

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

REPORT NUMBER 180 OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD

May 31, 2012

To the Governing Council,
University of Toronto

Your Board reports that it held a meeting on Thursday, May 31, 2012 at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall at which the following were present:

Professor Ellen Hodnett (Chair)
Professor Hugh Gunz (Vice-Chair)
Professor David Naylor, President
Professor Cheryl Regehr, Acting Provost
Professor Scott Mabury, Vice-President, University Operations
Dr. Francis Ahia
Professor Donald Ainslie
Professor Benjamin Alarie
Mr. Larry Alford
Professor Derek Allen
Professor Maydianne Andrade
Ms Katherine Ball
Professor Dwayne Barber
Professor Dwayne Benjamin
Prof. Eric Bredo
Professor Terry Carleton
Professor Will Cluett
Professor David Cook
Professor Brian Corman
Professor Elizabeth Cowper

Mr. Tyler Currie
Professor Christopher Damaren
Professor Karen Davis
Professor Luc De Nil
Professor Charles Deber
Professor Joseph Desloges
Professor David Dubins
Ms Maria Pilar Galvez
Professor Meric Gertler
Dr. Carol Golench
Professor Avrum Gotlieb
Professor Rick Halpern
Mrs. Bonnie Horne
Mr. Peter Hurley
Mr. Adnan Hussain
Ms Anne Kerubo
Professor Paul Kingston
Mr. Nykolaj Kuryluk
Professor Jim Lai
Mr. Ben Liu
Professor Heather MacNeil
Mr. Aly-Khan Madhavji
Professor John Magee
Professor Henry Mann
Professor Douglas McDougall

Professor Angelo Melino
Ms Natalie Melton
Mr. Liam Mitchell
Professor David Mock
Professor Carol Moukheiber
Professor Amy Mullin
Professor Siobhan Nelson
Professor Emmanuel Nikiema
Professor Julia O'Sullivan
Professor Elizabeth Peter
Ms Judith Poë
Dr. Neil Rector
Professor Yves Roberge
Professor Lock Rowe
Professor Andrea Sass-Kortsak
Ms Ava-Dayna Sefa
Ms Helen Slade
Miss Maureen J. Somerville
Professor Richard Sommer
Professor Suzanne Stevenson
Ms Caitlin Tillman
Mr. Chirag Variawa
Professor Sandy Welsh
Professor Charmaine Williams
Professor Howard Yee

Regrets:

Ms Manal Al-Ayad
Professor Catherine Amara
Professor Cristina Amon
Professor Jan Barnsley
Dr. Katherine Berg
Ms Marilyn Booth
Ms Virginia Coons
Mr. Michael Da Silva
Professor Darryl Edwards
Professor Susanne Erb
Professor Zhong-Ping Feng
Mr. Cary Ferguson
Mr. John A. Fraser
Professor Alan Galey

Professor Robert Gibbs
Professor Robert Harrison
Professor Ira Jacobs
Professor Alison Keith
Dr. Chris Koenig-Woodyard
Professor Ron Levi
Ms Cecilia Livingston
Professor Roger L. Martin
Professor Don McLean
Professor Cheryl Misak
Professor Faye Mishna
Professor Matthew Mitchell
Professor Mayo Moran
Professor Michelle Murphy
Ms Yuchao Niu
Dr. Graeme Norval

Professor Janet Paterson
Professor Domenico Pietropaolo
Ms Melinda Rogers
Professor Jeffrey Rosenthal
Professor Seamus Ross
Mr. Kevin Siu
Professor Sandy Smith
Professor Markus Stock
Dr. Roslyn Thomas-Long
Dr. Sarita Verma
Professor Njoki Wane
Dr. Shelly Weiss
Professor Catharine Whiteside
Professor Joseph Wong
Mr. Tony Han Yin
Ms Grace Yuen

Non-voting Assessors:

Mr. Louis Charpentier, Secretary
of the Governing Council

Ms Sally Garner, Executive
Director, Planning and Budget
Ms Gail Milgrom, Acting
Assistant Vice-President,
Campus and Facilities Planning

Secretariat:

Ms Mae-Yu Tan

In Attendance:

Professor Jill Matus, Vice-
Provost, Students
Ms Nora Gillespie, Legal
Counsel, Office of the Provost
and Office the Vice-President,
Human Resources and Equity

Dr. Jane Harrison, Director,
Academic Programs and
Policy, Office of the Vice-
Provost, Academic Programs
Ms Cindy Robinson, Ontario
Universities Council on
Quality Assurance

Professor John Scherk - Vice-
Dean, Undergraduate,
University of Toronto
Scarborough (UTSC)

The Chair announced that Professor Cheryl Regehr, Vice-Provost, Academic Programs, would serve as Senior Assessor to the Board for the meeting on behalf of Professor Misak, who was out of the country. With the Board's agreement, the order of the agenda was changed in order to consider first the *in camera* items that required approval.

The Board moved *in camera*.

15. Appointments: University Professors

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the appointments of Professor Lewis Kay and Professor Mark Lautens as University Professors be approved, effective July 1, 2012.

16. Annual Report of the Nominating Committee for the University Tribunal and Academic Appeals Committee – 2011-2012

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT Ms Lisa Brownstone, Mr. Clifford Lax, Mr. Andrew Pinto, and Ms. Roslyn Tsao be re-appointed as Co-Chairs of the University Tribunal for the period of July 1, 2012 to June 30, 2015;

THAT Professor Hamish Stewart be appointed Senior Chair of the Academic Appeals Committee for the period of July 1, 2012 to June 30, 2013; and

THAT Mr. Tad Brown, Ms. Sara Faherty, Professor Andrew Green, Ms. Renu Mandhane, and Professor Edward Morgan be re-appointed as Chairs of the Academic Appeals Committee for the period of July 1, 2012 to June 30, 2013.

