Report of the UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO MISSISSAUGA ERINDALE COLLEGE COUNCIL meeting held on Thursday, March 8, 2012 at 3:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Room 3130, W. G. Davis Building.


In attendance: M. Daley, C. DeMarco, C. Bryson, T. Breukelman

1. Approval of Minutes of Previous Meeting (Minutes: January 31, 2012) (January 31 Meeting Documentation)

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved. (A. Mullin/M.A. Mavrinac)

2. Reports of Standing Committees and Officers

a) Academic Affairs Committee: Report of the February 28, 2012 meeting – Professor Nick Woolridge

For information, resolutions that received final approval by the Academic Affairs Committee:

i) Credit / No Credit Policy ii) Limit on term course load

Professor Woolridge reported that there were two proposals that were considered and received final approval by the Academic Affairs Committee; they were also confirmed by the Executive Committee. Changes to the credit/no credit policy represented the first item for approval for the committee. The Registrar presented two modifications for approval to the Credit/No Credit Policy: the first change was extending the deadline for the credit/no credit option from the last day to enroll in the course to the last day
of classes and the second change was to increase the option from 1.0 to 2.0 FCE, beginning in the summer of 2012. Professor Woolridge reported that there was considerable debate on the first proposal related to the credit/no credit policy, with the committee finally agreeing to an amendment to the proposal, resulting in a change to the deadline by which students elected to choose the credit/no credit option from the last day of classes to the last day to drop a course without academic penalty.

Professor Woolridge reported that the second proposal brought forth by the Registrar and approved by the AAC, involved limiting students to a course load of 6 courses per academic term in the fall/winter session and 2 courses per academic term in the summer session.

Professor Woolridge further noted that the rest of the reports to the AAC were all for information and concerned the following: minor changes to the MBiotech program, a small change in the governance process for doctoral stream programs (eliminating the 3CGC or Tri-campus Graduate Curriculum Committee) and a pilot program promoting the University of Toronto fast track three-year degree. More information about these informational reports could be found in the minutes of the AAC meeting.

b) Report of the Chair of the Governance Review Committee (GRC) – Professor Amrita Daniere, Vice-Dean Graduate and Chair of the GRC

Professor Daniere reported that the Governance Review Committee has met several times since the fall of 2011, discussing how the UTM governance structure may be improved and how it could be made to better fit within the framework and structure of that of the Governing Council. The GRC is considering the proposals put forth by the Taskforce On Governance and is in the process of producing a terms of reference document for UTM Council and committees that more closely conforms to the new framework proposed therein.

She reported that the GRC has already held two halls to give an update on its proceedings and to receive feedback. There is another town hall planned for April in order to provide an opportunity for the UTM community to hear about a more developed version of the terms of reference document and to provide feedback to members of the GRC.

c) Report of the Vice-Principal Academic and Dean on Academic Planning – Professor Amy Mullin

Professor Mullin reported that the Academic Planning Committee (APC) included representatives from the library, faculty from various disciplines, and
one undergraduate student, one graduate student, one alumni and one staff. She noted that a town hall was held in the fall to receive feedback and to present statement of values, which were proposed to guide academic planning.

She referred members to the academic planning website (http://www.utm.utoronto.ca/academic-planning/) and encouraged members to seek detailed information there the stages of academic planning. She reported that departments were encouraged to consult broadly with faculty, staff, and students and also with various other departments in developing their draft academic plans. The Office of the Dean in early to mid-February received these plans and subcommittees were established to give detailed feedback on them. Professor Mullin reported that she had just completed the last of 16 meeting with departments to give detailed feedback on these draft proposals and that departments are now charged with incorporating this feedback in the development of their next draft.

The Dean further reported that other mechanisms for consultation have been pursued, including a technology task force, and engagement with the library and the Office of the Vice-Principal Research.

The deadline to receive all departmental plans is March 30, 2012. The development of divisional plans will follow.

