

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

REPORT NUMBER 181 OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD

October 11, 2012

To the Governing Council,
University of Toronto

Your Board reports that it held a meeting on Thursday, October 11, 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 Cheryl Misak, Vice-
President and Provost
Professor Scott Mabury, Vice-
Provost, Academic Operations
Professor Cheryl Regehr, Vice-
Provost Academic Programs
Professor Catherine Amara
Professor Maydianne Andrade
Professor Jan Barnsley
Mr. James Bateman
Professor Dwayne Benjamin
Professor Eric Bredo
Ms Celina Caesar-Chavannes
Ms Ching Lucy Chau
Ms Yifan Chen
Professor Brian Corman
Professor Elizabeth Cowper
Professor Gary Crawford
Professor Christopher Damaren
Professor Karen Davis
Professor Luc De Nil
Professor Joseph Desloges

Ms Hanan Domloge
Professor David Dubins
Professor Suzanne Erb
Professor Zhong-Ping Feng
Mr. Peng Fu
Mr. Omar Gamel
Professor Meric Gertler
Mr. Andrew Girgis
Professor Avrum Gotlieb
Professor Bart Harvey
Mrs. Bonnie Horne
Mr. Peter Hurley
Professor Alison Keith
Mr. David Kleinman
Professor Jim Lai
Professor Ron Levi
Professor John Magee
Professor Henry Mann
Ms Beth Martin
Professor Douglas McDougall
Dr. Don McLean
Ms Michelle Mitrovich
Professor Amy Mullin
Professor Emmanuel Nikiema

Dr. Graeme Norval
Professor Laca Pavel
Ms Judith Poë
Ms Mainawati Rambali
Professor Michael Ratcliffe
Mr. Layton Reynolds
Professor Yves Roberge
Professor Jeffrey Rosenthal
Professor Seamus Ross
Professor Lock Rowe
Ms Deanne Saunders
Miss Maureen J. Somerville
Professor Markus Stock
Mr. Andrew Szende
Ms Tisha Tan
Professor Vincent Tropepe
Mr. Vijay Unnithan
Mr. Abhishek Vaidyanathan
Dr. Sarita Verma
Professor Cameron Walter
Dr. Shelly Weiss
Professor Sandy Welsh
Professor Joseph Wong
Professor Howard Yee

Regrets:

Dr. Francis Ahia
Professor Donald Ainslie
Professor Benjamin Alarie
Mr. Larry Alford
Professor Cristina Amon
Professor Robert Baker
Ms Katherine Ball
Professor Dwayne Barber
Dr. Katherine Berg
Ms Marilyn Booth
Professor Terry Carleton
Mr. Tyler Currie
Professor Charles Deber
Mr. Michael Dick
Mr. Michael Donnelly

Professor Wendy Duff
Professor Angela Esterhammer
Mr. John A. Fraser
Professor Robert Gibbs
Professor Daniel Haas
Professor Rick Halpern
Professor Robert Harrison
Professor Ira Jacobs
Professor Paul Kingston
Professor Roger L. Martin
Professor Faye Mishna
Professor Matthew Mitchell
Dr. Gary P. Mooney
Professor Mayo Moran
Professor Carol Moukheiber
Professor David Naylor
Professor Sioban Nelson

Professor Julia O'Sullivan
Professor Janet Paterson
Professor Elizabeth Peter
Professor Domenico Pietropaolo
Professor Russell Pysklywec
Professor Neil Rector
Professor Mohini Sain
Ms Ioana Sendroiu
Professor Richard Sommer
Professor Suzanne Stevenson
Ms Caitlin Tillman
Dr. Roslyn Thomas-Long
Professor Njoki Wane
Professor Catharine Whiteside
Professor Charmaine Williams

Non-voting Assessors:

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

Ms Judith Wolfson, Vice-President, University Relations

Secretariat:

Ms Mae-Yu Tan

In Attendance:

Mr. Chirag Variawa, member of the Governing Council

Dr. Jane Harrison, Director, Academic Programs and Policy, Office of the Vice-President and Provost

Ms Heather Kelly, Director, Student Services, School of Graduate Studies

Professor Brenda McCabe, Chair, Department of Civil Engineering, Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering

Ms Archana Sridhar, Assistant Provost

In this report, item 5 is recommended to the Governing Council for approval. The remaining items are reported for information.