17. Report of the Striking Committee

I. Council of Ontario Universities Academic Colleague for the University of Toronto

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT Professor Sandy Welsh be re-appointed the Council of Ontario Universities Academic Colleague for the University of Toronto for a two-year term from July 1, 2012 to June 30, 2014.

II. Board and Committee Membership

1. Membership of the Academic Board¹

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the following be appointed as members of the Academic Board for 2012-2013:

Administrative and Professional Staff

Ms Hanan Domloge, University of Toronto Scarborough (July 1, 2012 to June 30, 2014)
Ms Michelle Mitrovich, Victoria College (July 1, 2012 to June 30, 2015)

Alumni

Mr. Tyler Currie, Faculty of Arts and Science (A&S), New College*
Mr. Peng Fu, School of Graduate Studies

Students

Full-time Undergraduate

Mr. David Kleinman, A&S, University College
Ms Katharine Ball, A&S, University College*
Ms Lucy Chau, A&S, Innis College
Ms Ellen Chen, A&S, Victoria College
Ms Tisha Tan, University of Toronto Scarborough (UTSC)
Mr. Vijay Unnithan, Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering (FASE)
Mr. Abhishek Vaidyanathan, A&S, Trinity College

¹ *2011-12 member of the Board or Committee.

17. Report of the Striking Committee (cont'd)

1. Membership of the Academic Board (cont'd)

Part-time Undergraduate

Ms Ioana Sendroiu, A&S, Trinity College

Graduate

Mr. Michael Dick, Faculty of Information

Mr. Omar Gamel, A&S

Ms Beth Martin, A&S

Mr. Layton Reynolds, School of Public Policy and Governance

2. Membership of Committees of the Board

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the following be appointed to committees of the Board for 2012-2013:

i) Agenda Committee

Student

Ms Katharine Ball, A&S, University College*

Teaching Staff

Ms Judith Poë, University of Toronto Mississauga (UTM)*

Professor Alison Keith, A&S, Classics*

ii) Committee on Academic Policy and Programs

Administrative and Professional Staff

Ms Michelle Mitrovich, Victoria College

Students

Mr. Michael Dick, Faculty of Information

Mr. Omar Gamel, A&S

Mr. David Kleinman, A&S, University College

Ms Ioana Sendroiu, A&S, Trinity College

Ms Tisha Tan, UTSC

17. Report of the Striking Committee (cont'd)**2. Membership of Committees of the Board (cont'd)****ii) Committee on Academic Policy and Programs (cont'd)**Teaching Staff

Dr. Karen Davis, Faculty of Medicine (Surgery), past AP&P member*
 Professor Joe Desloges, A&S, Woodsworth College, past AP&P member*
 Professor Zhong-Ping Feng, Faculty of Medicine (Physiology)*
 Professor Rick Halpern, UTSC, past AP&P member*
 Professor Paul Kingston, UTSC (Political Science)
 Professor Douglas McDougall, OISE (Curriculum, Teaching, and Learning), past AP&P member, **Chair***
 Professor Emanuel Nikiema, UTM
 Professor Graeme Norval, FASE (Chemical), past AP&P member*
 Professor Janet Paterson, A&S, French*
 Professor Elizabeth Peter, Faculty of Nursing, past AP&P member, **Vice-Chair***
 Professor Russell Pysklywec, A&S, Geology
 Ms Judith Poë, UTM (Chemistry), past AP&P member*
 Professor Suzanne Stevenson, A&S (Computer Science), past AP&P member*
 Professor Sandy Welsh, A&S (Sociology)*

iii) Planning and Budget CommitteeAdministrative and Professional Staff

Mr. Peter Hurley, A&S, past P&B member*

Alumni

Mr. Peng Fu, SGS

Students

Ms Ellen Chen, A&S, Victoria College
 Mr. Layton Reynolds, School of Public Policy and Governance

Teaching Staff

Professor Donald Ainslie, A&S, University College*
 Professor Elizabeth Cowper, A&S (Linguistics), **Vice-Chair**, past P&B member*
 Professor Chris Damaren, FASE (Aerospace)*
 Professor Meric Gertler, A&S (Geography), past P&B member*

17. Report of the Striking Committee (cont'd)**2. Membership of Committees of the Board (cont'd)****iii) Planning and Budget Committee (cont'd)**

Dr. Avrum Gotlieb, Faculty of Medicine (Laboratory Medicine and Pathobiology), **Chair**
past P&B member *

Professor Bart Harvey, Faculty of Medicine (Dalla Lana School of Public Health)

Professor Jim Lai, Faculty of Dentistry, past P&B member*

Professor John Magee, A&S, (Medieval Studies)

Professor Henry Mann, Faculty of Pharmacy, past P&B member*

Professor Don McLean, Faculty of Music*

Professor Amy Mullin, UTM, past P&B member*

Professor Locke Rowe, A&S (Ecology and Evolutionary Biology), past P&B member*

Additional Members of the Agenda Planning Group

Professor Bart Harvey, Faculty of Medicine (Dalla Lana School of Public Health)

Professor John Magee, A&S, (Medieval Studies)

