

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL
REPORT NUMBER 126 OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD

February 26, 2004

To the Governing Council,
University of Toronto.

Your Board reports that it held a meeting on Thursday, February 26, 2004 at 4:15 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall. An attendance list is presented at the end of this report. In this report, items 3 and 4 are recommended to Governing Council for approval and the remaining items are reported for information.

The Chair welcomed Professor Vivek Goel to his first meeting as Interim Vice-President and Provost. The members welcomed him with applause.

A motion to adjourn not later than 6:30 p.m. was duly moved and seconded. The motion was carried.

1. Report of the Previous Meeting

The report of the previous meeting, dated January 15, 2004, was approved.

2. Report Number 111 of the Agenda Committee

The report was received for information.

The Chair drew attention to the discussion of the approval process of academic administrative appointments. The Agenda Committee had decided not to propose any changes to the current system.

3. Capital Project: Downsview, Library Storage Facility – Project Planning Report

(arising from Report Number 94 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Gotlieb reported that this project had been a priority because of the pressing need to have a facility for approximately one million volumes that currently were not appropriately stored nor easily accessed. Funding had become available within the accepted borrowing capability as a result of an independent decision to delay phase 2 of the Economics Building project until the external funding on which that project was premised had been secured.

A member noted that on page 12 of the proposal, it was stated that although the administration/processing facility would be accessible, the storage modules would only be accessible by able-bodied personnel. He asked for clarification of this point. Professor Venter explained that the building would be based on the storage model used by Harvard University. Robotic retrieval had been considered and discarded as too expensive. Instead, retrieval and filing would be done manually by staff using interconnected, elevated walkways. Portable steps would be used to reach the upper shelves. Someone in a wheelchair would not be able to retrieve books from the upper shelves. Hence the statement in the report. However, the administrative part of the

3. Capital Project: Downsview, Library Storage Facility – Project Planning Report (cont'd)

building would be accessible and there would be no restrictions there. Professor Goel said that under the Human Rights Code, employers were required to provide accessibility to the point of undue hardship. In the present case, if the stacks were to be made accessible it would require the re-design of the building and a significant increase in cost.

A member noted that there were a number of departments occupying space in the Robarts Library and asked whether these department could be re-located and the space returned to Library use thus making this project unnecessary. Professor Venter said that the non-Library occupants could be moved but the University did not have as much space to accommodate these departments as perhaps was thought. The main problem, however, was that the Robarts Library was not built as a major storage unit. The books weighed too much for all floors to support them. In any event, the freed space would only accommodate a small fraction of the books waiting to be stored and study space would be compromised. Another option that was considered was building a unit on the north-west corner of the Library block of land. This would result in the loss of windows on that side and would create other serious design problems as well as approvals from the City. Ms Moore added that the Library had been built for both stacks and people. Only a limited number of floors were built to support the stacks. The Centre of Criminology currently occupied space that could support stacks but it was the only non-Library department in such space. Another member cautioned that in moving departments, the quality of the new space compared to that of the current situation should be a consideration and was not always better.

The member asked whether the funding could not be used to renovate the Library to store the books. Professor Venter said that the cost would be prohibitive and the final outcome not as good as building at Downsview where high ceilings of 20 feet were possible to ensure storage efficiencies.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

1. THAT the Project Planning Report for the Library Storage Facility at Downsview, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "A", be approved in principle.
2. THAT the proposed Library Storage Facility be located on the Downsview campus.
3. THAT the project scope identified in the Project Planning Report, to establish a 2700 gross square meter storage facility to house 2 million volumes with the appropriate shipping, receiving and processing areas to service the facility be approved at a cost of \$6,000,000 with the funding source as follows:
 - i) A mortgage in the amount of \$6,000,000 to be amortized over a period of 20 - 40 years and to be repaid from the University of Toronto operating budget.

