

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

REPORT NUMBER 162 OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD

April 30, 2009

To the Governing Council,
University of Toronto

Your Board reports that it held a meeting on Thursday, April 30, 2009 at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall at which the following were present:

Professor Michael R. Marrus (In the Chair)	Professor Charles Deber	Mr. Roger P. Parkinson
Professor Brian Corman	Dr. Avrum Gotlieb	Professor Ito Peng
Professor David Naylor, President	Ms Pamela Gravestock	Mr. Jeff Peters
Professor Cheryl Misak, Vice-President and Provost	Ms Jacqueline Greenblatt	Professor Judith Poe
Professor Stewart Aitchison	Ms Emily Greenleaf	Professor Ato Quayson
Professor Varouj Aivazian	Ms Anne Guo	Professor Cheryl Regehr
Professor Cristina Amon	Professor Rick Halpern	Professor William Robins
Professor Gage Averill	Professor Wayne K. Hindmarsh	Professor Seamus Ross
Professor Ronald Beiner	Professor Ellen Hodnett	Mr. Paul Ruppert
Ms Patricia Bellamy	Mrs. Bonnie Horne	Professor Andrea Sass-Kortsak
Professor Denise Belsham	Ms Jenna Hossack	Ms Maureen Simpson
Professor Katherine Berg	Professor Gregory Jump	Professor Tattersall Smith
Ms Marilyn Booth	Professor Bruce Kidd	Mr. Shane Smith
Professor Ragnar Buchweitz	Professor Pamela E. Klassen	Ms Lynn Snowden
Dr. Christena Chruszez	Ms Lesley Ann Lavack	Miss Maureen J. Somerville
Professor Elizabeth Cowper	Professor Rhonda Love	Mr. Olivier Sorin
Professor Alister Cumming	Professor John R. Miron	Professor Suzanne Stevenson
Professor Gerald Cupchik	Professor Faye Mishna	Mr. Daniel Taranovsky
Professor Christopher Damaren	Ms Michelle Mitrovich	Dr. Donald A. Wasylenki
	Professor David Mock	Professor Donald Wiebe
	Ms Carole Moore	Dr. Cindy Woodland
	Professor Linda Northrup	
Regrets:	Professor Russell Hartenberger	Professor Michael Molloy
Professor Christy Anderson	Professor Glen Jones	Professor Mayo Moran
Professor Jan Angus	Ms Tharsni Kankesan	Professor Sioban Nelson
Professor George Baird	Professor Shashi Kant	Mr. Andrew Ngo
Professor Sylvia Bashevkin	Dr. Allan S. Kaplan	Professor Donna Orwin
Mr. Ryan Campbell	Dr. Young M. Kim	Professor Janet Paterson
Professor Sujit Choudhry	Dr. Chris Koenig-Woodyard	Ms Sheron Perera
Professor Will Cluett	Mr. Joseph Koo	Professor Susan Pfeiffer
Professor Gabriele D'Eleuterio	Professor Audrey Laporte	Professor Jolie Ringash
Professor Luc F. De Nil	Professor Louise Lemieux-Charles	Professor Wendy Rotenberg
Professor Joseph Desloges	Professor Robert Levit	Miss Charlene Saldanha
Professor Miriam Diamond	Professor Hy Van Luong	Miss Pamela Santora
Professor Wendy Duff	Dr. Gillian MacKay	Professor Elizabeth M. Smyth
Professor Dickson Eyoh	Professor Roger L. Martin	Professor Kim Strong
Professor Guy Faulkner	Professor Douglas McDougall	Professor Romin Tafarodi
Mr. John A. Fraser	Professor Mark McGowan	Ms Rita Tsang
Professor Meric Gertler	Mr. Andrew Mintz	Dr. Robert S. Turnbull
Professor Robert Gibbs		Professor Njoki Wane
		Professor Catharine Whiteside

Non-voting Assessors:

Professor Edith Hillan, Vice-
Provost, Academic

Ms Catherine Riggall, Vice-
President, Business Affairs
Professor Paul Young, Vice-
President, Research

Secretariat:

Ms Mae-Yu Tan

In Attendance:

