

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL
REPORT NUMBER 129 OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD

September 27, 2004

To the Governing Council
University of Toronto

Your Board reports that it held a meeting on Monday, September 27, 2004 at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall. In this report, items 5, 6 and 7 are recommended to the Governing Council, item 8 (a) and (b) are recommended for confirmation by the Executive Committee, and the remaining items are reported for information.

Present:

Professor W. Raymond
Cummins, Chair
Professor Brian Corman, Vice-
Chair
The Honourable Frank
Iacobucci, Interim President
Mr. John (Jack) Petch, Vice-
Chair, Governing Council
Professor Vivek Goel, Vice-
President and Provost
Professor John Challis, Vice-
President, Research and
Associate Provost
Professor S. Zaky, Vice-Provost,
Planning and Budget
Professor Rona Abramovitch
Professor Stewart Aitchison
Ms Holly Andrews-Taylor
Professor Sidney Aster
Professor Gage Averill
Professor George Baird
Professor James Barber
Professor Mary Beattie
Mr. Mark S. Bonham
Professor Donald Brean
Professor Ragnar Buchweitz
Professor Philip H. Byer
Mr. Blake Chapman
Mr. Shaun Chen
Professor Mary L. Chipman
Ms Maple Chong
Professor David Clandfield
Professor George Elliott Clarke
Professor David Cook
Professor Raisa B. Deber
Professor Donald N. Dewees

Professor Miriam Diamond
Professor James Donaldson
Professor Robin Elliott
Dr. Inez. Elliston
Professor Guy Faulkner
Dr. Shari Graham Fell
Professor Faith E. Fich
Professor Steven T. Fong
Professor John J. Furedy
Professor Jane Gaskell
Ms Bonnie Goldberg
Professor Avrum Gotlieb
Professor Hugh Gunz
Professor Anthony A. Haasz
Ms Bonnie Horne
Mr. Senai Iman
Professor Bruce Kidd
Professor Joel A. Kirsh
Professor Ronald H. Kluger
Professor Christina Kramer
Professor James Lepock
Professor Robert Lewis
Mr. William R.J. Lumsden
Mr. Joseph Mapa
Professor M. Marrus
Professor Diane Massam
Ms Susan C. McDonald
Ms Vera Melnyk
Professor John R. Miron
Professor Cheryl Misak
Professor David Mock
Professor David Naylor
Professor Mariel O'Neill-Karch
Mr. Kedar Patil
Professor Susan Pfeiffer
Mr. Andrew Pinto

Professor Cheryl Regehr
Professor Richard Reznick
Professor John Scherk
Professor Gareth Seaward
Professor Anthony N. Sinclair
Professor Pekka Sinervo
Professor Brian Cantwell Smith
Miss Maureen J. Somerville
Mr. Leo Trottier
Ms Oriel Varga
Professor Tas Venetsanopoulos
Professor Rinaldo Wayne Walcott
Professor Judy Watt-Watson
Professor Melissa S. Williams
Ms Cindy Woodland

Non-voting Assessors:

Professor D. Farrar, Deputy
Provost and Vice-Provost,
Students
Professor A. Hildyard, Vice-
President, Human Resources and
Equity
Professor Edith Hillan, Vice-
Provost, Academic
Ms Catherine Riggall, Interim Vice-
President, Business Affairs
Professor C. Tuohy, Vice-President,
Government and Institutional
Relations

Secretariat:

Mr. Andrew Drummond
Ms Cristina Oke, Secretary

Absent:

Professor Dyanne Affonso
 Mr. Syed W. Ahmed
 Professor Derek Allen
 Dr. Mary Barrie
 Ms Janice Bayani
 Professor Clare Beghtol
 Professor Terry Blake
 Ms Lisa E. Boyes
 Professor Rorke Bryan
 Mr. Bruce G. Cameron
 Professor Sujit Choudhry
 Professor Frank Cunningham
 Professor Ronald Daniels
 Professor Luc F. De Nil
 Mr. Sean Forbes
 Mr. John Fraser
 Professor Eric Freeman
 Professor Wayne Hindmarsh
 Ms Leigh Honeywell
 Professor Michael Hutcheon

