

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

REPORT NUMBER 188 OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD

November 21, 2013

To the Governing Council,
University of Toronto

Your Board reports that it held a meeting on Thursday, November 21, 2013 at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall at which the following were present:

Professor Ellen Hodnett, Chair	Professor Brian Corman	Professor Amy Mullin
Professor Andrea Sass-Kortsak, Vice-Chair	Professor Elizabeth Cowper	Ms Jessica Ng
Professor Cheryl Regehr, Vice- President and Provost	Professor Gary Crawford	Professor Emmanuel Nikiema
Professor Scott Mabury, Vice- President, University Operations	Professor Maria Cristina Cuervo	Dr. Graeme Norval
Professor Sioban Nelson, Vice- Provost, Academic Programs	Mr. Rastko Cvekic	Ms Jiwon Tina Park
Professor Donald Ainslie	Professor Charles Deber	Professor Lacra Pavel
Dr. Ramona Alaggia	Professor Joseph Desloges	Professor Elizabeth Peter
Mr. Larry Alford	Professor David Dubins	Professor Domenico Pietropaolo
Ms Laura Amodio	Professor Wendy Duff	Professor Michael Ratcliffe
Dr. Dimitri Anastakis	Professor Angela Esterhammer	Professor Seamus Ross
Professor Dwayne Benjamin	Professor Susanne Ferber	Professor Mohini Sain
Professor John Bland	Professor Avrum Gotlieb	Professor Sonia Sedivy
Professor Markus Bussmann	Professor Rick Halpern	Professor Salvatore Spadafora
Professor David Cameron	Ms Alexandra Harris	Professor Suzanne Stevenson
Professor Terry Carleton	Professor Richard Hegele	Professor Markus Stock
Mr. Louis R. Charpentier	Dr. Avi Hyman	Professor Cameron Walter
Dr. Caroline Chassels	Professor Ira Jacobs	Professor Howard Yee
Mr. Yuan Chung	Ms Jenna Jacobson	
	Mr. Asad Jamal	
	Professor Linda Kohn	
	Professor Ron Levi	
	Mr. Ian Lin	
	Professor Douglas McDougall	
Regrets:	Professor Robert Gibbs	Professor Michele Peterson- Badali
Dr. Francis Ahia	Professor Daniel Haas	Dr. Helen Polatajko-Howell
Professor Benjamin Alarie	Professor Robert Harrison	Professor Russell Pysklywec
Professor Cristina Amon	Professor Bart Harvey	Ms Daisy Qin
Professor Maydianne Andrade	Mrs. Bonnie Horne	Ms Jennifer Raso
Mr. Christopher Balette	Professor Howard Hu	Ms Aditi Ratho
Dr. Katherine Berg	Professor Douglas Hyatt	Professor Neil Rector
Professor Jan Barnsley	Professor Alison Keith	Professor Yves Roberge
Dr. Heather Boon	Professor Paul Kingston	Ms Melinda Rogers
Ms Marilyn Booth	Mr. David Kleinman	Professor Mohini Sain
Professor Eric Bredo	Professor Jim Lai	Professor Richard Sommer
Mr. Ken Chan	Mr. Yingxiang Li	Professor Andrew Spence
Professor Aziza Chaouni	Ms Lorraine McLachlan	Professor Scott Thomas
Professor Luc De Nil	Dr. Don McLean	Ms Caitlin Tillman
Ms Sara Dolcetti	Professor Faye Mishna	Professor Nhung Tuyet Tran
Ms Hanan Domloge	Ms Michelle Mitrovich	Professor Vincent Tropepe
Professor Zhong-Ping Feng	Dr. Gary P. Mooney	Professor Sandy Welsh
Mr. John A. Fraser	Professor Mayo Moran	Professor Catharine Whiteside
Mr. Peng Fu	Professor Julia O'Sullivan	Professor Joseph Wong
Professor Meric Gertler	Professor Janet Paterson	Ms Songyi Xu
	Professor Peter Pauly	

Non-voting Assessors:

Professor Angela Hildyard, Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity

Professor Edith Hillan, Vice-Provost, Faculty and Academic Life

Ms Sally Garner, Executive Director, Planning and Budget
Ms Gail Milgrom, Director, Campus and Facilities Planning

In Attendance:

Ms Nora Gillespie, Legal Counsel, Offices of the Vice-President and Provost and the Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity

Dr. Jane Harrison, Director, Academic Programs and Policy, Office of the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs
Ms Archana Sridhar, Assistant Provost

Secretariat:

Ms Mae-Yu Tan

Chair's Remarks

The Chair welcomed members to the meeting. She informed members of the election period that would be held in 2014 for seats on the Governing Council and its bodies. Elections for 15 teaching staff seats and one librarian seat on the Academic Board would be held; each seat would be for a three-year term, from July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2017. The one-week nomination period would begin in early January. Members were asked to raise awareness within their constituencies of the importance of University governance and to encourage participation during the nomination and election period. Information about applications for co-opted (appointed) members of the Academic Board – administrative staff, alumni, and students – would be provided next term.

