

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL
REPORT NUMBER 196 OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD

March 19, 2015

To the Governing Council,
University of Toronto

Your Board reports that it held a meeting on Thursday, March 19, 2015 at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall at which the following were present:

Professor Andrea Sass-
Kortsak, Chair
Professor Meric S. Gertler
Dr. Francis Kwabena Ahia
Ms. Halla Ahmed
Professor Donald C.
Ainslie
Dr. Ramona Alaggia
Mr. Larry P. Alford
Professor Maydianne C.B
Andrade
Mr. Nabil B. Arif
Dr. Heather S. Boon
Ms. Marilyn Booth
Ms. Shakira Brathwaite
Ms. Christine E. Burke
Ms. Caitlin Campisi
Mr. Ken Chan
Ms. Michelle Cook
Professor Gary W.
Crawford
Professor Maria Cristina
Cuervo
Mr. Dan G. D'Agostino
Professor Charles M.
Deber
Professor David Dubins
Professor Angela
Esterhammer
Professor Susanne Ferber
Ms. Rachel Ferenbok
Ms. Stephanie Gaglione
Ms. Sally Garner

Professor Robert B. Gibbs
Mr. Gary D. Goldberg
Mr. Simon Gooding-
Townsend
Professor Rick Halpern
Professor Bart J. Harvey
Professor Richard Hegele
Professor Angela Hildyard
Dr. Avi Hyman
Professor Ira Jacobs
Professor Susan Jaglal
Professor Linda Johnston
Professor Bruce Kidd
Ms. Jeannie Kim
Professor Ron Levi
Professor Scott Mabury
Professor Jay R. Malcolm
Ms. Lorraine McLachlan
Professor Faye Mishna
Ms. Susan Murray
Professor Sioban Nelson
Dr. Graeme W. Norval
Mr. David Palmer
Professor Elizabeth Peter
Professor Russell
Pysklywec
Professor Cheryl Regehr
Professor Seamus Ross
Professor Locke Rowe
Dr. Anne Harriet
Simmonds
Professor Elizabeth Smyth
Professor James Stafford

Professor Nicholas
Terpstra
Professor Scott Thomas
Professor Steven J. Thorpe
Professor Vincent Tropepe
Professor Cameron Walter
Ms. Judith Wolfson
Dr. Trevor Young
Ms. Alena Zelinka

REGRETS:

Professor John S. Bland, Vice-Chair	Professor Ed Iacobucci	Mr. Utkarsh Roychoudhury
Professor Suzanne Conklin Akbari	Professor Paul Kingston	Professor Mohini M. Sain
Professor Benjamin Alarie	Professor Linda M. Kohn	Professor Deep Saini
Professor Cristina H. Amon	Professor Jim Yuan Lai	Professor Sonia Sedivy
Dr. Dimitri J. Anastakis	Mr. Malcolm Lawrie	Mr. Hugh D. Segal
Ms. Alexis Archbold	Professor Peter Lewis	Mr. Michael Singh
Professor Dwayne Benjamin	Professor Reid B. Locklin	Professor Richard Sommer
Professor Eric Bredo	Ms. Chelsea Lowther	Professor Salvatore M. Spadafora
Professor Jutta Brunnee	Dr. Tiff Macklem	Professor Andrew M. Spence
Professor Markus Bussmann	Dr. Don McLean	Professor Suzanne Stevenson
Professor David Cameron	Professor Amy Mullin	Professor Markus Stock
Professor Aziza Chaouni	Professor Emmanuel Nikiema	Professor Nhung Tuyet Tran
Mr. Dylan Alexandre Chauvin-Smith	Professor Julia O'Sullivan	Ms. Adriel Weaver
Ms. Angel Difan Chu	Professor Janet M. Paterson	Professor Sandy Welsh
Professor Luc F. De Nil	Professor Lacra Pavel	Ms. Judith Wolfson
Professor Joseph R. Desloges	Professor Michele Peterson-Badali	Ms. Songyi Xu
Professor Zhong-Ping Feng	Professor David J. Phillips	
Professor Tara Goldstein	Professor Domenico Pietropaolo	
Dr. Daniel A. Haas	Dr. Helene Polatajko-Howell	
Mrs. Bonnie Louise Horne	Professor Michael J.H. Ratcliffe	
Ms. Shirley Hoy	Professor Neil A. Rector	
Professor Howard Hu	Professor Yves Roberge	
Professor Douglas Hyatt	Ms. Melinda M. Rogers	