1. Chair's Remarks and Orientation

The Chair welcomed new and continuing members to the first meeting of the Academic Board for 2012-2013. Professor Hugh Gunz, Vice-Chair of the Board; Professor Cheryl Misak, Vice-President and Provost and the Board's senior assessor; and other assessors who were in attendance were introduced. Members were encouraged to review the three Governance Principles documents – the *Principles of Good Governance*, the *Mandate of Governance*, and the *Expectations and Attributes of Governors and Key Principles of Ethical Conduct*, as well as the Board's Terms of Reference and the *Frequently Asked Questions* document that had been included with the agenda package.

The Chair then provided a brief outline of the Board's mandate, the role of Board members and meeting procedures. Professor Misak concurred with the Chair's comments and emphasized the importance of members' participation in Board discussions to ensure that views from each of the estates were shared.

2. 2011-2012 Academic Board Evaluation Survey

The Chair provided a summary of the feedback gathered from the Board evaluation survey that had been conducted for the third consecutive year in June, 2012. The response rate had remained consistent at 38%. Highlights included the following.

- In contrast with the previous year, this year only half of the respondents believed that agendas should be structured around a main theme when possible.
- Two-thirds of the respondents supported the continuation of educational components for Board members, although differing views were expressed by members who provided additional comments.

2. 2011-2012 Academic Board Evaluation Survey (cont'd)

- Noting that a suggestion for an orientation for new members had been provided on the survey, the Chair reported that an orientation had been held on Tuesday, September 25th and had been attended by 23 new Board members. The session had consisted of a brief history of the evolution of the Academic Board, an overview of the responsibilities of the Board and its four standing committees, and a panel discussion among former or current members of the Board who had shared their experiences with the new members.
- Members expressed overall satisfaction with the amount of time allotted for the introduction and discussion of the Board's main areas of responsibility (including academic programs, the budget, capital plans and projects and research).
- In general, respondents were very satisfied with the written material provided to the Board. However, approximately ten percent of the respondents felt that the amount of written information provided was inappropriate.
- Diverse responses with respect to the most/least valuable aspects of meetings were provided. Similarly, no clear themes emerged from the helpful suggestions for improvement.

In closing, the Chair said that the feedback had been helpful and she thanked those members who had made time to complete the survey and provide their thoughtful comments.

3. Report of the Vice-President and Provost

a) Trinity College – Dean of Arts

Professor Misak informed the Board that Professor Michael Ratcliffe had recently been appointed Vice-Provost and Dean of Arts of Trinity College for a six-year term, and she highlighted some of his outstanding accomplishments. Professor Ratcliffe had graduated from the University of Glasgow in 1976 with a Bachelor of Science degree in biochemistry and from the University of London in 1980 with a Doctor of Philosophy in immunology. From 1986 to 2001, Professor Ratcliffe had been a faculty member of the Department of Microbiology and Immunology at McGill University. Following that, he had joined the University of Toronto as Professor and Chair of the Department of Immunology and the Sunnybrook Health Sciences Center as a senior scientist. Prior to his current appointment, Professor Ratcliffe had been an Associate Fellow and then a Fellow at Trinity College. Professor Misak congratulated Professor Ratcliffe on his appointment.

b) The University of Toronto's Strategic Mandate Agreement

Professor Misak gave a presentation to the Board on the University's proposed Strategic Mandate Agreement. She spoke of the discussion paper entitled *Strengthening Ontario's Centres of Creativity, Innovation and Knowledge*¹ that had been released by the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities (MTCU) on July 1, 2012, the University of Toronto's response to that paper,² and the University's Strategic Mandate Agreement that would be

¹ <http://www.tcu.gov.on.ca/pepg/publications/DiscussionStrengtheningOntarioPSE.pdf>

² <http://www.president.utoronto.ca/speeches/the-university-of-torontos-response-to-the-mtcu-discussion-paper>

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

b) The University of Toronto's Strategic Mandate Agreement (cont'd)

submitted to the MTCU.³ Some of the matters outlined by Professor Misak included the following.