1. Report of the Vice-President and Provost**Ontario Productivity and Innovation Fund**

Professor Regehr announced that the University had been awarded \$5.8-million from the Ontario Productivity and Innovation Fund by the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities. Two individual proposals from the University had received funding – the *Active Learning: Online Redesign* project and the *Co-Curricular Record* project. As part of the former, a model for program and course re-design that targeted active learning strategies in online environments would be developed. The second project would support the implementation phase of the co-curricular record. The objective of tracking students' co-curricular experiences aligned well with the Province's objectives of increasing students' job-readiness.

Three multi-institutional proposals led by the University had also received funding. Through the *Multi-Institutional Space Management Solution* project, a collaborative of nine universities would design, acquire and customize software to manage and optimize space usage according to the Council of Ontario Universities guidelines. The *Ontario Digital Library Research Cloud* initiative would create a digital repository for electronic archival collections for Ontario Council of University Libraries institutions using cloud storage solutions, resulting in the preservation of five- to six-million digitized titles and texts. The third project, the *Shared High Density Library Storage Facility*, was a collaboration with Queen's, McMaster, and Western University to move, catalogue, shelve and store books at the University of Toronto's Downsview storage facility. Material could be held offsite, but delivered within twenty-four hours at a user's request, allowing for valuable library space to be repurposed for other student uses.

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

Access Copyright

Professor Regehr said that the University's agreement with Access Copyright would expire as of December 31, 2013. The University had given notice that it did not want to extend the current license at the existing royalty rate of \$26 per full-time student per year. The University was examining its options and engaging in negotiations with Access Copyright for a time-limited contract at a much lower royalty rate. A memorandum from Professor Regehr's office had been sent to Principals, Deans, Academic Directors and Chairs on November 5th outlining resources available to teaching staff in planning for the use of educational materials in the classroom. Professor Regehr observed that copyright law was changing rapidly, with legal decisions being made frequently on test issues. The University would continue to work with its libraries to ensure that its experts on these matters were well-engaged with faculty and instructors.

A member asked at what point faculty might presume that no agreement between the University and Access Copyright would be reached. Awareness of that critical date would be valuable as departments developed contingency plans. Professor Regehr replied that no such date had been identified and she asked that everyone prepare for the eventuality of no agreement.

2. Presentation by Professor Scott Mabury, Vice-President, University Operations and Ms Gail Milgrom, Director, Campus and Facilities Planning – Capital Projects

The Chair said that the Agenda Committee had decided that it would be valuable for members to learn more about the University's capital projects, given that was one of the Board's areas of responsibility. She then invited Professor Scott Mabury, Vice-President, University Operations and Ms Gail Milgrom, Director, Campus and Facilities Planning, to address the Board. Included in the matters highlighted during their presentation¹ were the following.

- The evolution of the University's campuses over the past hundred and fifty years.
- The University's Campus Master Plans, which served as roadmaps for past and future developments, incorporating planning principles such as support of the academic mission, sustainability, heritage preservation, accessibility and balanced intensification.
- The University's process for setting priorities for capital projects and institutional needs – during annual divisional budget review meetings chaired by the Vice-President and Provost, factors such as faculty complement, student enrolment, domestic/international and undergraduate/graduate student ratios and use of existing space were considered when developing academic priorities.
- The role of the Capital Projects and Space Allocation Committee in scrutinizing capital projects.
- Governance approval process of capital projects.
- Issues to be considered when contemplating future projects, included rehabilitation of buildings with heritage status, deferred maintenance, campus edges and relationships with the University's neighbours, improved space usage and efficiency, and funding.

¹ A copy of the presentation slides is attached to the Report.

2. Presentation by Professor Scott Mabury, Vice-President, University Operations and Ms Gail Milgrom, Director, Campus and Facilities Planning – Capital Projects (cont'd)

Following the presentation, a member asked if there were any plans to pedestrianize St. George Street between Bloor and College Street. Professor Mabury replied that that concept would need to be studied carefully in collaboration with the City of Toronto to determine the overall impact on the delivery of necessary services to the university and of diverting traffic to the narrower adjacent streets on the west campus. Pilot projects involving the closure of Devonshire Place and Willcocks Street had shown the former location (at the south end of the street) to have been less successful than the latter. The University was currently discussing closure of a small portion of the north end of Devonshire Place in front of the new Goldring Centre for High Performance Sport. A local planning group was exploring the possibility of a permanent closure of Willcocks Street between Huron Street and St. George Street.