3. Discipline Appeals Board

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the following be appointed to the Discipline Appeals Board for 2012-2013:

Students

Ms Yuchao Niu, full-time undergraduate, A&S, Trinity College*

Ms Sabrina Tang, full-time undergraduate, FASE, past Academic Board and DAB member

Mr. Chirag Variawa, graduate, FASE, (student governor)

Teaching Staff

Professor Faye Mishna, Faculty of Social Work*

Professor Graeme Norval, FASE (Chemical), past DAB member*

Professor Elizabeth Peter, Faculty of Nursing, past DAB member*

17. Report of the Striking Committee (cont'd)**4. Advisory Committee on the University of Toronto Library System**

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the following be appointed as the Board's representatives on the Advisory Committee on the University of Toronto Library System for 2012-2013:

Professor Alison Keith, Faculty of Arts and Science (Classics), past Committee member*
Professor Domenico Pietropaolo, St. Michael's College*

The Board returned to open session.

The Chair welcomed members and guests to final meeting of the year. She congratulated Professor Vincent Tropepe on his election to the Board as a Faculty of Arts and Science Teaching Staff representative (Department of Cell and Systems Biology) for a three-year term as of July 1, 2012. She also congratulated Ms Bonnie Horne on her re-election to the Board as a Librarian representative for another three-year term, effective July 1st.

1. Report of the Vice-President and Provost**a) Victoria College Principal**

Professor Regehr reported that Professor Angela Esterhammer had been appointed the eleventh Principal of Victoria College as of July 1, 2012. Professor Esterhammer, who graduated from Victoria College in English and Literary Studies in 1983, was an internationally renowned scholar of British, German and European Romanticism and 19th century literature and culture. She was the founding director of the Ph.D. program in English and American Literary Studies at the University of Zurich, where she held the Chair of English Literature. Professor Regehr said that she was very pleased that Professor Esterhammer would be rejoining the University.

b) Center for Urban Science and Progress

Professor Regehr provided an update on the Center for Urban Science and Progress (CUSP), an applied science research institute that was being created by New York University (NYU), Carnegie Mellon University and the University of Toronto. In response to a competition designed by New York City Mayor Michael Bloomberg in an effort to transform New York into a hub for engineering and applied science, a number of bids had been submitted to open an engineering school and rebuild Roosevelt Island. Following a series of meetings in New York led by Professor Misak and Professor Cristina Amon, Dean of the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering, the University (together with NYU and Carnegie Mellon University) submitted a smaller bid to develop a centre for cities

1. Report of the Vice-President and Provost (cont'd)

b) Center for Urban Science and Progress (cont'd)

engineering, planning and policy in downtown Brooklyn. The University of Warwick and the Indian Institute of Technology, Bombay later joined the consortium. The success of the bid had been announced on April 23rd.

The University, which had made no financial investment in the development, would identify ways in which its students and faculty would become deeply involved in the exciting project. It was anticipated that some new academic program proposals would follow as a result. At present, a CUSP-related graduate program was being designed, led by the Department of Civil Engineering. The Provost had created a CUSP Steering Group that would contemplate issues such as the University's vision for CUSP and the form and function of various associations that would be developed.

c) Work-Study Program

Professor Jill Matus, Vice-Provost, Students, then spoke of recent changes to the University's Work Study Program. In its April budget, the Provincial Government had eliminated funding for the Work Study Program. That decision had been met with grave concern across the University because the Work Study Program had provided meaningful employment opportunities for its students. However provincial funding had been restricted to students eligible to receive funding through the Ontario Student Assistance Program. The University had decided to reconfigure the program so that eligibility requirements would be less restrictive for its students. International, out-of-province, and part-time students taking a course load of at least 2.0 credits over the fall/winter terms would now be eligible to participate. As of the Fall, 2012, 80% of the program would be funded centrally by the university, with employing units or faculty contributing 20% of student wages. Professional Expense Reimbursement Allowance funds could be used by faculty for that purpose. A memo had been distributed to the University community and specific messaging for students had also been sent out. In response to a question from a member of the Board, Professor Matus said the outlined changes would have no impact on the University's commitment to student financial aid. The funds that had been spent on the Work Study Program in the past had not been counted towards the University's obligations under the Student Access Guarantee.

2. Presentation by Mr. Larry Alford, Chief Librarian - The State of the University's Library System

The Chair introduced the Chief Librarian, Mr. Larry Alford, noting that the Agenda Committee had been very pleased to accept his offer to give a presentation to the Board on the University's Library System. The topic fit very well within the Board's mandate and with the series of educational sessions that had been provided to the Board over the course of the year.

2. Presentation by Mr. Larry Alford, Chief Librarian - The State of the University's Library System (cont'd)

Mr. Alford expressed his appreciation for the opportunity to give a presentation to the Board. He spoke of the extensive expertise and knowledge of the staff who worked in the Universities' forty-four libraries and he acknowledged the foresight of his predecessors who had built one of the greatest library systems in the world. Referring to the University of Toronto Libraries' vast holdings, Mr. Alford stated that, in addition to the acquisition of 170,000 books each year, the University also acquired electronically thousands of books and most journals in major disciplines. In fact, approximately 55% of the Libraries' collections budget was spent on accessing electronic information; that percentage continued to grow significantly each year. Collections available within the Libraries were a national treasure and were important for teaching and research across Canada and around the world. However, it was an ongoing challenge to maintain such great collections due to funding limitations. There was no question that the Libraries were used heavily – as many as 18,000 people used the Robarts and Gerstein Libraries daily. That figure would likely double if all forty-four Libraries were included.