Highlights of the MTCU Discussion Paper and the University's Response

Three-year degrees

- The MTCU document suggested that an approach focusing on three- rather than four-year degrees might be adopted in Ontario, similar to the Bologna reforms of some European countries.
- Professor Misak stated that Canadian students with three-year degrees would find the doors of graduate schools and professional schools around the world slamming shut on them. The University was instead interested in exploring a 3+2 bachelors and masters/professional degree model for highly motivated students who would complete the requirements for a four-year undergraduate degree and a masters degree in less time than it would take to do the two degrees in sequence. The Faculty of Arts and Science was also developing a 'Fast Track' degree program to support and enable highly motivated students to do a full 20-credit degree in three years.

Credit transfer

- The MTCU proposed that first- and second-year introductory, general and core courses would be fully recognized and transferable between and across the universities and colleges across the Province.
- The University had recently joined six other Ontario universities in forming the University Credit Transfer Consortium which would streamline credit transfer for students within the participating institutions, while preserving the integrity of University of Toronto degrees.

Year-round learning

- Year-round learning options had been identified by the Ministry as a means of enabling post-secondary students to complete their programs more quickly, resulting in decreased post-secondary education-related costs.
- The University had increased its summer offerings at the three campuses. While the expansion of summer learning options would provide additional flexibility for students, mandated year-round learning would put at a disadvantage those students who had to work during the summer.

³ For the final report, see: <http://www.president.utoronto.ca/speeches/the-university-of-torontos-strategic-mandate-agreement-submission>

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

b) The University of Toronto's Strategic Mandate Agreement (cont'd)

Online education

- The Ministry's Discussion Paper suggested that one-third of a student's degree would be delivered online.
 - Professor Misak stated that the University of Toronto was not an online university. But the University's leadership in the provision of massive open online courses (MOOCs) as part of the Coursera consortium would continue; the first three such courses that it had offered had been quickly filled by more than 100,000 registrants and two more would be offered in the near future.

Entrepreneurial and experiential learning

- The MTCU proposed development of more entrepreneurial and experiential learning opportunities and workforce training for students in Ontario.
 - The University had proposed expanding the "Entrepreneurship 101" course through the Faculty of Arts and Science, and it also planned to offer more experiential learning opportunities through, for instance, the Centre for Urban Science and Progress in New York City.

Differentiation

- The concept of a differentiated post-secondary education system was raised in the Ministry's document.
 - The University of Toronto had been advocating for differentiation for many years and hence, welcomed this part of the discussion paper. However, there was also reference in the document to the standardized use of assessment tools, across-the-board credit transfer, etc., which seemed to pull against the idea of differentiation.

Efficiency and productivity

- The Ministry's document placed great emphasis on the importance of increased efficiencies, productivity and savings to be derived through innovation in teaching and learning.
 - The University had a long tradition of innovation within higher education and had continued to make outstanding strides despite ongoing fiscal pressures.

The University's Strategic Mandate Agreement Submission

- In developing the University's Strategic Mandate Agreement (SMA) submission, the administration had consulted extensively with members of the University. Professor Misak noted that, at a recent panel discussion, University administration, the University of Toronto Students' Union and the University of Toronto Faculty Association had all spoken in unison in response to the Discussion Paper.

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

b) The University of Toronto's Strategic Mandate Agreement (cont'd)

- The vision and mandate statements contained in the SMA submission had been drawn from the *Towards 2030: A Long-term Planning Framework for the University of Toronto*⁴ and *The View From 2012 – A Framework*.⁵
- The MTCU required each Ontario university to submit three priority objectives. The objectives that would be submitted by the University of Toronto – (1) research-intensity and enrolment differentiation, (2) technology and learning, and (3) entrepreneurship and experiential learning - were aligned with those identified in the Ministry's document. It was the administration's hope that funding would be granted for some of the University's initiatives, such as expansion of the number of international graduate students and providing more paid internship opportunities for students.
- A peer review panel at the Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario would adjudicate the submissions and submit final appraisals to Minister Glen Murray in February, 2013.