Ms Joeita Gupta, Member-Elect
of Governing Council

Ms Sheree Drummond, Assistant
Provost

Ms Helen Lasthiotakis, Director,
Policy and Planning, Office of
the Vice-President and
Provost

Ms Andrea Carter, Employment
Equity Officer and
Accessibility of Ontarians
with Disabilities Act Advisor

Ms Sally Garner, Executive
Director, Planning and Budget

Professor Barry Sampson,
Faculty of Architecture,
Landscape and Design

Mr. Neil Dobbs, Deputy
Secretary of the Governing
Council

Ms Nora Gillespie, Legal
Counsel, Office of the Vice-
President and Provost

Professor Dan Lang, Academic
Colleague to the Council of
Ontario Universities

In this report, items 5, 6, and 7 are recommended to the Governing Council for approval. The remaining items are reported for information.

1. Approval of Report Number 161 of the Meeting held on March 26, 2009

Report Number 161 of the meeting held on March 26, 2009 was approved.

2. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting

There was no business arising from the previous meeting.

3. Report of the Agenda Committee

The Chair offered his congratulations to Professor Cheryl Regehr, who would begin her new appointment as Vice-Provost, Academic Programs, on July 1, 2009.

Report Number 153 (April 14, 2009)

The Chair stated that the Agenda Committee had carefully considered Part II of the 2007-08 Reviews of Academic Programs and Units at its meeting of April 14, 2009. The Committee had discussed the Divisional Reviews and had determined that there were no matters arising from the reviews that required consideration by the Academic Board. During its meeting, the Committee had also discussed the benefits of having a protocol outlining a framework for the reviews, and it had suggested some areas for inclusion in such a protocol, which might improve the utility of the reviews. Professor Misak had assured the Committee that Professor Regehr would focus on assessing the review process.

The Chair encouraged members of the Board to submit their ideas and comments on the review process to the Office of the Vice-President and Provost.

4. Report from the Vice-President and Provost**(a) Tuition Fees: Faculty of Arts and Science, St. George Campus – Assessment of Full-Time Tuition Fees by Program**

Professor Misak commented on a proposal from the Faculty of Arts and Science on the St. George Campus to assess fees for full-time students on the basis of a single program fee, moving from the current practice of assessing fees on a course-by-course basis. She noted that extensive discussion had taken place within the University, with views expressed by both those in favour of and those opposed to the proposal.

Professor Misak said that the practice of charging a single program fee for full-time students was already in place in many divisions within the University, such as the Faculty of Music, the Faculty of

50793

4. Report from the Vice-President and Provost (cont'd)

(a) Tuition Fees: Faculty of Arts and Science, St. George Campus – Assessment of Full-Time Tuition Fees by Program (cont'd)

Physical Education and Health, the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering, as well as for the Commerce and Computer Science programs offered in the Faculty of Arts and Science. Within Ontario, approximately half of the universities charged a program fee for full-time students, and other institutions were considering moving to such a fee structure. This sort of tuition mechanism was becoming more necessary to assist universities within the province in providing the high quality of education which students deserved.

Professor Misak reported that the Students' Administrative Council operating as the University of Toronto Students' Union had submitted a court application alleging procedural fault with the proposal. Documentation for the proposal was available on the website of the Office of the Governing Council¹.

(b) Investment Portfolio

Referring to the recent dramatic decline of the financial markets, Professor Misak noted that there had been much commentary in the local media of the impact on the University of Toronto's long-term investment portfolio. Professor Misak encouraged members to read the letter from President Naylor dated April 9, 2009, which outlined how the University was addressing the situation. The letter was available on the website of the Office of the Vice-President and Provost².

(c) H1N1 Influenza

Professor Misak stated that the University's executive group was closely following all public health and policy developments with respect to the current outbreak of the so-called "swine flu". The University was especially well served by its Dalla Lana School of Public Health and its close ties to the relevant public health agencies and leaders at the local, provincial and national levels. A meeting of the Provostial Academic Disruption Committee would take place the following day to discuss the management of academic implications in the event that a disruption needed to be called. The current University-related information on pandemic influenza planning and preparedness was available on a dedicated website accessible from the University's homepage³. All members of the University community were encouraged to check the website regularly. An email informing students of the location of the website would be disseminated shortly. In response to a question, Professor Misak emphasized that, when preparing for a possible academic disruption, one of the goals of the Provostial Academic Disruption Committee would be to minimize any disorder experienced by students.