Professor Jenny Jenkins
 Professor Yuki Mayumi Johnson
 Ms Lesley Ann. Lavack
 Professor Lori Loeb
 Professor John F. MacDonald
 Professor Roger L. Martin
 Professor Mark McGowan
 Mr. Raza M. Mirza
 Ms Carole Moore
 Professor Paul Perron
 Ms Salma Rawof
 Professor James A. Reilly
 Professor Robert Reisz
 Ms Marvi H. Ricker
 Professor J. J. Berry Smith
 Professor Jay Rosenfield
 Professor Lisa Steele
 Ms Arjuna Thaskaran
 Professor Dennis Thiessen

In Attendance:

Ms Sheree. Drummond, Assistant
 Provost
 Dr. Beata FitzPatrick, Assistant
 Vice-President and Director,
 Office of the President
 Ms Connie Guberman, Status of
 Women Officer
 Ms Judith Pöe, University of
 Toronto Faculty Association

Introductory Remarks**(a) Welcome**

The Chair welcomed new and continuing members to the first meeting of the Academic Board for 2004-2005. He introduced Professor Brian Corman, the Vice-Chair of the Board, the interim President, the Honourable Frank Iacobucci, and Professor Vivek Goel, Vice-President and Provost and the Board's senior administrative assessor. Professor Goel introduced the Deputy Provost, Professor David Farrar and the Vice-Provosts, Professor Edith Hillan and Professor Safwat Zaky, as well as the Vice-Presidents who were in attendance: Professor John Challis, Professor Angela Hildyard, Ms Catherine Riggall, and Professor Carolyn Tuohy.

(b) Recognition of Ms Susan Girard

The Chair referred to the memorandum from the Secretary of the Governing Council that had announced the retirement of Ms Susan Girard from the University on September 30. He acknowledged the support and advice that Ms Girard had provided to the Chair, Vice-Chair, assessors and members of the Board since its establishment in 1988. He noted that she had served the University and its governance with dedication and commitment over the past twenty-three years. On behalf of the Board, he wished Ms Girard happiness and success in the next chapter of her life.

In gratitude for her committed service, Ms Girard was presented with a chair on behalf of the Governing Council and its Boards and Committees. The plaque on the back read:

To Susan Girard
 in recognition of twenty-three years
 of contributions to governance
 at the University of Toronto
 September 2004

Introductory Remarks (cont'd)

(b) Recognition of Ms Susan Girard (cont'd)

Ms Girard thanked the Chair and members of the Board for their good wishes, and stated that, while she would miss the people, she would not miss writing the meeting reports.

(c) Function and Procedures of the Board

The Chair highlighted the function and some of the key procedures of the Board.

i. Role of the Board

Under its Terms of Reference, the Academic Board, in general, was responsible for:

- matters affecting the teaching, learning and research functions of the University;
- the establishment of University objectives and priorities;
- the development of long-term and short-term plans; and
- the effective use of resources in the course of the above pursuits.

ii. Membership and Attendance

The Board had 121 **voting** members and 9 non-voting members.

Voting members were:

- **34 *ex officio* members**, including all Principals and Deans, the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Governing Council, the President and the Chancellor
- **65 elected members**, including 48 teaching staff from the divisions of the University, 2 librarians, 2 representatives from the School of Graduate Studies, and 7 members of the Governing Council
- **22 appointed members**, including three presidential voting assessors

Attendance was taken at the door.

iii. Agenda Items

Items on the Board's agenda normally arose from three sources.

1. Standing Committees

The Board had **4 standing committees**:

- Committee on Academic Policy and Programs (AP&P)
- Planning and Budget Committee (P&B)
- Academic Appeals Committee
- Agenda Committee

Some items were recommended by AP&P and P&B to the Board for approval, or for recommendation to Governing Council for approval. These items were presented to the Board by the Chair of the Committee making the recommendation.

The Board received for information copies of the reports of the Academic Appeals Committee

Introductory Remarks (cont'd)**(c) Function and Procedures of the Board (cont'd)****iii. Agenda Items (cont'd)****1. Standing Committees (cont'd)**

The Agenda Committee approved the membership of the Board's Striking Committee and determined whether items should be placed on the agenda of the Board

2. Senior Administration

Recommendations for academic administrative appointments and for changes to existing policies or new policies that are in the Board's purview came directly to the Board from the senior administration.

