

**Report of the UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO MISSISSAUGA ERINDALE
COLLEGE COUNCIL meeting held on Thursday, April 5, 2012, at 3:10 p.m. in the
Council Chamber, Room 3130, W. G. Davis Building**

Present: G. Anderson (in the Chair), D. Saini, A. Mullin, U. Krull, P. Donoghue, D. Crocker, M.A. Mavrincac, M. Overton, D. Di Censo, I. Still, M. Jalland, M. Meth, S. Senese, M. Jamieson, M. Berger, A. Birkenbergs, L. Gaspini, K. Horvath, C. Capewell, C. Clairmont, K. Duncliffe, S. Elias, P. Goldsmith, J. McCurdy-Myers, D. Mullings, A. Vyas, L. Bailey, A. Petersen, N. Woolridge, S. Kamenetsky, H. Gunz, M. Tombak, S. Stefanovic, B. Stewart, K. Wilson, M. Lettieri, A. Daniere, N. Alim, C. Thompson, R. El-Kadri, A. Rehman, R. Dantes, A. Madhavji, Q. Muhammad, J. Shek, N. Zhou, M. Zandawala, S. Da Silva, I. Sheoran
Regrets: L. Oliver, D. Dunlop, D. Coulson, D. Kreuger, I. DiMillo
In attendance: Walied Khogali, UTMSU; Carmen Bryson, Office of the VP Research; Carla DeMarco, Office of the VP Research

1. Approval of Minutes of Previous Meeting (March 8, 2012)

The report of the previous meeting was approved.

2. Reports of Standing Committees and Officers

a) Resource Planning & Priorities Committee: Report of March 26, 2012—Prof. Lee Bailey

Professor Bailey reported that as part of his very comprehensive report to the Committee on capital and budgetary matters, the Chief Administrative Officer discussed the 2012-13 budget. He called on Mr. Paul Donoghue, CAO, to provide Council with a presentation on the UTM budget, including the broader context of the university. The presentation is attached hereto as Appendix A. Mr. Donoghue explained that the fiscal context for the university's budget were the estimated \$16B Provincial and \$30B Federal deficits. He noted that there is no change in the allocation of \$52M to UTM's budget. He explained that the Drummond report recommended a 1.5% per annum increase, while at the same time, sector growth is projected at 1.7%. He showed a slide of Provincial government transfers to colleges and universities per student FTE for 2008-09, pointing out the large discrepancy between transfers to Ontario and the rest of the provinces: Ontario receives the lowest such transfers at approximately \$10,000, while Alberta receives more than \$25,000.

Discussing the university-wide overview, Mr. Donoghue noted that the university has a balanced budget and is in the final year of paying down the institution-wide accumulated deficit. This is in the context of a modest expansion in both undergraduate and graduate student numbers and pension challenges. The CAO explained that key budget assumptions going forward included full BIU funding, a continuation of the tuition framework (5% with restrictions; a maximum of 4.3% at U of T) and stage 2 pension solvency relief. He noted that the impact of the Ontario Tuition Grant on student access guarantee and operating budget remained unclear.

He reported that the university has a structural budget challenge in that the weighted average increase in revenue was 2.6%, while the weighted average increase in expenses was 4.3%. He provided a summary of undergraduate enrolment plans at the university, noting that at UTM, undergraduate FTE numbers are projected to be 12,361 by 2016. A similar increase would occur at Scarborough, while the Faculty of Arts & Science was holding its intake at the 2011 level.

Mr. Donoghue reported that UTM enjoys a balanced budget, and with the continuation of the \$3M per year deficit repayment, UTM will eliminate its debt by 2016. He showed university-wide costs by bin for 2012-13, and noted that occupancy costs were at the top at 23%. With respect to major expense categories, compensation represents the highest percentage at 63%, which is consistent across the university.

In this context, UTM achieved its overall enrolment targets with the highest admission averages to date and with a retention rate of 92%. International undergraduate student intake is targeted to be between 15.5% and 17% by 2015.

The CAO discussed student to faculty ratio and space, facilities and research infrastructure as the fundamental challenges faced by the campus.

He reported that the 5-year capital plan includes the following:

- North building re-construction (May 2012 start)
- Teaching labs over four summers (Biology is first priority during the summer of 2012)
- Kaneff Centre addition
- Davis Building Phase II
- Research labs (renovations and new)
- Student Centre expansion

The total borrowing for the above projects is approximately \$17M.

The refined 5-year capital plan includes research labs in an expandable addition concept (\$20M) instead of a stand-alone science building, a library expansion (\$15M) and a second parking deck (\$6M), all projects that are to be pursued as money becomes available. Mr. Donoghue noted that ancillary operations remain strong and as a change in process, all surpluses are to be allocated to capital reserves.