President Naylor reassured members that, while there was cause for concern with respect to the swine flu, there was no need for alarm or panic. Comparing the response to the global spread of the Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS) in 2003 with the current spread of the H1N1 influenza, he commented that the etiology of the flu and its mode of transmission had been understood for decades. As well, officials were working with a known virus with the swine flu. In contrast, it had been some time before officials had been able to isolate the SARS virus during the 2003 epidemic and there had also been uncertainty in the first weeks of the SARS outbreak about the transmissibility of the virus. A second point of contrast involved vaccines and drugs. Vaccines that are generally effective against flu viruses had existed for

¹ See Item 3 - Tuition Fees: Faculty of Arts and Science, St. George Campus – Assessment of Full-Time Tuition Fees by Program:

<http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/Assets/Boards+and+Committees/Business+Board/2008-2009+Academic+Year/a0427.pdf>

² [http://www.provost.utoronto.ca/Assets/publication/memo/president\\$!27s+msg.pdf](http://www.provost.utoronto.ca/Assets/publication/memo/president$!27s+msg.pdf)

³ <http://www.preparedness.utoronto.ca/site3.aspx>
50793

4. Report from the Vice-President and Provost (cont'd)

(c) H1N1 Influenza (cont'd)

decades and a vaccine for this variant of flu virus was under development. Furthermore, there were two drugs that were effective against swine flu. With SARS, there was no history of vaccines for related viruses, and no drugs had been identified with specific anti-SARS effects during the outbreak.

Last, although the World Health Organization had recently issued a pandemic alert at level five of a six-level warning scale with respect to the swine flu, the processes that had been put in place to respond to public health emergencies since the occurrence of SARS were continuing to work most effectively in Canada and elsewhere.

Members thanked President Naylor for his balanced presentation of the current situation. One member suggested that the ongoing provision of clear, coordinated information to divisional leaders would be most helpful as developments occurred.

5. Capital Project: Project Planning Report for the Expansion of the John H. Daniels Faculty of Architecture, Landscape and Design

The Chair introduced the three capital projects which would be presented to the Board. He recalled that, at the Board's previous meeting, the Provost had reported that the University had submitted some proposals for the first round of government infrastructure funding. The University had carefully chosen projects which could be quickly initiated and completed in order to meet the government's program requirements. The three projects which would be considered by the Board were being presented for governance approval with the understanding that their execution was contingent on the provision of government funding.

Outlining the governance path, the Chair stated that all three projects had been considered by the Planning and Budget Committee (P&B) on April 1, 2009. If recommended by the Board, the proposals would then be considered for approval by the Governing Council on May 20, 2009. Professor Misak added that three other project proposals had also been submitted for government funding. Those included two large projects at the University of Toronto at Scarborough and the University of Toronto at Mississauga, as well as one smaller project on the St. George campus; all three proposals would be presented for governance approval in the near future.

The first capital project considered by the Board was the Project Planning Report for the Expansion of the John H. Daniels Faculty of Architecture, Landscape and Design.

Dr. Gotlieb reported that, at the P&B meeting, Ms. Sisam had advised members that the Governing Council had approved a Users Committee report in 1997 of the then School of Architecture and Landscape Architecture. The report had contained a proposal for a \$10-million, multi-phased renewal and renovation of the existing building at 230 College Street. Since that time, some of the needed improvements had occurred. However, much work remained to be done.

Dr. Gotlieb stated that since 2008, a reconstituted Project Planning Committee had been considering the increased space requirements of the Faculty's new Academic Plan. A considerable amount of new space was needed, as the existing facilities presented challenges to program expansion and had no capacity to accommodate either additional research offices or design studio space. The estimated cost of the proposed project was \$20-million. This included a proposal for the infill of the existing courtyard and the construction of an additional two floors on the roof.

The project met the main criteria of the Federal Infrastructure Program, and Board approval was being sought subject to receipt of funding. If the project was not selected for federal funding, the Project

5. Capital Project: Project Planning Report for the Expansion of the John H. Daniels Faculty of Architecture, Landscape and Design (cont'd)

Planning Report would remain approved in principle, until other funding or private benefaction could be obtained.