In response to the member's question of whether there were plans to build a residence on the St. George campus, Professor Mabury confirmed the existence of discussions about a University residence near the intersection of Sussex and Spadina Avenue. A proposal, which would include a partnership between both public and private parties, would be brought forward for broad consultation once it had been more fully developed and once a suitable funding model had been identified. Professor Mabury noted that there was pressing need for approximately 2,000 spaces for students who wanted to live on campus.

The Chair thanked Professor Mabury and Ms Milgrom for their informative presentation.

3. Academic Plans

The Chair explained that the Board was required to receive for information and discussion academic plans of the divisions. She invited Professor Regehr to provide some context before the individual plans for the Faculty of Information, the Faculty of Kinesiology and Physical Education, and the University of Toronto Libraries were discussed.

Professor Regehr said that academic plans were created as guides for divisions' future goals and activities, including capital projects. As outlined in the *University of Toronto Quality Assurance Process* (UTQAP), a division's self-study was normally led by the Dean's Office and involved in-depth consultation with the division's various constituencies. Dialogue about both the division's strengths and challenges took place, and, often, academic programs were examined before reviews were conducted by prominent external reviewers. After the self-study, the academic planning process occurred.

Professor Regehr explained that key documents referred to during the process of academic planning included the *Policy for Approval and Review of Academic Programs and Units* and the *UTQAP*. In addition, academic planning was governed by Provostial guidelines described in *Academic Planning in the Context of Towards 2030*. In 2010, former Vice-President and Provost, Professor Cheryl Misak, had assembled a working group to examine academic planning in greater detail. The draft report produced by that working group was available on the website of the Office of the Vice-President and Provost and was relied upon in the development of the academic plans on the agenda.

3. Academic Plans (cont'd)

Academic plans and the cyclical planning process ensured the excellence of the University, increased its world-wide research influence and contribution and helped to maintain the highest possible academic standards, while offering the best educational experience possible to students of the University.

Professor Elizabeth Cowper made some introductory comments and noted that the Planning and Budget Committee had been satisfied with all three plans.

a) Faculty of Information Academic Plan, 2012-2017

Professor Seamus Ross, Dean of the Faculty of Information, advised members that the Faculty's strategic plan reflected its "commitment to excellence in scholarship and education to enable information to transform positively the possibilities of individuals and society". Included among the Faculty's many strengths was its relevance in addressing emerging challenges faced by society. In understanding the place of information in human endeavours, the Faculty made a difference through its activities and its community. Through its strategic plan, the Faculty would do so in more effective ways. Professor Ross outlined the consultation process that had been carefully and thoughtfully undertaken. The process, which had begun in 2009, culminated in the unanimous approval of the current plan by Faculty Council on April 12, 2013.

Professor Ross said that the Faculty's plan gave vibrancy to its mission of change, academic excellence, research innovation and social responsibility. Since its establishment, there had been constant rebirth with the change of the place of information in society. The Faculty's current strategic plan, which reflected conversations sustained over several years, provided a platform for the Faculty to be innovative, catalytic, and relevant. Professor Ross concluded by saying that the process had promoted a culture of conversation in the "iSchool", which was an excellent outcome.

No questions were raised by members of the Board.

b) Faculty of Kinesiology and Physical Education Academic Plan, 2013-2018

Professor Ira Jacobs, Dean of the Faculty of Kinesiology and Physical Education, spoke of the Faculty's academic plan, which had been endorsed unanimously at a recent Faculty Council meeting. In developing the roadmap for realizing the Faculty's vision of the future, a widely consultative and iterative process had been undertaken. Following the self-study and external review, Professor Jacobs had written a position paper used to ignite discussions during three subsequent phases of consultation. An implementation plan had been developed and progress of that plan would be monitored semi-annually.

Professor Jacobs noted that the Faculty had been established only fifteen years ago. Through the integration of curricular and co-curricular mandates, there had been an evolution of dynamic synergy. That synergy would be reinforced and leveraged through the Faculty's academic plan. Professor Jacobs closed by noting that the Faculty's leadership team was very excited to proceed with its implementation plan.