3. Divisions

Changes to the Constitution of a divisional Faculty Council came directly to the Board for approval.

4. Placement of an item on the agenda by a member

An item could be placed on the Board's agenda by a member in several ways. A member could move a motion at the meeting to add an item to the agenda. This required the support of 2/3 of those present and voting in order to carry. Board members could add an item to the agenda of a subsequent meeting. This required the support of a simple majority of those present and voting,

Members could submit a written request, signed by at least 10% of the Board (13 members), at a meeting. The matter would be automatically placed on the agenda of the next meeting. Members could also give a notice of motion at a meeting. The notice of motion would be considered by the Agenda Committee, and would either be added to the agenda of the Board's next meeting, referred to the administration for comment, referred to the relevant committee of the Board for consideration, or not put on the agenda. Whatever action was taken would be reported to the Board through the report of the Agenda Committee.

iv. Meeting Documentation

Members should receive their meeting agenda package four to five days before the meeting. Once the documentation had been sent out, members would be sent a message from the Secretary with the url of the agenda and non-confidential documentation. Members who had chosen to receive non-confidential meeting material electronically would be sent confidential material via campus mail or Canada Post. In those instances where, of necessity, material was distributed later than usual, members were encouraged to access it electronically to ensure that they had time to prepare for the meeting. If members had not received the material for a meeting when it had been expected, they were asked to call the Board Secretary.

If members found the documentation inadequate, or if there was something missing that they felt would be helpful in making a decision about any of the items, they were encouraged to call the Board Secretary, who would alert the Chair and the appropriate Assessor to obtain a response. The Secretary could also facilitate access to policies, Committee reports or public documents that Governing Council had on file.

Introductory Remarks (cont'd)**(c) Function and Procedures of the Board (cont'd)****v. Actions of the Board**

The Board could accept, reject, or refer back a proposed recommendation. Matters recommended by the Board would either be confirmed by the Executive Committee or forwarded to the Governing Council for final disposition.

vi. Items for Information

Items for information came before the Board chiefly for the purpose of keeping members informed of current issues and developments. The Board received these reports for its background interest. It was presumed that members had read the documentation and, at the meeting, no review or introduction was given by the assessor. Members could always ask questions or ask for discussion on an aspect of the report, as well as give advice to the appropriate assessor.

vii. Calendar of Business

The calendar of business was intended to be a guide for members to understand the expected items of business that would come forward to the Board and how these items would be handled. It was a “living” document and would change over the year. A Consolidated Calendar of Business for the Governing Council and its Boards and Committees was available on the Governing Council website and was updated throughout the year

viii. Conduct of Meetings

As noted in the Terms of Reference, meetings of the Board were conducted using the procedures set out for meetings of the Governing Council in By-Law Number 2. Meetings of the Board were held in **open session** with guests in attendance, sitting in a designated area. The Board usually moved *in camera* at the end of the meeting to deal with academic appointments, and other confidential matters. All non-members were asked to leave when the Board moved *in camera*

Due to the size of the Board, members were asked to sit at the table or forward in the room, and were requested to stand and give their names when they spoke.

ix. Speakers and Speaking Requests

Only members of the Board were allowed to speak to items that were on the agenda. However, guests were present on some occasions to help with the conduct of the business and might be asked by the Chair to respond to questions from members.

Requests by non-members to speak were made by contacting the Secretary no later than one day in advance of the meeting. A member could make a motion to permit a non-member to address the Board. To carry, such a motion required the support of 2/3 of the members present and voting. In all cases, speaking time for non-members was limited to no more than five minutes.