Dr. Gotlieb recounted that, during the Committee's discussion, a member had asked about the priority setting process for the University's capital projects. Professor Misak had replied that all of the projects being brought forward were high priorities for the University and would remain so even if the specific federal funding being sought was not provided.

Invited to comment, Professor Barry Sampson, a member of the Faculty of Architecture, Landscape and Design, emphasized the Faculty's pressing need for increased space and updated facilities which would also demonstrate the principles of sustainability taught to its students. There was a deep desire to take advantage of the expansion and renovation project to create a high performance building that was both energy efficient and a notable example of design. Some prominent international architectural teams had expressed interest in the proposed project despite the challenges of a limited budget and a tight time frame. Selected teams would be invited to participate in a design exercise over the next while. The Faculty was very excited about the proposed project and the opportunities for learning that it would offer to its students and faculty.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

1. THAT the Project Planning Report for the John H. Daniels Faculty of Architecture, Landscape and Design, a copy of which is attached hereto as [Appendix "A"](#), be approved in principle to accommodate the activities and functions described for the expansion of the Faculty's programs at its present location, 230 College Street.
2. That the project scope for Phase 1, comprising an addition of approximately 1250 net assignable square metres or 2023 gross square metres be approved at a total project cost of \$20,000,000, subject to funding.
3. THAT the project scope for subsequent phases of renovations be brought forward to implement through the Accommodation and Facilities Directorate for components valued at less than \$2 million, and those exceeding \$2 million in accordance with the Policy on Capital Planning and Capital Projects.

6. Capital Project: Utilities Infrastructure Renewal for the St. George Campus

Dr. Gotlieb stated that P&B had also considered the Capital Project for the St. George Campus Utilities Infrastructure Renewal at its last meeting. Ms Riggall had informed the Committee that, under the federal Knowledge Infrastructure Program, physical infrastructure, including utilities infrastructure, would be eligible for funding. Each of the projects outlined in the proposal would be needed in the future to support the growing demand for utilities services on the St. George campus. As stated previously, the projects were contingent on the receipt of the funding.

Ms Riggall briefly elaborated on the proposal, explaining that the projects ranged from electrical upgrades to an improved chiller plant and a strengthened cogeneration facility which would ensure that any damage to buildings and research was minimized in the event of a power failure. Although none of the projects were critical in the short-term, all were important for the continuing operation of the University over the long-term.

6. Capital Project: Utilities Infrastructure Renewal for the St. George Campus (cont'd)

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the Utilities Infrastructure Renewal program of projects be approved, at a total cost not to exceed \$15.9 million, and assuming receipt of funding from the government economic stimulus program:

- Government of Canada \$8.0M
- Government of Ontario \$7.9M

Documentation is attached hereto as [Appendix "B"](#).

7. Capital Project: Interdisciplinary Design Studios within the Department of Civil Engineering and the Lasonde Institute Project Change of Scope

Dr. Gotlieb reported that at the P&B meeting, Ms Sisam had provided an overview of the Interdisciplinary Design Studios within the Department of Civil Engineering and the Lasonde Institute Project Change of Scope Capital Project. She had recalled that the renovation project had been previously approved by P&B in June 2008. At that time, the estimated total cost of the project had been \$12,150,000 and had included high priority roof renovations. Since then, the project had been reviewed, and it had been determined that external deferred maintenance items should be added, along with a proposal for photovoltaic panels to increase the energy efficiency in the Mining Building. The additional items, together with the escalation in time of tender had increased the total project cost to \$20-million.

Dr. Gotlieb said that, as with the Architecture project, should federal funding not be provided, the project would remain approved in principle until funding became available from private benefaction. During the Committee's discussion, a member had inquired about the high cost per square metre for the renovation. Mr. Shabbar had advised that the proposed project would improve the building's accessibility with the addition of an interior elevator shaft.