Mr. Alford spoke of the power of twenty-first century research libraries, such as those belonging to the University. With access to excellent electronic and print resources, University of Toronto students and faculty were able to undertake research projects more easily now than in the past. As well, while it might not have been possible to have considered certain questions just a few years ago, such questions could now be asked, in part because of the University's electronic collections.

Mr. Alford then outlined two significant challenges facing the University's Libraries. First, the cost of scholarly information was rising dramatically. The University would need an additional \$1.6-million each year just to keep pace with its current collections budget. Open access was often pointed to as one means of addressing the complexities of scholarly publications and resultant outcomes such as obtaining tenure and building an international reputation. In fact, the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE) Faculty Council had recently passed a resolution to approve an *OISE Open Access Policy Statement*.² Thanks to budget support from President Naylor, one staff member would be hired in the library to work with faculties in addressing such issues. Also, faculty members would continue to be encouraged to seek out open access journals and to retain rights to deposit work electronically into the University's research repository, T-Space, which was operated by the Libraries. The second challenge was that of teaching information skills to students within the current electronic environment. Although students were becoming increasingly sophisticated users of technology, there was still a need to assist them in learning how best to use available resources as research tools. Initiatives such as the "personal librarian" project in the Faculty of Arts and Science, which was designed to address this challenge, would continue to be developed. Mr. Alford closed his presentation by stating his pleasure at having the opportunity to lead the University of Toronto Libraries. He looked forward to working with members of the University community to address some of the challenges.

A member observed that while great effort had been made to expand student study space, there was still much demand for space. Mr. Alford commented that the capital project for the revitalization of

² http://www.oise.utoronto.ca/research/UserFiles/File/OA_Policy.pdf

2. Presentation by Mr. Larry Alford, Chief Librarian - The State of the University's Library System (cont'd)

Robarts Library, which had been led by Ms Carole Moore prior to his arrival at the University, had had a significant impact on the student experience. Thanks to generous funding from the Ontario Government, matching funds by a lead donor and Student Experience Funds, the remarkable transformation had allowed for the creation of additional study space and collaborative space. President Naylor had been most helpful in his efforts to obtain the remaining funds needed to complete the project. Mr. Alford remained hopeful that the funds needed to complete the Robarts Common addition to Robarts Library designed to add 1200 student seats would be raised soon.

The Chair thanked Mr. Alford for his informative presentation.

3. University of Toronto Scarborough: Proposal to Disestablish the Existing Department of Humanities and Establish Two New Departments and an Extra-Departmental Unit A

The Chair said that the Board was being asked to consider two UTSC proposals regarding restructuring of academic units. Both proposals had been considered by the Planning and Budget Committee (P&B) on May 16, 2012 and, if recommended by the Board, would be considered for approval by the Governing Council on June 25, 2012.

Professor Gotlieb, Chair of P&B, introduced the first proposal to disestablish the existing Department of Humanities and establish the Department of Arts, Culture and Media, and the Department of Historical and Cultural Studies. It was also being recommended that a Centre for French and Linguistics be created as an Extra-Departmental Unit A (EDU:A). Professor Gotlieb then outlined the discussion that had occurred at the P&B meeting, a summary of which is contained in the Committee's report.³

There were no questions from the Board.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

- (i) THAT the Department of Humanities at the University of Toronto Scarborough be disestablished, effective July 1, 2012; and
- (ii) THAT the following units be established, effective July 1, 2012, in its place:
 - The Department of Arts, Culture, and Media,
 - The Department of Historical and Cultural Studies, and
 - The Centre for French and Linguistics as an Extra-Departmental Unit: A.

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

³<http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/Assets/Governing+Council+Digital+Assets/Boards+and+Committees/Planning+and+Budget+Committee/2011-2012+Academic+Year/r0516.pdf>

4. University of Toronto Scarborough: Proposal to Disestablish the Existing Department of Social Sciences and Establish Four New Departments and an Extra-Departmental Unit B

Professor Gottlieb gave an overview of the proposal to restructure UTSC's Department of Social Sciences. It was being recommended that four discrete disciplinary departments - the Departments of Anthropology, Human Geography, Political Science and Sociology – and an EDU: B – the Centre for Critical Development Studies –be created, effective July 1, 2012.

Invited by the Chair to comment, Professor Rick Halpern, Dean and Vice Principal (Academic), UTSC, said that both proposals had been developed during a careful planning process undertaken at UTSC over the past two years. The creation of the proposed academic units would enable each discipline and its programs to develop a stronger identity. It would also allow the UTSC campus to elevate its activities with respect to student and faculty recruitment as well as programming at all levels. Professor Halpern acknowledged the work of Professor Elizabeth Cowper, a past Chair of the Humanities Division. Professor Naylor commented on the restructuring proposals that had been brought forward to the Board over the past year. He stated that it was encouraging to see the positive response and engagement of both faculty and students and the ongoing development of UTM and UTSC. He congratulated all those who had contributed to the initiatives.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

- (i) THAT the Department of Social Sciences at the University of Toronto Scarborough be disestablished, effective July 1, 2012; and
- (ii) THAT the following units be established, effective July 1, 2012, in its place:
 - The Department of Anthropology,
 - The Department of Human Geography,
 - The Department of Political Science,
 - The Department of Sociology, and
 - The Centre for Critical Development Studies as an Extra-Departmental Unit: B.