4. Capital Project: University of Toronto at Mississauga, Phase 8 Residence - Project Planning Report, Initial Design Work
(arising from Report Number 94 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Gotlieb explained that the Planning and Budget Committee had the responsibility of considering new capital projects with respect to the scope of the project, its site, its estimated cost and the identified sources of funding. In this case, sources of funding were not yet known so approval of the project was contingent upon reconsideration by the Planning and Budget Committee when those could be identified. Policy allowed the proposal to expend \$300,000 for design work to proceed directly to the Business Board. However, the administration was asking for recognition of the need and approval in principle of all but the sources of funding at this time.

The Chair noted that Mr. Chris McGrath, Director of Residences at UTM, was present.

A member asked why the residence would be for first-year students only rather than a mix. Professor Venter responded that the new residence was not restricted to first-year students. He also noted that currently 75 per cent of the residence spaces available were occupied by first-year students; this was not perhaps the most appropriate mix of students and, with the addition of the new residence, this high percentage would be reduced. Part of the intent of this new residence facility was to provide a dining hall and implement a meal plan. The 418 beds would help recruitment but the residence would house a mix of students, not just first-year students.

A member asked if there would be family housing and a day-care centre in this residence. Professor Venter explained that the other seven phases of residence at UTM included townhouse style residences that could be converted to family use. The new residence would be for single students. A day-care facility was not part of this phase. The question of day-care facilities needed to be addressed separately.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDED

Subject to the project returning to Planning and Budget Committee for consideration of further funding sources when those can be identified,

1. THAT the Project Planning Report for the Phase 8 Residence at the University of Toronto at Mississauga [UTM], the executive summary of which is attached hereto as Appendix "B", be approved in principle;
2. THAT the proposed residence be located on the UTM Campus on the site(s) identified for residence accommodation within the UTM Master Campus Plan;
3. THAT the project scope identified in the Project Planning Report, to establish a 418-bed student residence totaling approximately 11,000 gross square meters at an estimated cost of \$26.215 million, be approved;
4. THAT funding in the amount of \$300,000 to initiate the design of the Phase 8 Residence at UTM be from the UTM Operating Budget.

5. Items for Information

(a) Report of the Vice-President and Provost

(i) Academic Planning

Professor Goel reported that *Stepping UP, A Framework for Academic Planning 2004-2010*, was approved by the Governing Council on February 11, 2004. The planning focus now shifted to the divisions which were busy developing their academic plans. He noted that last month, the Provost's office had held a very successful session on promoting interdisciplinarity and multi-unit planning. The President would be striking a committee to revise the University's *Statement of Institutional Purpose*, in light of the *Framework* document. One of the important components of the academic planning process was the establishment of benchmarks to measure how divisions were doing over time and relative to successful divisions at other institutions in achieving their academic plans. The benchmarks would be a divisional and departmental creation, not a central one, as the divisions and departments were best suited to determine how to measure their success both qualitatively and quantitatively.

With respect to other matters, Professor Goel noted that the Long-Range Budget Guidelines would be considered by the Planning and Budget Committee at its meeting on March 2 and the Budget Report would follow two weeks later. There was no tuition fee schedule at this time. There had been no announcement yet about replacement funding for tuition fees or student aid. In response to a question, the President confirmed that there had been no information provided by the provincial government.

The President said that the process for recommending a new Vice-President and Provost had begun with a call for nominations for membership on his Advisory Committee. The membership would be finalized next week and the search begun as soon as possible. The decision of whether to hire a search consultant would be taken in consultation with the Committee. He hoped to complete the process by the early summer. Similarly, plans were underway to search for a new Vice-President, Business Affairs. The deadline for input on membership was March 3 and, again, he hoped to be able to recommend an appointment by early summer.

(ii) Appointments and Status Changes / Appointment of Professors Emeriti

The above item was presented for information. There were no questions.

(b) Items for Information in Report Number 94 of the Planning and Budget Committee

Professor Gotlieb had no comments on the information items and members had no questions.

(c) Report Number 105 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs

Professor Smith had no comments on the information items.

A member asked for more details about the issues raised in connection with the Faculty of Arts and Science program changes concerning the course content of Sexual Diversity Studies programs, the reasons for deletion of the minor program in Humanism and the ethical implications of course material offered in the Molecular Genetics program. Professor Smith took the question under advisement and the Chair suggested that Professor Smith respond directly to the member.