Introductory Remarks (cont'd)**(c) Function and Procedures of the Board (cont'd)****x. Business Arising and Other Business**

The agenda item 'Business Arising' referred to matters that required action from the previous meeting, including undertakings to provide further information or take particular steps. 'Other Business' referred to such matters as the continuation of discussion of an item reported in the minutes of the previous meeting or notices of motion regarding items not on the agenda.

xi. Role of Members

Members of the Board were expected to act in the best interests of the University of Toronto and not as an agent of a particular constituency. They had an obligation to ensure that the University was strengthened by the decisions that they made. Their role was to review the documentation and, if available, the report of the Committee that first considered the proposal; ask any questions that remained after they had read the documentation; listen attentively to their fellow members and, always, consider when voting what was in the best interests of the entire University.

xii. Conduct of members

The Chair expected that meetings of the Board would be conducted in an atmosphere of respect and collegiality. Procedural wrangling at meetings would be avoided as it did nothing to advance the consideration of the Board's business. To create an atmosphere of "no surprises", members were encouraged to inform the Secretary or the Chair well before the meeting if they intended to ask for more information before making a decision, move to refer the matter back, or amend the motion. Procedural advice would be given in a timely fashion.

The Chair proceeded with the regular business of the meeting.

1. Report of the Previous Meeting

The Chair noted that he had been advised of one proposed correction to the report. A member had requested that on page 4, under item 3, the second complete paragraph be amended to read:

Although there was a seconder for this motion, the Chair ruled the motion out of order as there was already a motion on the floor, *and because, in the Chair's opinion, the motion was the same in content as the proposal of the administration.*

(change shown in *italics*)

The report of the previous meeting, as amended, dated June 3, 2004, was approved.

2. Business Arising Out of the Report

There was no business arising.

3. Report Number 114 of the Agenda Committee (September 23, 2004)

The report was received for information.

4. Report from the Vice-President and Provost

(a) Remarks from the Interim President

Professor Goel invited the Honourable Frank Iacobucci, interim President, to address the Board. The Board welcomed the interim President with prolonged applause.

The President indicated that, having come back to the University after a twenty-year absence, he would begin his remarks from a historical perspective. The unicameral system of governance had come into being during his time at the University. One of the major concerns about and perceived deficits of the unicameral system had been the lack of a sufficient academic voice. Many had felt that there was a need for the opportunity for a full academic perspective to be considered in debates on issues for the University.

The President stated that he was pleased to see that changes had been made since his departure from the University. The creation of the Academic Board, and the committees that report to it, had gone a long way to remedying the imperfections of the unicameral system.

The President then briefly highlighted what he saw as the important academic issues for the coming year.

(i) The Rae Review

The President observed that he and the members of his senior administration would be spending a great deal of time on this file because of its fundamental importance to the academic mission. The University continued to depend primarily on government support, both for teaching and for research. This had been true twenty years ago and continued to be the case today, which was why the Rae Review of post-secondary education was so critical at this time.

Under the leadership of Vice-President Carolyn Tuohy, a discussion paper was being prepared that would be widely distributed to the university community for comment. This would inform the University's submission to the Rae Review. Governance would, of course, be involved in this process.

The University's challenge was in preparing its messages to the Rae Review. The University had to work with its sister universities but at the same time properly represent its own needs as defined by its academic mission.

(ii) Building on "*Stepping UP*"

The President stated that it was important to maintain the momentum that had been established through the Academic Planning Framework: to be a leader among the world's best public teaching and research universities. He noted that, since divisional plans would come to the Academic Board and its Committees, the Board had an especially important role to play in moving the University forward. A particularly important focus had to be to concentrate the University's effort to improve the student experience in every way possible.

(iii) Accountability

The President observed that it had not taken him long to realize that accountability was a very important aspect of the work of the University. In its quest for improvement, the

4. Report from the Vice-President and Provost (cont'd)

(a) Remarks from the Interim President (cont'd)

University had to identify ways of measuring performances and the accomplishment of goals. The University's development of performance indicators had shown very impressive progress to date.

(b) Vice-President and Provost

(i) Academic Planning

Professor Goel reported that a substantial part of the work of his office was the review of the divisional academic plans that had been received. Enhancing student experience, identifying interdisciplinary and inter-divisional initiatives, and improving outreach were common themes in the plans. Divisions had an October deadline to apply for allocations from the Academic Initiatives Funds in the current budget year. A second round of allocations would be made in the winter of 2005 for 2005-06.

Professor Goel informed members that it was his intention to bring forward to governance an annual report of the progress made by divisions in the implementation of their academic plans. This would provide increased accountability.

