

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

At the request of the Chair, MaryLynn West-Moynes acknowledged Terry Caputo, Director of Finance, and Craig Loverock, Director of Budgets and Financial Planning. She introduced Tom Ouchterlony, legal counsel with Borden, Ladner, Gervais, LLP.

ADDITIONS/DELETIONS TO THE AGENDA

None was noted.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST DECLARATIONS

None was noted.

APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MINUTES

There being no errors or omissions in the minutes of the Regular Board meeting of May 14, 2003, the Chair declared the minutes accepted as presented.

ACTION ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES

None was noted.

DECISION ITEMS

By-Law Number 1

Bob Strickert commented that the By-Laws had been discussed at the May Board meeting and the Executive Committee had also reviewed changes at its meeting on June 2. He advised some changes had been made and these were reflected in the document circulated to the Board. Bob remarked that the recommendation included two Executive Committees, one for UOIT and one for DC, which would meet jointly, as appropriate, with a number of co-populous members.

He commented on discussion regarding the use of the words “adjournment” and “recess” and the Committee had agreed to use “recess”. Joanne Burghardt noted concern with this and felt the section was somewhat vague. Her concern was that potentially opposing groups of the Board could recess if they so chose and thought guidelines could be added. Tom Ouchterlony noted that ultimately a motion to recess would have to be made and if made prematurely or inappropriately, the Chair could rule the motion out of order and that a majority would be required to pass the motion. He was not sure of the likelihood of this happening. Joanne asked if a majority would still be required to pass the motion even if there was not a quorum? Tom replied yes. Doug Wilson noted that common corporate practice was to use the word “adjourn”. Discussion followed regarding the meaning of “adjourn”. Rocky Simmons commented that the word “adjourn” means to delay and it might not be practical to redefine commonly used terms. After further discussion, it was agreed to replace “recess” with “adjourn” and the Board will use the word “terminate” at the conclusion of a meeting.

Doug Wilson complimented the Executive Committee on its diligence with the By-Laws and noted it had resolved both political as well as small, practical matters.

Moved by Gail MacKenzie

Seconded by Lorraine Sunstrum-Mann

MOTION #44 “That the Board of Governors of the University of Ontario Institute of Technology approve the By-Law Number 1 with the modifications noted to Sections 6.12 and 6.13, reinsertion of the word ‘adjourn’ and the inclusion of the section of the By-Law previously approved pertaining to Academic Council.”

CARRIED

Bob noted this was a historic moment.

UOIT Strategic Plan

Michael Finlayson presented two documents, the Vision, Mission and Values Statement and the Goals and Objectives, which comprised the Strategic Plan. He noted a slight rewrite of the Vision, Mission and Values statement to reflect research. The Goals and Objectives are criteria by which the success of the University's activities are measured. He noted the document outlined 16 measurables for the University.

Gail MacKenzie noted the statement in the section pertaining to Student Success, "achieve high quality student body, as measured by admission cut-offs" and stated there were other ways to measure this than using admission cut-offs. Michael replied this was one standard, a key performance indicator for universities and the higher the cut-off, the greater the claim for academic success. He agreed there were other ways to measure success. He noted universities strive to increase cut-offs as a measure of success to appeal to students in the province. He noted it was a classic measure of success but reiterated it was not the only one.

Bob Strickert noted that some points under Student Success added targets or measures and asked why others did not? Michael stated it was sometimes difficult to measure some items. He stated he could delete the references to the measures. Bob also commented that the vision was for a first class teaching institution and that was very important to this Board and the focus should not just be on students' marks. Lorraine Sunstrum-Mann echoed Bob's comments and stated these did not resonate with educational justice. She commented she was not sure that the statement "attract a financially viable student body in every Faculty" should be the first point in this section. Michael thought the Board would think financial viability was a measure of success but perhaps the point could be rephrased and repositioned.

Peter Bagnall referred to the modification of the Vision. He stated it was more than a simple change and noted the importance to preparing students to go out into the world of employment. He stated this would distinguish the University. He noted we must understand the metric for graduating students. Michael replied the first statement of the Mission addressed preparing students for the working world. He stated that research has become very important in the last 13 months. He does not believe we have lost the market-driven orientation. Michael commented that the revisions clearly put research on our agenda and the need to recruit research focused faculty to be successful. Peter noted the "founding members" also felt research was important.

Doug Wilson commented this Mission statement is clearly different than other universities. He noted the proof of the test is what we do in the future and to stay with the vision. He stated we should be driven by the needs of our employers. Michael commented that the Deans were comfortable with this and with the Vision, Mission and Values statement.