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

5. Capital Project: Project Planning Report for University of Toronto Mississauga Kaneff Centre Expansion

The Chair said that the proposal for the University of Toronto Mississauga (UTM) Kaneff Centre Expansion capital project had also been considered by the P&B on May 16th and, if recommended by the Board, would be considered for approval by the Governing Council on June 25th.

Professor Gottlieb introduced the proposal, explaining that the proposed Kaneff Centre Expansion project would consist of a three-storey (plus basement) building addition that would wrap around the

5. **Capital Project: Project Planning Report for University of Toronto Mississauga Kaneff Centre Expansion** (cont'd)

existing open space. The project, which would result in approximately 6,950 gross square meters of new construction and renovation, would offer a quality of space equivalent to other academic buildings recently developed on campus. It would consolidate academic and administrative departments currently dispersed in the William G. Davis Building and elsewhere, and it would address a serious campus space shortage and provide accommodation for the projected enrolment growth to approximately 12,000 full-time equivalent (FTE) students by 2015/2016. As a secondary effect, much-needed space for student services expansion in the William G. Davis Building and other areas would be vacated. The total project cost of \$35-million would be funded from the accumulating capital reserves within UTM's Operating Budget.

Invited by the Chair to comment, Professor Amy Mullin, Vice-Principal Academic and Dean, UTM, spoke of the significant space concerns on the UTM campus. She noted that, with increased office space, academic units would be able to proceed with much-needed searches to expand the faculty complement.

There were no questions from the Board.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

- a) THAT the Project Planning Report for the University of Toronto Mississauga (UTM) Kaneff Centre Expansion, dated April 26, 2012, a copy of which is attached hereto as [Appendix "C"](#), be approved in principle; and
- b) THAT the project scope, comprising a 2,670 nasm (5,340 gross square metres) building addition plus a courtyard infill for a Rotunda and the renovation of existing space, at a total project cost of \$35-million, funded entirely from accumulating capital reserves with UTM's operating budget, be approved.

6. ***Policy on Capital Planning and Capital Projects***

The Chair noted that one of the Board's responsibilities was to consider capital projects. The proposed revision to the *Policy on Capital Planning and Capital Projects* had been considered by the P&B on May 16th and, if recommended by the Board, would be considered for approval by the Governing Council on June 25th.

Professor Gottlieb outlined the proposed revisions to the *Policy*. It was being recommended that three rather than the current two levels of approval for capital projects be made available. The type of approval required would be dependent on the total project cost. A Capital Projects and Space Allocation Committee (CaPS), which would replace the Accommodations and Facilities Directorate, would provide integrated oversight and review.

6. Policy on Capital Planning and Capital Projects (cont'd)

There were no questions from the Board.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the revised *Policy on Capital Planning and Capital Projects*, a copy of which is attached hereto as [Appendix "D"](#), be approved, effective July 1, 2012, replacing the *Policy* approved by the Governing Council on June 28, 2001.

7. Constitutional Revisions: Faculty of Law; John H. Daniels Faculty of Architecture, Landscape and Design; and University College

The Chair said that the Board was being asked to consider a proposal for three revised constitutions. The Board had authority to consider divisional constitutions for approval, while divisional by-laws were approved by the Divisional Councils themselves. If approved by the Board, the constitutions would require confirmation by the Executive Committee on June 11, 2012.

Mr. Louis Charpentier, Secretary of the Governing Council, reminded the Board that the project to update divisional constitutions and by-laws, initiated in June, 2011, was expected to be completed in the Fall, 2012. The proposed amendments to the constitutions were consistent with those presented in previous meetings of the Board and made explicit delegated authority to the divisional Councils for approval of proposals for major modifications of academic programs. Mr. Charpentier noted that, although the format of the consolidated document that served as the Faculty of Law's constitution differed from other divisional constitutional documents, the most recent resolution of the Faculty's Council contained the key elements that were currently being added to all constitutions.

A member asked why the Faculty of Law had not developed a constitution consisting of one document that would be more coherent and easier to use. When reading the existing compilation of documents, one had to refer back to much earlier documents in order to determine the current authority and composition of the Faculty's Council. Professor Benjamin Alarie, a Board member from the Faculty of Law, replied that it was the Faculty's tradition to approve resolutions building on Statute Number 1507 from July 1, 1941. The Chair said that the question had also been forwarded to Dean Mayo Moran, who was currently out of the country.

7. Constitutional Revisions: Faculty of Law; John H. Daniels Faculty of Architecture, Landscape and Design; and University College (cont'd)

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

- i) THAT, subject to confirmation by the Executive Committee, the amended Constitution of the Faculty of Law, which was approved by the Faculty of Law Council on March 28, 2012, be approved;
- ii) THAT, subject to confirmation by the Executive Committee, the amended Constitution of the John H. Daniels Faculty of Architecture, Landscape and Design, which was approved by the John H. Daniels Faculty of Architecture, Landscape and Design Council on April 26, 2012 be approved; and
- iii) THAT, subject to confirmation by the Executive Committee, the amended Constitution of University College, which was approved by the University College Council on April 27, 2012, be approved.

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

8. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units: September 2011 – March 2012

The Chair said that the September 2011 to March 2012 Report of the Reviews of Academic Programs and Unit had been considered by the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs (AP&P) at its meeting of April 3, 2012, and she invited Professor Sass-Kortsak, Chair of AP&P, to give a brief update to the Board.