Non-Voting Assessors

Mr. David Palmer, Vice-President University Advancement
Mr. Malcolm Lawrie, Assistant Vice-President, University Planning and Design
Ms Christine Burke, Director, Campus and Facilities Planning
Ms Sally Garner, Executive Director, Planning and Budget

Secretariat:

Mr. Anwar Kazimi, Secretary, Academic Board
Mr. Patrick McNeill

In Attendance:

Mr. Rastko Cvekic, former member of the Governing Council, PhD Candidate, Department of Anthropology, CUPE 3902 Unit 1
Mr. Paul Donoghue, Chief Administrative Officer, University of Toronto Mississauga
Ms. Jennifer Francisco, Coordinator, Academic Change, Office of the Vice-Provost Academic Programs
Mr. Jamile Ghaddar, Faculty of Information, CUPE 3902 Unit 1
Ms Nadina Jamison, Executive Director, Stakeholder Relations & Strategic Initiatives, Office of the President
Ms. Therese Ludlow, Operations Manager, UTSC
Dr. Jennifer Mallinick, Coordinator, Academic Planning, Office of the Vice-Provost Academic Programs
Mr. Steve Moate, Senior Legal Counsel, University of Toronto
Professor Jay Pratt, Vice-Dean, Research and Infrastructure, Faculty of Arts and Science
Mr. Malcolm Ramsay, Department of Anthropology, CUPE 3902 Unit 1
Ms Archana Sridhar, Assistant Provost, Office of the Vice-President & Provost

Chair's Remarks

The Chair welcomed members and guests.

She announced the following results for the 2015 Academic Board elections:

- Professor Lorna MacDonald was declared elected to serve as the teaching staff representative for the Faculty of Music to serve a three-year term on the Board from July 1, 2015 to June 30, 2018.
- Professor Alice Maurice (University of Toronto Scarborough) and Professor Ron Kluger (Faculty of Arts and Science) had been acclaimed as teaching staff representatives to each serve a two-year term from July 1, 2015 to June 30, 2017.

Members were reminded that Monday, March 23rd at 5:00 p.m., was the deadline for administrative staff, alumni, and students to submit an online application to serve as co-opted members of the Board in 2015-2016. Members who would continue to serve on the Board in 2015-16 were reminded to complete the form (that was distributed earlier that day of the meeting on March 19, 2015) and indicate on which of the Board's standing committees they would like to serve next year.

Three speaking requests had been received from members of the Canadian Union of Public Employees (CUPE) 3902 Unit 1, on the matter of the ongoing labour negotiations with the University. All three requests had been granted.

1. Report of the Vice-President and Provost

Professor Regehr said the University administration had reached a tentative agreement with the bargaining team for CUPE 3902 Unit 1. CUPE 3902 Unit 1 had a two-stage process for the ratification of this tentative agreement. The tentative agreement would be presented to the CUPE members at a meeting on March 20, 2015. Professor Regehr encouraged all available teaching assistants, laboratory demonstrators, and course instructors to attend that meeting to learn about the deal, and to cast their vote on whether this deal proceeded to the full membership for ratification.

Professor Regehr said two key policies – the [*Policy on Academic Continuity*](#) and the [*University Assessment and Grading Practices Policy*](#) – would be instrumental in dealing with the courses which had been impacted by the strike.

The *Policy on Academic Continuity* rested on a few key principles:

- The primacy of the University's education mission;
- The integrity of the University's academic programs; and
- The principle of fairness to students.

The *Policy on Academic Continuity* provided for the declaration of an 'academic disruption' in certain specific situations. A disruption could be declared at any level of the University – at the individual course level up to a program, department, or division.

The authority to declare a state of academic disruption rested with the Provost or the Academic Board – this parallel authority had been mandated in the former iteration of the *Policy* and remained so in the new *Policy*, which was approved by the Governing Council on the recommendation of the Academic Board in 2012.

Professor Regehr referred to the *University Assessment and Grading Practices Policy* and said that this *Policy* offered faculty members and instructors considerable flexibility to change the marking scheme or assessment for a course. The *Policy* was used in normal circumstances and not just in exceptional ones. Guided by this *Policy*, some instructors took votes in their classrooms for changes to the marking scheme.