3. Vice President and Principal’s Report

a) Implications of the Drummond Report on Ontario universities

The Vice-President and Principal reported on the Drummond Report and its implications on Ontario universities. The Drummond commission on the reform of Ontario’s public service was mandated to make recommendations that would help eliminate the Ontario deficit by 2017-18, but not by raising taxes or privatizing health care or education. The report projects that the province’s low economic growth will continue, persisting at 2.2% and then in 2015 slowing to 2%. The report predicts that government revenues in 2017-18 will be $7B less than projected if the status quo is maintained.

The report recommends differential caps for annual growth in various areas, maintained until 2017-18: health has the highest cap (2.5%), followed by post-secondary education (1.5%). If these caps are implemented, then PSE spending will increase in this period by $0.7B. The report seriously questions the possibility of eliminating the deficit by 2017-18.

Professor Saini noted that there were thirty recommendations directed at PSE in the report, covering various topics, including tuition policy, research,
teaching quality and operating funding. The core theme of these recommendations on PSE is to meet the challenges for rising demand for higher education at a time of constraint in funding. To do this it calls for PSE to become much more efficient than it is today.

The report recommends that if the proposed measures do not allow the ministry to live within the cap of 1.5% annual growth, the government should eliminate the 30% tuition grant.

The report notes that the highest priority of the government should be to fully fund the operating grants for colleges and universities, the second priority being current capital commitments. The report also outlines the major challenges faced by PSE, including the lowest level of per student funding and the lowest in Canada at a time of significant enrolment pressure. The report notes that institutions are heavily reliant on tuition fees for operating funding and highlights challenges related to quality including large class sizes, with increased use of part-time instructors in the system. The report explicitly rejects tuition fee increases and notes that research efforts should not trump teaching and calls for a better balance between teaching and research.

There were 7 categories of recommendations to enhance efficiency and quality in PSE, as follows:

1. 1.5% cap on funding growth; government should work with PSE to align bargaining and compensation agreements with more recent settlement trends in the broader public sector area.
2. Differentiation to improve PSE quality and achieve financial sustainability; ask for establishment of mandated agreements by 2012-13 that would provide more differentiation and minimize duplication among universities and colleges and then ask for these to be implemented by 2013-14; Quoting the report: “not every institution has to become a comprehensive research university nor does each college require degree granting authority…”
3. Encourage and reward quality; refocus institutional resources and rewards towards teaching, including more resources for experiential learning, independent study, problem based learning and study abroad opportunities; universities should be encouraged to include flexibility in teaching and research workloads in collective agreements, with teaching only and research only streams; reward excellent teachers.
4. Research funding structures: address funding full cost of research; call for awarding provincial research funding more strategically and more efficiently.
5. Tuition: report recommends maintenance of current overall 5% cap; but that the framework be simplified to allow institutions greater flexibility to adjust fees at the program level.

6. Student financial systems: report calls for pairing the simplified tuition framework with an enhanced system of student loans; should ensure that student aid is better targeted to low income students including the new Ontario tuition grant; implying that the current family threshold of $160K is too high; streamline student financial systems by decoupling loans and grants.

7. Cost efficiencies: integrating administrative and back office functions; implement coordinated purchasing by PSE and coordinated approach to sourcing, content management and product and process standardization; calls for consolidation of university pensions into one single pension fund administrator; calls for institutions to demonstrate increased use of space and consider year-round optimization of spaces; priority should be given to deferred maintenance before any new capital projects are approved.

4. Announcement regarding the Summer U-Pass: Mr. Dan DiCenzo, VP University Affairs and Academics, UTMSU

Mr. DiCenzo reported that UTMSU was working with EPUS to run a referendum to include part-time students in the summer UPass; this will allow all students to use the summer UPass. He noted that the referendum was underway and asked members to encourage part-time students to vote.

The Chair announced that the next meeting of ECC was scheduled for Thursday, April 5, 2012.

The meeting adjourned at 3:53 p.m.
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