Professor Sass-Kortsak outlined AP&P's responsibilities which were a) to satisfy itself that the process of reviews was being managed well, b) to satisfy itself that the necessary steps were being taken by the academic units to address any problems and achieve improvements and c) to report to the Agenda Committee and the Board on the outcome. Two Provostial reviews and ten reviews of departments and their programs had been considered by AP&P. The most important outcome had been the clear recognition by the reviewers that the University offered outstanding programs. In all of the reviews, thought-provoking suggestions had been made and valuable advice had been given, including ideas for areas of improvement. Recommendations had covered a broad range of issues including academic program matters (enrolment, student funding and curriculum issues), faculty matters (hiring, promotion, mentoring, and development), governance, administration and quality and quantity of space. The Deans of the relevant Faculties, in their administrative responses and in their remarks to AP&P during its meeting, had clearly understood the issues and had articulated concrete plans for addressing them. AP&P, therefore, saw no need to draw any specific problems to the attention of the Agenda Committee or to request a follow-up report arising from any of the reviews.

8. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units: September 2011 – March 2012 (cont'd)

One theme raised during AP&P's discussion of the reviews related to graduate programs in the University's tri-campus structure. With the growth of UTM and UTSC, some distinctive Master's programs had been developed. For example, the Master's Degree Program in Biotechnology was located at UTM. As well, the first doctoral program at UTSC (in Environmental Science) had recently been established. Moving forward, the nature of tri-campus graduate models would need to be considered carefully and perhaps adjusted.

Professor Sass-Kortsak explained that the review process did not end at the University. The Vice-Provost, Academic Programs, prepared a Final Assessment Report for each review, which was submitted to the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance (Quality Council). That Report highlighted key elements in the reviews and the Deans' plans for addressing the recommendations. As well, the executive summary component of the Final Assessment Report was published on the Vice-Provost's website following the completion of the University's governance process. Professor Sass-Kortsak also noted that the Quality Council had an audit process in which auditors appointed by the Quality Council visited each university on an eight-year cycle and selected program reviews for audit. Among other matters, the auditors would advise the Quality Council on the University's compliance with its own Quality Assurance Process.

In closing, Professor Sass-Kortsak reported that the outcome of AP&P's review of reviews had been highly positive. The quality assurance process was working to ensure that the University was fulfilling its commitment "to being an internationally significant research university, with undergraduate, graduate and professional programs of excellent quality."⁴ On behalf of AP&P, she thanked the Provost's Office - particularly Professor Cheryl Regehr, Dr. Jane Harrison and Dr. Daniella Mallinick - for their excellent work in making the process work. She acknowledged the enormous amount of work required to prepare the in-depth material. Professor Sass-Kortsak also thanked her colleagues on AP&P for their hard work and thoughtful insights in providing governance oversight to the process.

Mr. Jason Dumelie, Commissioner for Academics and Funding, Divisions 3 and 4, Graduate Students' Union, was then invited by the Chair to address the Board. Noting that the review of two basic science departments – the Department of Immunology and the Department of Pharmacology and Toxicology – had been included in the current package of reviews, Mr. Dumelie commented that more in-depth and frequent reviews were needed. Although the reviews that were currently conducted might lead to some positive outcomes, they were quite limited in their use. In his opinion, a review of the assessment of graduate student skills and knowledge should be conducted in order to obtain evidence of the value of a graduate degree. It seemed that many of the skills obtained by graduate students were those that could be developed by working in entry-level jobs. Mr. Dumelie also expressed concern about the manner in which the reviews were conducted. He suggested that separate components of a program should be assessed by those with expertise within those components, rather than having reviews performed by external reviewers who were scholars in the field of study being reviewed. For example, a management expert might assess the structure of a

⁴ University of Toronto's *Statement of Institutional Purpose* - <http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/policies/mission.htm>

8. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units: September 2011 – March 2012 (cont'd)

research laboratory work environment. Mr. Dumelie closed by stressing the importance of both external and internal incentives for demonstrating the efficacy of graduate programs and he urged the University to ensure that promotion of its graduate programs continued.

Professor Regehr thanked Mr. Dumelie for his comments, which he had also shared with her during a previous meeting. Noting that this was the first year in which the new *University of Toronto Quality Assurance Process* had been implemented, Professor Regehr said that the University could continue to consider its process. She stated that she would be pleased to speak with the Dean of the Faculty of Medicine regarding some of the matters that Mr. Dumelie had highlighted. Professor Avrum Gotlieb, Acting Vice-Dean, Graduate Affairs, Faculty of Medicine, also responded to Mr. Dumelie's comments. He reported that the Faculty had been very pleased with having been able to successfully comply with the *Quality Assurance Process* requirements. The external reviewers had been of a very high calibre, they had been knowledgeable and thorough and they had provided excellent feedback. As such, the Faculty was confident that the Quality Council would be satisfied with its reported activities. The review process had provided a valuable learning opportunity. With the completion of other reviews, the Faculty would have additional data to allow for comparisons to be made among its departments, which were quite heterogeneous and which carried out excellent discipline-specific graduate education and research.

In response to a question from President Naylor, Professor Gotlieb confirmed that reviewers were aware that most graduate programs within the Faculty were housed at multiple locations. Such information was included in the self-study report that was provided to them. During their visit, reviewers typically met with students who were assembled for that purpose in a central location on campus. As well, depending on the nature of the department, reviewers also visited other sites in order to speak with students.