Professor Regehr assured members that the University administration had been, and continued to be, committed to addressing the larger issues that had been raised during the strike. In this regard, Professor Regehr recalled that Professor Sandy Welsh had been appointed as the Provostial Advisor on Graduate Student Funding in 2014. Professor Welsh had extensively consulted with graduate students, department chairs, and others about graduate funding. Professor Regehr thanked all those who had participated in these consultations including the Graduate Students Union. She added that Professor Locke Rowe, Dean of the School of Graduate Studies and Vice-Provost, Graduate Research and Education, had been closely assisting divisions with innovative work on career supports for graduate students and on improving time-to-completion rates in departments across the University.

1. Report of the Vice-President and Provost (continued)

Concluding her remarks, Professor Regehr stressed that it remained essential for the University to integrate important financial decisions with academic ones, in order to support and enhance academic programs and to make decisions in a collegial manner.

A member asked whether there were any specific Provostial guidelines for graduate funding. Professor Regehr replied that the nature of graduate funding, including where the funding was derived from, remained department specific.

2. [Budget Report, 2015-2016](#)

Professor Mabury and Professor Regehr made a detailed [presentation on the Budget Report](#) for 2015-2016. A copy of the presentation is appended to this report.

The following themes were highlighted:

- The Budget context 2015
- Enrolment
- Revenue and expense
- University Fund allocations
- Student financial support

Among the matters that arose in questions and discussion were the following:

- A member referred to the information provided on funding for graduate students. She asked what this would look like for graduate students who were outside of the funded cohort.

Professor Mabury said that the University received grants from the Provincial government for PhD and doctoral stream masters students while they were in the funded cohort. Students outside the funded cohort would have access to research grants and employment income.

- A member referred to the minimum funding commitment for graduate students. The member noted that the amount of \$15,000 per year had been established in 2008. What had been the rationale for that figure and why had the amount not increased with inflation?

Professor Mabury said that in 2001 the minimum funding commitment for graduate students had been established with a value of \$12,000 per year. By 2008, this had increased to \$15,000 per year. The University had continued to review the minimum funding commitment relative to changing fiscal and other external conditions. These conditions varied across the University divisions. As a result, Chairs and Deans made decisions about levels of funding for their graduate students beyond the minimum funding commitment.

2. *Budget Report, 2015-2016* (continued)

- A member noted that the University planned to increase its graduate student enrolment in the next few years. He commented that with declining external grants, it was increasingly difficult for some departments to meet the funding commitment. Had the University any plans in place to bridge this gap?

Professor Mabury replied that the University continued to do well in increasing its share of grants from the three federal research granting agencies – the number of the University’s Canada Research Chairs had recently increased by seven. Even as the amount of individual Principal Investigator (PI) funding was decreasing, collaborative and group grants were increasing.

- A member referred to the indirect costs of research and asked how this compared with those incurred by Canadian peers. What measures could the University take to recover more of these indirect costs of research?

Professor Goel said that the Federal government’s Research Support Fund (RSF) provided postsecondary institutions with indirect costs associated with managing their research enterprises. The Research Support Fund remained a fixed amount even as share of funding from the three federal research granting agencies varied. The formula by which the RSF was allocated was based on the level of research funding received – those with the smallest amount of funding received the same or more of the RSF. On average this was meant to be forty per cent but for the largest institutions like the University of Toronto, it was closer to seventeen per cent. The University would also continue to look at procuring more funds for contract sponsors to recover some of the indirect costs of research.

- A member referred to the projected special payments to address the deficit in the pension plans. He asked whether the Provincial government could mandate increases in these payments to address the pension solvency deficit. On another matter, the member noted that the investment income was projected to grow from 1.8 per cent to 3.5 per cent. What was the basis of this projection?

Professor Mabury said that \$97 million had been set aside in the 2015-2016 operating budget for the special payments to address the pension solvency deficit. The projected future payments would be based on the returns from the financial markets and the interest rates. The University was engaged in conversations with the Provincial government, the Ontario Confederation of University Faculty Associations, and its employee unions about a sector-wide pension plan, with the hope of solvency relief from the Provincial government. On the matter of the projected growth of the investment income, Professor Mabury said that there had been no specific change to the investment strategy and that the projected growth was based on solid, but conservative, numbers.