3. Academic Plans (cont'd)

There were no questions from members.

c) University of Toronto Libraries Academic Plan, 2013-2018

Mr. Larry Alford, Chief Librarian, spoke of the vision that had been developed many years ago to build one of the world's great libraries. It was important to maintain and strengthen the University of Toronto Libraries, which consisted of 44 libraries and over 70 collections. To that end, the academic planning process had been guided by two co-chairs, who had ensured that full consultation had occurred. The Steering Committee had been broadly representative of all employee groups, there had been multiple opportunities for staff participation (including those both within and external to the central system), and the University community as well as the library and archives community had been consulted. Key components of the academic plan addressed the University's comprehensive collections, its singular spaces where students were able to work, the Libraries' focus on innovative inquiry, the manner in which the Libraries engaged with partners, and its stewardship of resources.

Mr. Alford then announced that the University had just acquired the personal correspondence of General James Wolfe. He acknowledged the generous support of Helmhorst Investments Limited, the Department of Canadian Heritage, and the Office of the Vice-President and Provost, which had made possible the acquisition.

In response to a member's question as to how library systems among the University's teaching hospitals might be integrated, Mr. Alford pointed to the complexity of such a project. He stated that it would be very costly to obtain licences of electronic resources for hospital staff and that consortium arrangements would have to be examined.

4. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units: April – October 2013

The Chair noted that, under the *Policy for Approval and Review of Academic Programs and Units*, the Agenda Committee was responsible for identifying any specific academic issues raised by the overview of reviews of academic programs and units that warranted discussion by the Academic Board.

Department of Materials Science and Engineering

Professor Doug McDougall, Chair of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs (AP&P), reported on the meeting of October 29, 2013, at which one new review and one follow-up report had been discussed. In consideration of the review of the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering's Department of Materials Science and Engineering and its programs, the AP&P had raised two issues. First, members had requested a more thorough explanation of international opportunities. At the AP&P meeting, Professor Cristina Amon, Dean of the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering, had stated that, while the requirements of the Canadian Engineering Accreditation Board had presented some challenges for finding room in the curriculum for international opportunities, there were several pathways for students to go abroad. With respect to members' second question about the Department's commitment to diversity of the faculty complement, Professor Amon had said that faculty in the unit were already culturally diverse and

4. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units: April – October 2013 (cont'd)

that progress was being made in gender diversity. More than half of the tenure cases that had been taken forward in the past year had been for female faculty.

A member of the Board asked whether it was possible to consolidate the many international opportunities available to students at the University in order to make it easier for them to access the information. Professor Regehr replied that the Centre for International Experience served as a hub for students contemplating studying abroad.

Toronto School of Theology

Professor McDougall reported that, upon reviewing the review of the conjoint degree programs delivered by the Toronto School of Theology (TST) on October 29, 2012, the AP&P had requested a one-year follow-up report regarding the content of the recommended conjoint Ph.D. program. The report had addressed several items including recommendations of quality assurance, planning and integration with TST member institutions, faculty and student research, doctoral student supervision, and the consultation process as it developed the conjoint Ph.D. program.

A member asked whether students in the conjoint Ph.D. program might be assessed fees for membership in both the University of Toronto Students' Union (UTSU) and the Graduate Students' Union (GSU). Professor Regehr replied that a response would be obtained and provided to the member.

CONSENT AGENDA

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the consent agenda be adopted.

5. Approval of the Report of the Previous Meeting: Report Number 187 – October 3, 2013

Report Number 187 of the meeting held on October 3, 2013 was approved.

6. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting

There was no business arising from Report Number 187.

7. Items for Information

The following items for information were received by the Board.

- a) Annual Report: Academic Discipline - 2012-2013
- b) Semi-Annual Report: University Tribunal, Individual Cases, Fall 2013

- c) Semi-Annual Report: Academic Appeals Committee, Individual Cases, Fall 2013
- d) 2013 Report on Membership of the Advisory Committee on the University of Toronto Library System
- e) Report Number 195 of the Agenda Committee – November 6, 2013
- f) Report Number 164 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs – October 29, 2013
- g) Report Number 157 of the Planning and Budget Committee – October 28, 2013

8. Date of the Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Board was scheduled for Thursday, January 30, 2014, 4:10 – 6:00 p.m., in the Council Chamber.

9. Other Business

There were no items of other business.

The Board moved *in camera*.

***IN CAMERA* CONSENT AGENDA**

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the *in camera* consent agenda be adopted.

10. Quarterly Report on Donations

The Board received for information the Quarterly Reports on Donations - August 1 to October 31, 2013.

The Board returned to open session.

The Chair thanked members for their attendance and participation in the Board meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 5:40 p.m.

Secretary
November 27, 2013

Chair