9. Proposed Terms of Reference for University of Toronto Mississauga and University of Toronto Scarborough Campus Councils

The Chair stated that the proposed Terms of Reference for the UTM and UTSC Campus Councils were being presented for information to the Board by Professor Bill Gough, Member of the Governing Council and Chair of the Working Group on Tri-Campus Matters, and Mr. Louis Charpentier, Secretary of the Governing Council.

Professor Gough provided a brief overview of the proposals for the UTM and UTSC Campus Councils. The structure of the Councils had been based on that of the Governing Council as outlined in the *University of Toronto Act, 1971*⁵. Half of the membership would be composed of administrative staff, students and teaching staff of each campus (internal members) and half would be composed of alumni and community members (external members). Such membership would contribute to strengthened governance processes, with input on campus decisions provided not only by those directly invested in the outcomes, but also by other supporters of the campuses who were more distant from campus matters. The proposed Academic Affairs Committee had been designed to mirror the Academic Board because it would address similar types of academic issues.

⁵ <http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/policies/uoftact-1.htm>

9. Proposed Terms of Reference for University of Toronto Mississauga and University of Toronto Scarborough Campus Councils (cont'd)

The proposed Campus Affairs Committee would address various campus-specific matters considered by the University Affairs Board and the Planning and Budget Committee.

Professor Gough reminded the Board that advice to the Task Force on Governance had indicated that the existing College Councils at UTM and UTSC did not meet the needs of the campuses as they had grown and evolved. Having served as a Chair of the UTSC Council for a number of years, Professor Gough had directly observed the need for an improved Council structure, and a review of the UTSC governance process over the past two years also had identified clear dissatisfaction with the existing structure. Professor Gough and Mr. Charpentier had consulted with UTM and UTSC representatives during the development of the current proposals and the feedback had resulted in some revisions. Most recently, the student membership on the Councils had been increased from 3 to 4 out of a total of 26 members. Other comments elicited during consultations had pointed to clarifying the preference for alumni members of Council to be alumni of the respective campuses; the proposed Terms of Reference would be modified to reflect preferential but not exclusive selection of alumni from each campus.

Among the matters raised during the Board's discussion were the following.

a) Governance Approval Process

Noting that changes to Divisional Council constitutions required Academic Board approval, a member asked why Board approval was not required for the proposed UTM and UTSC Terms of Reference. Professor Gough explained that, similar to Governing Council Boards, the proposed Campus Councils would report directly to the Governing Council. For this reason, Governing Council rather than Academic Board approval of their Terms of Reference was required. Such a structure would allow for the development of a closer relationship with Governing Council as well as delegation of authority to the Campus Councils for certain matters so that decisions could be made locally.

b) Campus Council and Committee Membership

Some members expressed the view that the number of administrative staff, student, and teaching staff members on the Councils and the Committees should be increased, particularly given the number of external representatives on the bodies, and they suggested that the existing diversity of views might be lost. Professor Gough reiterated that the Campus Councils were modelled on the composition of the Governing Council, which was prescribed by the *University of Toronto Act*. The *Task Force on Governance* had concluded after its consideration that, at present, there were no compelling reasons to re-open the *Act*. Student membership on the Academic Affairs Committee

9. Proposed Terms of Reference for University of Toronto Mississauga and University of Toronto Scarborough Campus Councils (cont'd)

had been scaled to 50% of the 16 students on the Academic Board. Five student seats on the Campus Affairs Committee had been determined to be appropriate given that student membership on the Planning and Budget Committee was three and that on the University Affairs Board was eight.

In response to Professor Naylor's request for an elaboration of the rationale to draw the mandate of the Campus Affairs Committee from both the Planning and Budget Committee and the University Affairs Board, Mr. Charpentier said that the Campus Affairs Committee would consider non-academic matters. It had been a struggle to deal with the hybrid nature of the proposed Campus Affairs Committee and, although the suggested balance had seemed reasonable, the membership would be reconsidered in view of the feedback received.

A member asked how the number of student seats on the Councils and their Committees would be distributed across part-time undergraduate, full-time undergraduate and graduate constituencies. Professor Gough responded that such details would be determined at a later point and that students would be consulted to ensure that the distribution used was reasonable. Details regarding election processes would be outlined in the *Elections Guidelines* and revisions to the *Guidelines* would be considered by the Elections Committee of the Governing Council. Mr. Charpentier added that, in the coming year, the Elections Committee would undertake to examine more generally the matter of appropriate distribution within the estates represented on Governing Council bodies and, should the Campus Councils be approved, it would also consider the proposed Campus Councils and their Committees.

c) Authority of Campus Councils and their Committees

A member stated that, in her view, the ability of the Campus Council to influence administrative decisions would be diminished under the proposed structure. She cited an instance in the past when, in her opinion, members of the current Erindale College Council had felt empowered by being able to voice their opposition to a proposal, even if Council's advice ultimately had not been heeded by the UTM Vice-President and Principal. It seemed unlikely that future proposals considered by the proposed Council would be rejected, given the member's observations of the outcome of proposals considered by the Governing Council. The member expressed her opposition to the current proposal and urged that it not be forwarded to the Governing Council for approval on June 25, 2012. Rather, it should be returned to the UTM Council for further discussion in the second cycle of governance in the Fall, 2012.

In response to a comment from another member, Professor Gough noted that it was expected that substantive discussion on matters would occur at meetings of the Academic Affairs Committees or the Campus Affairs Committees, rather than at meetings of the Campus Councils, in the same way that greater debate occurred at Committee and Board meetings rather than at Governing Council meetings. The various constituencies were well-represented on the Committees of the Campus Councils and their views would be heard. Professor Regehr added that governance approval paths for academic proposals would remain unchanged. Where necessary, recommendations of the Academic Affairs Committees would still be forwarded to the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs, the Academic Board, or the Executive Committee of the Governing Council.