The CAO discussed issues going forward, which include: faculty growth at a top priority; the University Fund and moving toward “equalization”, resourcing departments to support past and current growth, protecting departments from budget cuts, office and research space, the borrowing cap and UTM’s deficit to 2015-16. Within this context the campus has to accomplish academic planning, capital construction, a review of governance, new programs, an international recruitment push and a major fundraising campaign.

b) Academic Affairs Committee: Report of March 27, 2012 —Prof. Nick Woolridge

Professor Woolridge reported that as part of its monitorial responsibility, the Committee heard annual reports on the 2010-11 year from the following areas:

- Committee on Standing, Diane Crocker, Registrar and Director of Enrolment Management
- Academic Appeals Board, Professor Stuart Kamenetsky, Chair
- Academic Discipline, Lucy Gaspini, Manager of Academic Integrity and Affairs, Office of the Dean
- Research, Devin Kreuger, Director of the Office of the Vice-Principal Research
- Library, Mary Ann Mavrinac, Chief Librarian

Professor Woolridge noted that all of these annual reports are available on the governance website as part of the agenda materials for today's Council meeting. He reported that the AAC also approved the proposed transcript notation from the Department of Management and called on Professor Gunz to present the item and make the appropriate motion.

- [Proposed Transcript Notation: Professional Skills Development Program \(PSDP\) in the Department of Management](#) – Professor Hugh Gunz, Associate Chair and Director, Undergraduate Programs, Department of Management

Professor Gunz presented the proposal for the introduction of a transcript notation in the Professional Skills Development Program in the Department of Management. He explained that consistent with Governing Council policy, which allows for extra-curricular activities such as this to be noted on student transcripts, the department would like to move forward with the proposal that is attached hereto as Appendix B.

It was duly moved and seconded,

THAT

Erindale College Council approve the Professional Skills Development Program (PSDP) transcript notation in the Department of Management as described in the attached proposal, effective immediately.

The motion was carried.

The Chair reported that in addition to the annual reports listed above, the Committee also received a detailed report on the 2010-11 reviews of academic units and programs; he called on the Dean to provide this report to Council. This presentation was also available on the governance website as a supporting document to the Council meeting agenda and is attached hereto as Appendix C.

- Reviews of Academic units and programs 2010-11 – Professor Amy Mullin, Vice-Principal Academic and Dean

The Dean noted that this was the second year in which external reviews have taken place under the University of Toronto Quality Assurance process or UTQAP, which is supervised

by the provincial Quality Council. She thanked Ms. Melissa Berger, Program and Planning Officer in the Office of the Dean for her great work in managing the external review process. She reported that in 2010-11, there were external reviews for the departments of Biology and Political Science. She discussed the major findings, positive elements, concerns as well as the university's responses to the findings of the review. In the case of the Department of Biology, these responses included new teaching labs, a clearer and more participatory departmental governance structure, increased lab offerings and new hires when appropriate. With respect to the Department of Political Science, responses included two new searches to address concerns about student to faculty ratio and to address the faculty gender imbalance. Professor Mullin noted that the department made two new hires in 2011, both of which were women.

3. Update from the Governance Review Committee: Professor Amrita Daniere, Chair

Professor Daniere's presentation is attached hereto as Appendix D. She reported that the Governance Review Committee (GRC) had been meeting since November of 2011 and had come to a general consensus on the following points:

- The structure of committees and framework for reporting relationships within UTM and to Governing Council and its Boards/Committees
- Mandates of Council and its Committees
- Membership composition and numbers, with discussion still ongoing about the specifics of composition, particularly the selection of student representatives

She provided an overview of the proposed UTM governance structure and showed how the UTM model would fit within the overall U of T governance structure. The UTM governance structure would have a Campus Council (CC) at the top and the following three standing committees reporting to it: the Executive Committee, Academic Affairs Committee (AAC) and the Campus Affairs Committee (CAC).

