Faculty of Arts and Science

Introduction

Professor Misak recalled that at the May 19, 2011 meeting of the Governing Council, a motion had been approved requesting that the Program Fee Monitoring Committee (PFMC) continue its work for one more year and provide an update to the administration based on the data for 2011-12 on the effects of the Program Fee at the Faculty of Arts and Science (FAS). The PFMC had continued its work and had reported that, consistent with its findings in 2011, no systemic negative consequences had resulted from the implementation of the Program Fee at the FAS.

Invited to address the Council on the report, Dean Gertler thanked Professor McGowan, Chair, PFMC, and other members of the PFMC for their efforts in preparing the report. He highlighted the following:

- The PFMC had carefully and systematically studied the impact of the implementation of the Program Fee at the FAS. The results of the study had been consistent with the Committee's initial findings and reassuring with respect to the impact of the implementation of the Program Fee at the FAS.
- Increased revenue from the Program Fee had been reinvested to enrich the student experience. The process of monitoring the effects of the Program Fee had been useful in providing direction for structural changes to the course selection system that would result in greater efficiency and equity in course selection. The benefits that had resulted from the flexibility to add and drop courses had been recognized by the students.

The Report of the PFMC and the presentation by Professor McGowan are appended to the minutes.

Discussion

A member thanked the Provost and the PFMC for the report. It was his view that the implementation of the Program Fee at the FAS had resulted in financial hardships for a small but significant number of students. He suggested that more detailed student perspectives be included in future reports and that the numerous financial aid resources that had been put in place by the University to mitigate the effects of the Program Fees faced by some students be highlighted.

Guest Speakers

Mr. Munib Sajjad addressed the Council on behalf of UTSU (SAC) and Mr. Andrew Ursel addressed the Council on behalf of the UTMSU and they expressed the following views:

- The Program Fee had been ratified by the Arts and Science Council and approved by the Governing Council in May 2009 against widespread opposition.
- The Program Fee was a barrier to access for students. The PFMC report was based on poor data, non-illuminating and ill-informed analysis, and was not a critical review.
- The Program Fee had benefitted students who resided on campus.
- New students to the FAS did not have sufficient information on the Program Fee and its financial implication for them four to five years later.
- Any future reports on the effects of the Program Fee should examine the debt-levels at the entry and graduation levels for three or four separate student cohorts.
- On average, students completed an undergraduate degree in five years. Under the Program Fee system, the students were expected to complete their studies in four years. Expediency was not necessarily the best method for all students. Students had been driven to enroll in more credits which had resulted in unintended academic and financial consequences.

13. Update on the Implementation of the Program Fee in the Faculty of Arts and Science (cont'd)

Response

In her response to the comments made by the guest speakers, Professor Misak said that the University continued to address the financial challenges faced by its students. She reiterated the comments made earlier by the President - that the level of financial aid available for students at the University exceeded the levels that had been legislated by the Provincial Government. She noted that student views on the Program Fee had not been homogenous. Many students had taken the opportunity to complete their program in a shorter duration and there was a strong demand on the University from students and government to offer more accelerated programs. Contrary to the opinion of the guest speakers, the data to support the retention of the Program Fee at the FAS was strong. This data had put to rest the legitimate worries that had been expressed when the Program Fee had been put in place.

The President expressed concern that Mr. Sajjad had described the report to be non-illuminating and ill-informed because it had used National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) data and successive cohorts. In the opinion of the President, citing his own academic work with large data sets, any perceived shortcomings in the collection of data for the report did not support the speaker's argument that the data were not responsive to the questions put to them. He believed that the broad inferences that had been drawn in the report with regard to the comparative impact of the implementation of the Program Fees over the years were valid.

14. Report of the Implementation Committee for the Task Force on Governance

Professor Gough reported that consultations at UTM and UTSC were being completed and that documents related to the proposed changes to governance had been provided to the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs and the Planning and Budget Committee and that they reflected the consultations at UTM and UTSC. He said that the purpose of providing the information to the governance bodies was:

- To provide members with highlights of the proposals;
- To outline the consultation process that had been initiated to develop the proposals; and
- To receive any feedback prior to presenting the recommendations to the Executive Committee and the Governing Council for approval.

Professor Gough said that it had been clear to the Task Force on Governance – and had been confirmed in the processes of the previous months – that the existing College Councils were no longer sufficient for UTM and UTSC as the campuses had grown and evolved. Each campus needed an academic governance structure and other governance bodies with responsibilities that were not currently within the authority of the College Councils.

The proposed Campus Councils (CC) and their Committees would establish:

- An academic governance structure – the Academic Affairs Committee (AAC) – that, like College / Faculty Councils, was intended to reflect the composition of the Academic Board (their parent body) and, consistent with such bodies, had particular reporting relationships with the Academic Board and the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs.
- A Campus Affairs Committee (CAC) that would have responsibility for campus-specific matters that related, to some extent, to the responsibilities of the University Affairs Board and the Planning and Budget Committee.

Professor Gough added that, unlike the existing Councils at UTM and UTSC, the proposed model would provide the campuses with decision-making authority for particular matters – with appropriate accountability to the Governing Council. The principles on which the model was based were described in the cover memorandum provided to the Committee on Academic Policy

14. Report of the Implementation Committee for the Task Force on Governance (cont'd)

and Programs and the Planning and Budget Committee, and were focussed on the principles of representation and responsibility that had been articulated in the *University of Toronto Act (1971)*, the *Report of the Chairman's Advisory Committee on Governance (1988)* (the Balfour Report) and the *Report of the Task Force on Governance (2010)*.

Since the outset of the planning process, there had been consistent agreement on the mandates of the proposed Councils and their Committees. Professor Gough said that discussions at UTM and UTSC had focussed primarily on the details related to the intended size of the CC and its standing committees and to the representation of various constituencies on the bodies. The discussions at the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs and the Planning and Budget Committee on the student representation on the Campus Councils would be carefully considered.

In response to a question from a member, Professor Gough noted that the proportion of students on the Campus Council would be reflective of that on the Governing Council. Similarly, the proportion of students on the AAC would be similar to that on the Academic Board.

15. Question Period

A member referred to the decision by the University of British Columbia (UBC) not to sign the license agreement with Access Copyright. She asked for the administration's reaction to this decision by UBC in light of the discussions on the matter of Access Copyright at the previous two meetings of the Governing Council. Professor Matus replied that the University was interested in the response from Access Copyright and in how this matter would unfold.

Thank you

The Chair thanked Professor Vaccarino and the staff at UTSC for their work in preparing for the Governing Council meeting. She invited those present to join Professor Franco Vaccarino at a reception at the Ralph Campbell Lounge.

The meeting adjourned at 7:10 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

May 29, 2012