5. Items for Information (cont'd)**(d) Reports Number 289 and 290 of the Academic Appeals Committee**

The reports were presented for information.

A member referred to a quote on page 4 of Report Number 290. A departmental administrator had written to a student, urging her to discontinue appeal efforts based solely on accusations made about a professor which were unsubstantiated charges and he said that she would be better advised to rewrite her comprehensive examination. The member considered this intimidation. He believed the University was committed to student rights. A member of the Board who was also a member of this particular hearing committee noted the next sentence in the report which stated that the minority of the appeals committee members also found the statement amounted to intimidation.

Professor Goel said that he could not comment on the specifics in this case, but he agreed that intimidation in the appeals process was inappropriate. Since this case had been heard at the divisional level, the School of Graduate Studies had instituted increased training for personnel involved in appeals, reviewed the detailed procedures and provided clearer guidance to those involved. Professor Marrus noted that the appeal in question had been heard at the divisional level by Professor Emeritus Ralph Scane of the Faculty of Law. It was, in his opinion, inappropriate to judge part of a decision without knowing the whole context. Hearings were solemn events, usually attended by lawyers, involving the extensive efforts of faculty, staff and students. Every time a decision was rendered, something new was learned. Those lessons were fed back into the process to improve it.

Another member also urged the Board not to take the paragraph out of context. The Board's job was not to second guess the appeals hearing. The Board's role was to look at the process and ensure that it was fair, that the student was represented, etc. The Board should not venture into commenting on substance. Professor Goel said that the administration did learn from the appeals and undertook to improve the process based on issues brought to its attention.

A member referred to Report Number 289 and asked about electronic submission of students' work. She noted that it would be easy for student assignments submitted electronically to get lost, particularly if professors were using a program to screen email spam. Professor Goel said that he was cognizant of this problem and that Mr. Marden Paul, Director of Strategic Computing, was drafting guidelines on the use of email for such things as student assignments, and confidential letters on promotion or tenure. Questions on such matters as the time of submission, the security of the document, and the identification of the sender were under consideration.

The Chair reminded members of the importance of giving notice of questions about the Academic Appeals Committee's Reports to the Secretary in advance of the meeting so that arrangements could be made to have the appropriate Chairs in attendance to respond to the questions.

(e) Report of Donations over \$250,000, November 2003 to January, 2004

This report was presented for information. There were no questions.

The President noted the substantial donations in support of the new Ontario Student Opportunity Trust Fund (OSOTF) program. These donations would be targeted to support student financial aid and would ensure accessibility.

6. Date of Next Meeting

The Chair noted that the next regular meeting of the Board would be held on April 8, 2004.

7. Other Business

A member asked about the relationship between the Centre for Cellular and Biomolecular Research (CCBR) and the new Medical and Related Sciences (MaRS) project being built on the periphery of the University, in particular about the possibility of funding being funneled to MaRS. Professor Challis said that the research undertaken by CCBR was compatible with scholarship and the University's and the Faculty's strategic plans. It would not be driven by the MaRS agenda but the University would, of course, continue to assess commercialization opportunities.

8. Academic Administrative Appointments

The following academic administrative appointments were approved:

FACULTY OF INFORMATION STUDIES

Professor Joan Cherry	Vice-Dean from March 1, 2004 to June 30, 2006
-----------------------	-----------------------------------------------

FACULTY OF LAW

Professor Lorne Sossin	Associate Dean from July 1, 2004 to June 30, 2007
------------------------	---------------------------------------------------

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE

Professor Paul Perron	Principal from July 1, 2004 to June 30, 2005 (re-appointment)
-----------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO AT SCARBOROUGH

Mr. Nick Cheng	Associate Dean from July 1, 2004 to June 30, 2007
----------------	---------------------------------------------------

In addition, Professor Goel reported that in over 140 new hires in 2002-03, the search process was waived on nine occasions, 3 for spousal appointments, 5 for full professors on appointments of opportunity and 1 for a change in rank position. In all cases, the chairs were required to consult with the department prior to recommending the appointments.