She explained that on behalf of the Governing Council, the Campus Council would exercise governance oversight of campus-specific matters arising from the AAC and CAC, as well as any matters assigned to them by the Governing Council. Comparable to a Board of Governing Council, decisions of the CC may be final or require confirmation by the GC Executive Committee and/or approval by GC or Academic Board. The CC would be concerned with matters affecting UTM's objectives and priorities, the development of long-term and short-term plans and the effective use of resources in the course of these pursuits. The total proposed membership of the CC is 26, and follows the membership principle of half internal and half external members and the representation of the 5 estates (students, faculty, staff, alumni and community.) The Executive Committee would be primarily an agenda-setting and coordinating body for the work of the Campus Council. The EC proposed membership total is 10, appointed annually by the CC from among its members and also represents the 5 estates. The Academic Affairs Committee, comparable to a divisional academic Council would have responsibility for academic matters currently within the authority of ECC. Depending on the specific matter, items would either receive final approval at the AAC or require further approval or confirmation by the CC, GCEX, GC, Academic Board (AB) or the

Committee on Academic Policy and Programs of the AB. The total proposed membership of the AAC is 57, and is representative of students, faculty, staff, alumni and community. The Campus Affairs Committee would have responsibility for monitoring, reviewing and making recommendations on a broad range of campus planning issues and priorities for the use of campus resources. The total proposed membership of the CAC is 28; a majority of these would be members of the university community.

Professor Daniere noted that matters still under discussion for the governance review include different perspectives on the method of selection of student participation (ex-officio versus elected students) and explained that a guiding principle of the proposed model is that with the exception of the Chancellor and the Chair and Vice-Chair of Governing Council, ex-officio members are individuals who, as officers of the University, have responsibility for bringing business items to governance for consideration. In the proposed model, they include for example, the Dean and Vice-Deans and the Department Chairs on the Academic Affairs Committee.

She concluded her update report by discussing the next steps of the governance review as follows:

- Town Hall: April 12, 3 p.m., in the Council Chamber
- Finalize terms of reference document at the upcoming meeting of the GRC: April 16, 2012
- Final terms of reference document for discussion to a special meeting of ECC on May 28, 2012, 2PM, Council Chamber
- GC consideration and approval date: June 25, 2012
- Implementation: 2012-2013
- Effective date of changes: July 1, 2013

The Chair opened the floor to questions on Professor Daniere's report.

In response to a member's question about whether the principle of half internal and half external membership on Campus Council was a requirement of the U of T Act, Professor Daniere answered that she believed it was, but that a more detailed answer would be provided to members on this at the next meeting. In response to a member's question about why the Academic Affairs Committee was so large compared to other committees, Professor Daniere explained that it acts like a Senate and has to have representation from a wide range of voices. The Dean added that because this committee would be focused on academic matters, it would need to include at least one representative from each department, a consideration that added 16 members to the committee at a minimum.

Professor Daniere noted that the specific committee membership numbers would be available to everyone as part of the presentation at the April 12 Town Hall and would thereafter be posted on the governance review website.

4. Vice President and Principal's Report

Professor Saini noted that despite the discrepancy in provincial government transfers to universities, the University of Toronto has had a wonderfully productive year and continues to rank among the top universities in the world. He reported that there was an increase in UTM's enrolment, which also coincided with a raise in the campus' admission standards. He congratulated the faculty on their research successes and students on academic and extra-curricular successes. He pointed to a number of very prestigious architectural awards received by UTM's Instructional Centre and Health Sciences Complex. He noted that UTM enjoys a great relationship and support from the City of Mississauga and western GTA community. He remarked that over the next year, the campus would be working towards greater visibility for its management programs and will continue to work to introduce engineering to the campus.

Professor Saini emphasized that the campus would be launching its own very ambitious fundraising campaign on May 23, 2012, as part of the university's overall \$2B campaign, which has already crossed the \$1B mark. The Vice-President and Principal extended an invitation to all Council members to attend the launch on Wednesday, May 23, at 5:30 p.m., in the Instructional Centre. He added that in conjunction with the campaign launch, UTM is in the process of planning a visibility campaign with the goal of putting the campus front and centre in the minds of the surrounding community.

The VP&P also took the opportunity to thank the Chair of ECC and the Director of Governance for their work. He also expressed his thanks to the Chief Librarian, Ms. Mary Ann Mavrinac, for her many years of exemplary service to UTM and congratulated her for accepting a wonderful new opportunity as the Vice-Provost and Andrew H. and Janet Dayton Neilly Dean of River Campus Libraries, University of Rochester, NY. He concluded by wishing everyone a productive and restorative summer.

The Registrar commented that UTM already has 6000 students enrolled in summer courses.

The Chair congratulated the President-elect of UTMSU, Mr. Chris Thompson, and invited members to stay for the end-of-term celebratory reception immediately following the Council meeting. The Chair announced that as mentioned by Professor Daniere, the next meeting of ECC would be a special meeting on May 28, 2012 to discuss the proposed terms of reference of the Campus Council stemming from the tri-campus governance review, and that the time of the meeting would be confirmed with the agenda notice of the meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 4:35 p.m.

Secretary _____ Chair _____