Matters raised during the Board's discussion included the following:

- A member suggested that institutions seeking transfer credits for their students should be required to demonstrate that the requirements of corresponding University of Toronto courses had been met. Professor Misak commented this was the aim of the University Credit Transfer Consortium.
- It was suggested that the University consider the possibility of offering MOOCs as a service to the local community. Professor Misak agreed that MOOCs met a great need worldwide, as had been demonstrated by the overwhelming positive response to the courses that had been made available by the University.
- A member inquired about steps being taken by the University to improve the student-faculty ratio and any plans to expand the successful first-year seminar program available through the Faculty of Arts and Science. Professor Misak noted that 57 new faculty positions had been added last year to those already planned, resulting in better student-faculty ratios. The University would continue to seek to identify funding that would enable the ratios to be improved further. Professor Misak noted that her office was supporting the expansion of the successful ONE programs to all of the colleges.
- Professor Meric Gertler, Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Science, spoke highly of the first-year seminar program, noting that every unit within the Faculty offered at least two "199" courses. Funds derived from the University Fund had been funneled to academic units with the highest student-faculty ratios in the Faculty in order to alleviate some of their enrolment pressures.
- Professor Misak replied to a question about co-operative programs that would provide experiential learning while also enabling students to gain some income. She pointed to the University of Toronto Scarborough's leadership in offering co-operative programs and stated that an expansion of such programs would be welcome.

⁴ http://www.towards2030.utoronto.ca/files/Long-Term_Planning_Framework_Oct_2008.pdf

⁵ <http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/AssetFactory.aspx?did=8598>

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

b) The University of Toronto's Strategic Mandate Agreement (cont'd)

Typically, proposals for co-operative programs were initially developed within academic units and then put forward for approval.

- Referring to the University's ongoing plans to increase international graduate student enrolment, the Chair expressed concern that developing countries would lose much-needed resources as a result of decisions made by international graduate students to remain abroad upon completion of their programs. Professor Misak acknowledged the concern but stated that it was a reality that some international students chose to remain abroad after graduation.

The slides used during Professor Misak's presentation are appended as Attachment "A".

4. Presentation by Professor Brian Corman – Central Graduate Recruitment Strategies

The Chair introduced Professor Brian Corman, Vice-Provost, Graduate Education and Dean of the School of Graduate Studies (SGS), and Ms Heather Kelly, Director of the SGS Student Services, who had agreed to give a presentation on central graduate recruitment strategies. The Chair commented that the suggestion for the presentation had arisen from a discussion that had occurred at a Board meeting the previous year.

Professor Corman and Ms Kelly spoke of the range of strategies being used by the SGS and divisional graduate units to provide outreach and support to prospective students. A number of marketing and promotion initiatives had been put in place, particularly those using online systems, and data indicated that the SGS tools were being heavily used. Through the development of an online application survey, the SGS continued to enhance and focus the services it provided.

The slides used during the presentation are appended as Attachment "B".

The Chair thanked Professor Corman and Ms Kelly for their informative presentation.

5. Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering: Master of Engineering in Cities Engineering and Management

The Chair outlined the governance approval path for the proposed Master of Engineering in Cities Engineering and Management (M.Eng.C.E.M.) graduate degree program. The proposal had been considered by the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs (AP&P) at its meeting of September 19, 2012. If approved by the Academic Board, it would then be considered for confirmation by the Executive Committee at its meeting on October 19, 2012. It was a requirement of the *University of Toronto Act, 1971* that certain decisions made by the Board be confirmed by the Executive Committee because the Board was not composed of a majority of members of the Governing Council. Once University governance approvals were obtained, the proposal would be reviewed by the Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario and then by the MTCU. A number of stages would need to be passed before the first cohort of students could be accepted into the program.

5. Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering: Master of Engineering in Cities Engineering and Management (cont'd)

Professor Doug McDougall, Chair of AP&P, introduced the proposal and highlighted the Committee's discussion, a summary of which is contained in the Report of the AP&P meeting.⁶

Among the matters that arose during the Board's discussion were the following.

a) Consultation and Collaboration within the University

Some questions about existing related programs and consultation that had occurred during the development of the proposal were raised by a member. Professor Meric Gertler, Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Science, replied that, while undergraduate and graduate programs with a focus on urban studies were currently offered at the University, the proposed program would fill a distinctive and un-served niche. Professor Brenda McCabe, Chair of the Department of Civil Engineering, confirmed that consultation had taken place with the University's Cities Centre⁷, and she reported that its Director was very supportive of the initiative. Professor Misak noted that collaborative discussions about the development of the Center for Urban Science and Progress and the proposed M.Eng.C.E.M. program had been held with Deans and faculty members from a number of divisions within the University.

b) Resource Implications of the Proposal

In response to a question regarding necessary resources for the proposed program, Professor McCabe explained that the Theme A infrastructure-related engineering courses would not require additional resources, as they would be drawn from existing Master of Engineering courses. Theme B courses, which were related to complex systems in cities, would be supported by a team of professors and industry experts who had agreed to participate in the program. Details regarding delivery of those courses had not yet been developed. Support for the third component of the program, a graduate-level practicum, would be provided by the University's existing Practical Experience Year Office and by a half-time program administrator. Professor Cheryl Regehr, Vice-Provost, Academic Programs, informed the Board that a multi-disciplinary team of senior University administrators considered every program proposal in its initial stages of development. During those discussions, factors such as available resources, potential program costs and prospective revenue were examined to ensure that the sponsoring Faculty would have sufficient resources for the program.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the proposed Master of Engineering in Cities Engineering and Management (M.Eng.C.E.M.), as described in the proposal from the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering dated August 2, 2012, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "A", be approved effective for the academic year 2013-2014.

⁶<http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/Assets/Governing+Council+Digital+Assets/Boards+and+Committees/Committee+on+Academic+Policy+and+Programs/2012-2013+Academic+Year/r0919.pdf>

⁷The Cities Centre evolved from the Centre for Urban and Community Studies.

CONSENT AGENDA

The Chair explained to members that, following a revision to the Board's Terms of Reference in 2011, certain routine items were now placed on a "consent" agenda in order to allow greater time for the Board to focus its discussion on more substantive matters. Unless questions or requests to place any of the consent items on the regular agenda were submitted to the Secretary 24 hours before a meeting, the items would normally be handled without presentation or discussion.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the consent agenda be adopted.

6. **Approval of the Report of the Previous Meeting:** Report Number 180 – May 31, 2012

Report Number 180 of the meeting held on May 31, 2012 was approved.

7. **Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting**

There was no business arising from Report Number 180.

8. **Items for Information**

The following items for information were received by the Board.

- (a) Report on Approvals Under Summer Executive Authority
- (b) Calendar of Business for 2012-13
- (c) Reports of the Agenda Committee Meetings
 - i) Report Number 183 - June 12, 2012
 - ii) Report Number 184 – June 28, 2012
- (d) Report Number 157 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs - September 19, 2012
- (e) Report Number 151 of the Planning and Budget Committee - September 20, 2012

9. **Quarterly Report on Donations**

- (a) February 1 – April 30, 2012
 - (b) May 1 – July 31, 2012
-

10. Date of the Next Meeting

The Chair stated that the next meeting of the Board was scheduled for Thursday, November 22, 2012, at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber. She highlighted the agenda items that would be presented at the subsequent meeting. Those dealt predominantly with academic appeals and academic discipline matters. As well, the Provost would give a presentation on the *Provost's Guidelines on Donations*.

11. Other Business

There were no items of other business.

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

The meeting adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

Secretary
October 24, 2012

Chair