9. Proposed Terms of Reference for University of Toronto Mississauga and University of Toronto Scarborough Campus Councils (cont'd)

At the invitation of the Chair, Mr. Andrew Ursel, Vice President, University Affairs and Academics, University of Toronto Mississauga Students' Union, addressed the Board. He said that students felt that consultation about a suitable model of governance for UTM had not occurred. It appeared that the current proposal had simply been presented for input and students had not been given a choice as to the type of system that might be implemented. Students also had concerns about the requirement for a balance between internal and external membership on the governance bodies. Mr. Ursel commented that the role of the Academic Board was an important one, as it allowed proposals considered previously by other governance bodies to be reviewed. A similar system should exist within UTM's governance. In his view, the final terms of reference for the UTM governance bodies should be tabled until a suitable model could be developed.

The Chair thanked Mr. Ursel for having provided a written copy of his comments for distribution to Board members.

Professor Mullin informed the Board that the UTM Governance Review Committee, whose membership and mandate had been approved by the Erindale Campus Council, had had administrative staff, alumni, student and teaching staff representatives. There had been broad communication and consultation within the UTM community through the use of a website, three Town Hall meetings and a special Council meeting. At the latter, the one teaching staff member who had spoken had expressed his support for the proposal. The student comments that had been submitted had related to having elected rather than *ex officio* student representatives on the bodies. Student views had been considered seriously and, as a result, the number of student seats on the Council had been increased.

The Chair thanked Professor Gough and Mr. Charpentier for their ongoing work on the complex tri-campus governance matters.

CONSENT AGENDA

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the consent agenda be adopted.

10. Approval of the Report of the Previous Meeting: Report Number 179 – April 19, 2012

Report Number 179 of the meeting held on April 19, 2012 was approved.

11. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting

There was no business arising from Report Number 179.

12. Items for Information

The following items for information were received by the Board.

- a) Annual Report: Council of Ontario Universities Academic Colleague, 2011
 - b) Semi-Annual Report: Academic Appeals Committee, Individual Cases, Spring 2012
 - c) Semi-Annual Report: University Tribunal, Individual Cases, Spring 2012
 - d) Reports of the Agenda Committee
 - a. Report Number 181 May 1, 2012
 - b. Report Number 182 May 22, 2012
 - e) Report Number 155 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs (April 3, 2012)
 - f) Report Number 156 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs (May 15, 2012)
 - g) Report Number 150 of the Planning and Budget Committee (May 16, 2012)
-

13. Date of Next Meeting

The Chair stated that the next meeting of the Board would be held in the Fall, 2012.

14. Other Business

a) Review of Board Accomplishments

The Chair provided an overview of the many accomplishments of the Board during the past academic year. There had been a smooth transition to the use of its revised Terms of Reference. A number of items for which the Board had authority for final approval had been considered, and many items had been recommended by the Board to the Executive Committee for confirmation and to the Governing Council for approval. Numerous regular and occasional reports for information had been considered by the Board and some invited presentations had been given in order to assist members in developing a greater understanding of various aspects of the University. A copy of the Chair's slides is provided as [Attachment "A"](#).

b) Appreciation of Members

The Chair expressed her appreciation to all those who had contributed to the work of the Board during the past year. She thanked the assessors who brought matters forward to the Boards and Committees, particularly the senior assessor, Professor Misak, and voting assessors Professors Mabury, Regehr, and Young. She acknowledged the work of the members of the Agenda Committee, who oversaw the flow of the business of the Board, and who were diligent in approving academic administrative appointments on behalf of the Board. Their work would continue throughout the summer.

The Chair thanked Professor Hugh Gunz for having served as Vice-Chair, cheerfully chairing meetings on her behalf when necessary, and for having provided her with excellent advice throughout the year. She acknowledged the leadership that had been demonstrated by the Chair and

14. Other Business (cont'd)**b) Appreciation of Members (cont'd)**

Vice-Chair of the Planning and Budget Committee, Professor Avrum Gotlieb, Professor Elizabeth Cowper, and previously Professor Miriam Diamond. She also expressed appreciation for the work of the Vice-Chair of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs, Professor Doug McDougall. The Chair stated that Professor Andrea Sass-Kortsak had served with distinction as Chair of the AP&P for the past six years and as a member of the Board for the last seven years. Professor Sass-Kortsak would be stepping down from AP&P and the Board, but she would continue to serve on other governance bodies in her role as a teaching staff governor. In line with University tradition, Professor Sass-Kortsak would be given a University of Toronto captain's chair. The Chair thanked Professor Sass-Kortsak for her leadership and commitment over the years. The Board applauded her.

The Chair also acknowledged the lengthy service of Professor David Mock, Dean of the Faculty of Dentistry. He had served willingly on the Board, on P&B, and on the P&B agenda planning group, providing wise counsel for many years. The Chair thanked all members of the Board for their contribution to the governance of the University, particularly those whose terms would end on June 30, 2012 and she thanked the Secretary for her support of the Board.

c) Board Evaluation Survey

The Chair asked members to complete an online evaluation form that had been made available to them. Their feedback would be useful in planning Board meetings for the coming year.

The Chair thanked members for their attendance at the Board meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 6:15 p.m.

Secretary
June 6, 2012

Chair