Professor Cristina Amon, Dean of the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering, noted that the proposed renovations would benefit not only undergraduate and graduate student activity within the Interdisciplinary Design Studios, but also the other tenants of the Mining Building, which included the Department of Mechanical and Industrial Engineering and the Institute for Biomaterial and Biomedical Engineering.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

Be It Recommended to the Governing Council

1. THAT the Project Planning Report for the Civil Engineering Interdisciplinary Design Studios, a copy of which is attached hereto as [Appendix "C"](#), be approved in principle.
2. THAT the project scope, comprising renovations to approximately 630 net assignable square meters and 1,130 gross square meters be increased to a total project cost of \$20,000,000, subject to funding, to include high priority repairs, maintenance and restoration and items addressing sustainability.

8. Items for Information

(a) Semi-Annual Report: Academic Appeals Committee, Individual Cases, Spring 2009

The Chair noted that both the Academic Appeals Committee and the University Tribunal semi-annual reports were provided to the Board for information. Professor Hillan commented on the dedication of the Committee members who volunteered much of their time in reviewing case documentation, participating in hearings, and preparing the reports which were received by the Board. The University was grateful for their commitment.

No questions were raised by members.

(b) Semi-Annual Report: University Tribunal, Individual Cases, Spring 2009

In response to a question from the Chair, Professor Hillan stated that the annual report on academic discipline would be presented to the Board at its meeting in June. The majority of those cases were resolved at the divisional level, and only a very small number proceeded to the Tribunal level. Such cases occasionally involved students who had committed multiple offences.

(c) Annual Report: Employment Equity, 2008

Speaking on behalf of Professor Hildyard, who was unable to attend the meeting, Professor Hillan noted that the format of the Employment Equity report had been altered somewhat this year. However, it had still been prepared in compliance with the requirements of the Federal Contractor's Program.

A member expressed disappointment with the report, specifically, with the small number of People with Disabilities and Aboriginal persons employed by the University. Professor Misak acknowledged that the number of University employees in those two categories was low. Because the figures were small, it was important to exercise caution when trying to infer meaning from yearly fluctuations. This was not a situation unique to the University of Toronto. Rather, it was evident that structural problems existed within the broader society. While there was a need for the University to continue to implement recruitment and retention programs which would attract excellent people in all of the designated categories, there was also a need for society as a whole to address existing problems.

Ms Andrea Carter, the Employment Equity Officer and Accessibility of Ontarians with Disabilities Act Advisor, added that the University had developed new partnerships with agencies that support People with Disabilities in gaining employment, and it was also engaged in ongoing outreach to the Aboriginal community.

(d) Annual Report: Vice-President, Research, 2007-08

Professor Young briefly highlighted recent research achievements, noting that the University's efforts (as outlined in the 2009 annual report to Governing Council) were yielding positive results. Through the Canada Excellence Research Chairs program, five chairs had recently been selected at the University in the first phase of the competition in health sciences and climate change science. Nominations of candidates would now follow in Phase 2 of the competition for twenty Chairs nationally that would be selected in 2010. A change in the selection process for Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council (NSERC) grants had also resulted in a favorable outcome for the University, with significant increases in the average grant in excess of \$10,000 for many professors in the Faculties of Arts and Science and Applied Science and Engineering. Professor Young noted that a number of important initiatives had been presented in the Annual Report of the Division of the Vice-President, Research, dated March, 2009, which had been distributed to members.

8. Items for Information (cont'd)

(e) Annual Report: Council of Ontario Universities (COU) Academic Colleague

Professor Dan Lang reported on the role of the Academic Colleagues of the Council of Ontario Universities (COU). He explained that each member institution appointed an academic colleague to the COU, who served in an advisory capacity, providing input on a range of post-secondary education issues, such as quality assurance, granting councils, participatory technologies for teaching and learning, and transfer admissions. As part of their work, the academic colleagues served on various task forces, working groups, and COU standing committees, regularly producing comprehensive working papers.

The Chair thanked Professor Lang for his service as the University's Academic Colleague to the COU. He noted that the Board would appoint a new Academic Colleague at its next meeting in June.

Members also received the following reports for information:

(f) Selection Committee for University Professors

(g) Report Number 140 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs (March 31, 2009)

(h) Report Number 131 of the Planning and Budget Committee (April 1, 2009)

9. Date of Next Meeting

The Chair reminded members that the next meeting was scheduled for Monday, June 1, 2009, at 4:10 p.m.

10. Other Business

There were no items of Other Business.

The meeting adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

Secretary
May 9, 2009

Chair