The meeting adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

Secretary
February 27, 2004

Chair

Present:

Professor W. R. Cummins, Chair
 Professor B. Corman, Vice-Chair
 Dr. T. Simpson, Chair, Governing Council
 Professor R. J. Birgeneau, President
 Professor V. Goel, Interim Vice-President and Provost
 Professor J. Challis, Vice-President Research and Associate Provost
 Professor R. Venter, Vice-Provost, Space and Facilities
 Professor S. Zaky, Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget
 Professor R. Abramovitch
 Professor D. Affonso
 Mr. S. Aggarwal
 Mr. S. Ahmed
 Professor D. Allen
 Professor G. Allen
 Professor C. Beghtol
 Professor T. Blake
 Mr. M. Bonham
 Professor R. Bryan
 Professor P. Byer
 Professor D. Clandfield
 Mr. J. Cohen
 Mr. B. Davis
 Mr. C. Davis
 Ms M. De Jesus
 Professor R. Deber
 Dr. I. Elliston
 Ms A. Emam
 Ms R. Fernandes
 Mr. S. Forbes
 Professor J. Furedy
 Professor J. Gaskell
 Ms B. Goldberg
 Professor D. Goring
 Professor A. Gotlieb
 Professor A. Haasz
 Professor W. Hindmarsh
 Ms B. Horne
 Professor S. Horton
 Ms M. Jackman
 Professor M.Y. Johnson
 Professor A. Johnston
 Professor B. Kidd
 Professor B. Langille
 Professor L. Loeb
 Professor J. MacDonald
 Professor M. Marrus
 Professor D. Massam
 Ms S. McDonald
 Ms V. Melnyk
 Professor D. Mock

Ms C. Moore
 Professor S. Pfeiffer
 Mr. C. Ramsaroop
 Professor C. Regehr
 Professor J. Reilly
 Professor J. Scherk
 Ms C. Seymour
 Professor P. Sinervo
 Professor B. C. Smith
 Professor J. J. B. Smith
 Miss M. Somerville
 Mr. J. Sousa
 Professor D. Thiessen
 Professor M. Williams

Non-voting Assessors:

Professor D. Farrar, Vice-Provost, Students
 Professor A. Hildyard, Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity
 Professor R. Venter, Vice-Provost, Space and Facilities Planning

Secretariat:

Ms S. Girard, Secretary

Absent:

Professor S. Aster
 Professor J. Barber
 Dr. M. Barrie
 Professor N. Bascia
 Professor D. Beach
 Professor M. Beattie
 Mr. F. Bellaurdo
 Professor N. Camerman
 Professor P. Catton
 Professor M. Chipman
 Professor S. Choudhry
 Professor F. Cunningham
 Professor L. De Nil
 Professor M. Diamond
 Professor J. Donaldson
 Professor R. Elliott
 Dr. S. Graham Fell
 Professor F. Fich
 Mr. J. Fraser
 Professor E. Freeman
 Professor R. Geist
 Ms R. Ghosh
 Professor M. Gotlieb
 Professor H. Gunz
 Professor P. Halpern
 Professor E. Hillan

Ms L. Honeywell
Professor M. Hutcheon
Mr. M. Hyreza
Professor J. Jenkins
Professor G. Kerr (on leave)
Professor R. Kluger
Ms L.A. Lavack
Professor J. Lepock
Professor R. Lewis
Professor R. Martin
Professor M. McGowan
Professor C. Misak
Mr. S. Morley
Professor D. Naylor

Professor M. O'Neill-Karch
Professor I. Orchard
Ms T. Pazonis
Professor P. Perron
Professor R. Reisz
Professor L. Richards
Professor J. Rosenfield
Professor B. Sampson
Professor B. Sherwood Lollar
Professor K.-L. Shun
Professor A. Sinclair
Ms F. Turgeon
Mr. N. Turk-Browne
Professor T. Venetsanopoulos

In Attendance:

Ms S. Drummond, Assistant Provost and Special Assistant to the Vice-President and Provost
Dr. B. FitzPatrick, Assistant Vice-President and Director, Office of the President
Mr. C. McGrath, Director of Residences, University of Toronto at Mississauga
Ms J. Poë, Vice-President, University of Toronto Faculty Association