2. ***Budget Report, 2015-2016*** (continued)

- A member referred to the University-wide costs and enquired whether these costs were in check.

Professor Mabury said that there had been increases in certain University-wide costs in areas such as student support, library services, and advancement. Overall, the University-wide costs as a portion of the revenue had been consistent for the last nine years. Each year, more funds were allocated to academic divisions than to the shared services. The University's budget model allowed for input from divisions to allocate and prioritize funds for shared services on an annual basis.

On a motion duly moved, seconded and carried,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDED

THAT the Budget Report, 2015-2016 be approved, and
THAT the Long Range Budget Guidelines 2015-2016 to 2019-2020 be approved in principle.

3. **Capital Project: The Report of the Project Planning Committee for the Renovation and Expansion of the Recreation Wing (R-Wing) at the University of Toronto Scarborough – the new *Highland Hall* – Project Scope and Sources of Funding**

Professor Mabury highlighted the details of the Report of the Project Planning Committee for the Renovation and Expansion of the Recreation Wing (R-Wing) at the University of Toronto Scarborough.

On a motion duly moved, seconded and carried,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDED

1. THAT the Report of the Project Planning Committee for The Renovation and Expansion of the Recreation Wing (R-Wing) at the University of Toronto Scarborough, dated November 20, 2014, be approved in principle, contingent on award of the Ontario Major Capacity Expansion Program (as cash); and,
2. THAT the project scope totalling 4,237 new NASM (8,178 GSM) of new construction and 2,223 NASM (4,291 GSM) of renovation of the R-Wing at UTSC, to be funded by UTSC Operating Funds, Capital Campaign, Provost Central Funds, and award of the Ontario Major Capacity Expansion Program (as cash), be approved in principle.

4. **Capital Project: University of Toronto Mississauga Parking Deck Expansion - Report of the Project Planning Committee - Project Scope and Sources of Funding**

Professor Mabury highlighted the details of the Report of the Project Planning Committee for the Parking Deck Expansion at the University of Toronto Mississauga. Mr. Donoghue noted that schedule for the project had been revised because of matters concerning the pre-cast technology proposed for the construction of the deck.

On a motion duly moved, seconded and carried

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the Project Planning Committee Report for the Parking Deck Expansion at the University of Toronto Mississauga, dated November 10, 2014 (revised March 2, 2015), be approved in principle; and

THAT the proposed construction of a single-level parking deck, on the site of an existing surface lot with a capacity of approximately 300 parking spaces, be approved in principle, to be funded by the UTM Parking Ancillary's Capital Reserve and an internal transfer to the Parking Ancillary from UTM's general Capital Reserves.

5. **Updated Provost's Guidance on Sanctions; new Appendix C of Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters**

Professor Nelson said that the updated *Guidance on Sanctions* (new Appendix C to the *Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters*) would enhance consistency in sanctions across divisions while allowing for divisional discretion that would enable the appropriate resolution of matters at that level and provide the ability to consider all the particular circumstances of an individual case including mitigating factors. At the same time, the *Guidance* preserved the independence of the University Tribunal in imposing sanctions for academic misconduct following hearings when charges were laid. The *Guidance* also promoted transparency and allowed students to more clearly understand the range of sanctions that the Provost would potentially be seeking when charges proceeded to the Tribunal level.

A member asked whether Downtown Legal Services had been consulted in the process of updating the *Guidance on Sanctions*. Had input been sought from students and, what measures were in place to evaluate whether students had a better understanding of these updates?

Professor Nelson replied that the students' understanding of the *Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters* had been addressed by other initiatives that had been developed concurrently with these updates. An entirely new institutional website about academic integrity had been created to support students and other members of the University community and their understanding of the *Code*. This was in addition to a number of initiatives that had been developed at the divisional and departmental levels. A broader update about other academic integrity initiatives could be provided at a future meeting of the Board.

6. [Change in the name of the Department of Art, to Department of the History of Art, Faculty of Arts and Science](#)

Professor Nelson introduced the proposal for the change in the name of the Department of Art to the Department of the History of Art in the Faculty of Arts and Science.

A member noted that the documentation for the proposal mentioned that it had been decided not to change the tri-campus graduate Department of Art's name at this time. The member asked whether that discussion was ongoing. Had there been a consideration of whether challenges might arise with the St. George undergraduate department and graduate Department of Art both offering degrees in History of Art but under differently named departments?