Bill Hunter commented that in the university environment, the word "job" has negative connotations while the word "career" implies a requirement for a longer lasting skill set. Bob commented that as a past employer, he was looking for someone who could problem solve and had presentation and communication skills. Bill remarked that the university was looking to prepare someone to problem solve, instill initiative and creativity and was looking for a career. Bob stated that a lot of university grads were not prepared for the "working world" and most organizations want graduates to have these above-mentioned skills.

Gary commented that the Vision statement was distinctive and communicated a market-oriented focus with excellence in teaching and learning, value-added research and vibrant student life. He also commented that the Mission statement reflected focus on programs that are innovative and responsive to the needs of students and employers. Gary reiterated this market-driven focus was not common within the university environment. Gary stated that once the Strategic Plan is approved, a follow-up action plan document with metrics would be reported to the Board.

After further discussion, it was agreed to delete the measurables noted under Student Success and that the statement regarding financial viability would be the fourth point. Rocky stated that the financial viability statement seemed elitist but he understood this was not the intent.

It was agreed the changes, as discussed, would be made to the document.

Bob Strickert stated he felt our mindset was to put students first and this was upfront on the Vision statement. He questioned why Student Success was not the first point on the Goals and Objectives document? Michael replied that a university is a research organization, discovering knowledge and transmitting that knowledge to students. He stated his colleagues felt Research and Development should be the first point on the document. Bob noted he had worked in research facilities both with and without students and that a university has students and that should always be first. He did not want to lose focus on teaching and learning and that the founding members of the university were keen to keep the student focus. Bob commented that he was not trying to minimize the importance of research. Rocky Simmons agreed with Bob's comments. Michael commented that teaching was apt to be "dead" if it did not have the animation of research and teachers want to teach what they discover. MaryLynn suggested putting both the Student Success and Research and Development sections side-by-side on the document.

Bob commented we must accept students come first and research second and could figure out a way to satisfy both the Board and our University colleagues in structuring the Goals and Objectives document. Bill Hunter remarked that if students were first, research would have exactly the same priority in order to ensure student success.

Action: Michael Finlayson to amend the Goals and Objectives page, as noted above.

Moved by Joanne Burghardt

Seconded by Denise Jones

MOTION #45 "That the Board of Governors of the University of Ontario Institute of Technology approve the Strategic Plan, as presented and as clarified."

CARRIED

Tom Ouchterlony left the meeting at this time.

Affirm Decision Item(s) from Joint Boards of Governors Meeting

2002/2003 Audited Financial Statements

Moved by Peter Bagnall

Seconded by Carol Beam

MOTION #46 "That the Board of Governors of the University of Ontario Institute of Technology approve the 2002/2003 Financial Statements as prepared by management, audited by Deloitte & Touche, LLP, and reviewed by the Audit & Finance Committee, as presented."

CARRIED

Approval of External Auditors

Moved by Joanne Burghardt

Seconded by Liesje de Burger

MOTION #47 "That the Board of Governors of the University of Ontario Institute of Technology approve Deloitte & Touche, LLP, as the external auditors for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2004."

CARRIED

INTERIM FINANCIAL REPORT

Craig Loverock advised that the financial statements distributed reflected the past two months of April and May. He noted revenue had decreased by \$3.2M and expenditures had decreased by \$3.2M for a \$0M net contribution. Craig stated that expenditures had decreased, as the University had not hired all staff as forecasted.

Peter questioned if the March 2004 projection of \$18.5 was accurate? Craig replied it was. Gary noted if there was under-spending then more would be in the transitional fund for next year but this was not expected to be a large amount. He noted the challenge was to budget for the coming years so that the University would become self-sustaining. Craig noted that enrolment was key and we would have a better idea of these numbers in September.

COMMUNITY INFORMATION AND QUESTIONS

None was noted.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

UOIT Admissions and Applications

Richard Levin stated the next 10 days were critical as the acceptance deadline was June 16. He noted we have 504 confirmed acceptances as of today and was confident we would reach 700. Bob commented it would be impressive to reach 800 and noted we would still accept students over the summer. He questioned if there was a shortage of university spaces due to the double cohort? Richard stated the Government had done a good job aggregating spaces for the aggregated number of students but noted demand would exceed supply in some programs, which was not unusual.

REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

Vision Update

No questions or comments were noted.

Academic Council Meetings held May 20, 2003

Michael Finlayson noted the minutes had been circulated and that a number of new programs were proceeding to PEQAB for approval. Gary commented the Deans were aggressive and creative in the next wave of programs. Michael commented on three new programs in the energy field and that all would have a direct link with OPG.

Welcome Week Draft Agenda

Gary stated this was a fabulous effort by our colleagues in making sure we're ready and the students perceive we're ready for them.

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting was adjourned at 8:05 p.m.

Bob Strickert, Chair

Gary Polonsky, President