At the invitation of the Chair, Professor Elizabeth Legge, Chair, Department of Art, provided the rationale for the name change. Professor Legge said that what distinguished the Department of Art at the St. George campus from the corresponding departments at UTM and UTSC was that faculty at the Department of Art at the St. George campus comprised of art historians only. The departments of art at UTM and UTSC consisted of a broad range of art disciplines such as film studies, etc. In drafting the proposal for the name change, extensive research had been conducted on a number of peer institutions and this was followed by broad consultation with the faculty. It had been concluded that for prospective undergraduate students the change in the name would accurately reflect the non-studio focus of the program. The proposal had received support from the Faculty of Arts and Science Council.

On a motion duly moved, seconded and carried

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the name of the *Department of Art* be changed to *Department of the History of Art* effective immediately upon approval

CONSENT AGENDA

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the consent agenda be adopted.

7. [Approval of the Report of the Previous Meeting:](#) Report Number 195 – January 29, 2015 was approved.

The report of the previous meeting, Report 195, was approved.

8. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting

There was no business arising from the minutes.

9. Items for Information

The following items for information were received by the Board

- (a) Appointments: President's Teaching Award Selection Committee
- (b) Reports of the Agenda Committee Meetings
 - i) Report Number 211 of the Agenda Committee – February 10, 2015
 - ii) Report Number 212 of the Agenda Committee – March 10, 2015
- (c) Report Number 172 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs – March 3, 2015
- (d) Report Number 165 of the Planning and Budget Committee – March 4, 2015

10. Date of the Next Meeting – Thursday, April 23, 2015, 4:10 – 6:00 p.m.

11. Other business

The Chair invited the three speakers representing CUPE 3902 Unit 1 to address the Board. In their comments, the speakers – Mr. Malcolm Ramsay, Ms Jamile Ghaddar, and Mr. Rastko Cvekic – stated the following:

- A majority of graduate students were living on the basic annual stipend of \$15,000, while many received no funding. Even as some graduate students earned as much as \$30,000 to \$35,000 annually, they had to seek support from other sources (e.g. parents and family members) to meet their living costs.
- With an annual stipend of \$15,000 some graduate students found it challenging to produce the quality of research expected at a globally-recognized institution like the University of Toronto. Some graduate students could not afford to attend academic conferences where they could disseminate their research for the benefit of the University.
- Referring to an update on the negotiations provided by the administration on March 16, 2015, the speakers noted that progress had been made but further structural issues remained outstanding.

The speakers concluded by presenting the administration with what they said were signed petitions from over 12,000 members of the University community in support of striking teaching assistants.

Responding to the speakers, President Gertler said that each member of the University community had been affected by the strike in different ways. The University administration remained committed to continuing to convene a University-wide conversation on these issues. The topic of financial support for graduate students would be integrated with a conversation about academic programs. There were many competing claims on the University budget at a time when the institution faced severe financial constraints. The administration recognized the seriousness of these issues. Concluding his remarks, President Gertler expressed hope that the latest offer would be ratified by the membership of the CUPE 3902 Unit 1.

The Board moved *in camera*.

12. Capital Project: The Report of the Project Planning Committee for the Renovation and Expansion of the Recreation Wing (R-Wing) at the University of Toronto Scarborough – the new *Highland Hall* - Budget and Sources of Funding

On motion duly moved, seconded and carried

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDED

THAT the recommendation, regarding the Renovation and Expansion of the Recreation Wing (R-Wing) at the University of Toronto Scarborough, contained in the memorandum from Prof. Scott Mabury, Vice-President, University Operations, dated March 12, 2015 be approved.

13. Capital Project: University of Toronto Mississauga Parking Deck Expansion - Report of the Project Planning Committee - Project Scope and Sources of Funding

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the recommendation, regarding the University of Toronto Mississauga Parking Deck Expansion, contained in the memorandum from Prof. Scott Mabury, Vice-President, University Operations, dated March 12, 2015 be approved.

14. Quarterly Report on Donations: November 1, 2014 – January 31, 2015

There were no questions from the Board.

The Board returned to closed session

The meeting adjourned at 6:10 p.m.

Secretary

March 20, 2015

Chair