(ii) Budget Review Group

Professor Goel informed members that a Budget Review Group led by Professor Zaky was reviewing the internal budget model. A top priority of the University was to expand the size of the funding envelope. The purpose of the review is to ensure that internal allocations are as efficient as possible. Recommendations from this group would come forward to governance later in the fall.

(iii) Capital Projects

Professor Goel indicated that a revised Capital Plan would be presented, in light of the University's limited borrowing capacity. A member asked whether a committee would be created to review the revised Capital Plan. Professor Goel replied that updates to the Capital Plan were presented regularly to the Planning and Budget Committee and to the Business Board. The revised Capital Plan would update and consolidate remaining priorities.

(iv) Varsity Site Development

A member asked for a status report on the development of the Varsity site. The President replied that, over the summer, the design had been changed to maintain the integrity of Devonshire, and acoustic, parking and traffic flow studies had been undertaken. The project had been articulated in terms of academic needs. An information session was planned for October 14 for members of the Governing Council and its Boards, and the project plan was expected to be considered by the Planning and Budget Committee in October, and by the Academic Board at its November meeting.¹

¹ Secretary's Note: On September 30, 2004, the University announced that it would not proceed with the Varsity Centre project.

5. School of Graduate Studies: Proposed new one-year Master's Degree in Environmental Science (M.Env.Sc.)

Professor Regehr reported that the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs (AP&P) had considered this proposal at its meeting of Wednesday, September 22. It had been noted that this program would be the first graduate program to be offered at the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC).

Discussion at AP&P had been quite positive about this program. Members had asked about the level of financial aid and whether it met expected need. The Committee was informed that, because the program was designed for practitioners, and fell outside the funded cohort, financial assistance was not expected to be problematic. Members also had asked about the potential for overlap with programs in Environmental Health Studies in the Faculty of Medicine. The senior assessor had noted that a fundamental element of the current academic planning process was the encouragement of interdisciplinarity wherever possible. The proposal had been endorsed unanimously by the Committee.

Professor Gottlieb reported that the Planning and Budget Committee had amended the original motion after a discussion of the resource implications of the program.

A member asked for information about the process of consultation, including the consultation with industry and with non-government organizations. At the invitation of the Chair, Professor Ragnar Buchweitz, Dean of UTSC, replied that the program had been developed over a three-year period, and that considerable market research had been conducted during that time.

The member noted that part-time graduate students did not receive funding, and asked what was being done to ensure the accessibility to the proposed program. Professor Farrar, Deputy Provost and Vice-Provost, Students, commented that students enrolled in professional master's programs were not covered by the University's funding guarantee for graduate students. The member observed that there was a perception that part-time students were working in well-paying jobs, but that was not always the case.

A member pointed out that the Institute for Environmental Studies (IES) was the graduate unit for the program, although the program would be offered at UTSC, and that this represented a significant development in the three-campus structure

Professor Goel reminded members that proposed programs reached the Board after being considered by divisional governance and, in the case of graduate programs, by the Council of the School of Graduate Studies. Members were encouraged to raise any questions that they had in advance of the Board meeting, so that appropriate information could be provided, and, if necessary, arrangements made to invite colleagues who could speak to specific issues.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDED

THAT the proposal for a Master's degree in Environmental Science (M.Env.Sc.) at the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC), a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "A", be approved. This program will be supported by resources from UTSC and by a share of enrolment growth revenue.

6. *Ontarians with Disabilities Act: University of Toronto Accessibility Plan, 2004-05*

The Chair welcomed Professor Hildyard and Ms Guberman to the meeting. Professor Hildyard presented the highlights of the University's Accessibility Plan for 2004-05. She described the University's approach to accessibility as building on *Stepping UP's* direction for equity and access. She noted that the Plan united individual expertise and collective initiatives, and resulted from a highly consultative process.

Professor Hildyard reminded members that no additional resources had been provided by the provincial government. Capital expenditures had been built into capital budgets, and were reported separately. While individuals contributed a lot of time, it was difficult to quantify the cost of that contribution.

Professor Hildyard highlighted the key accomplishments of the 2003-04 plan. She noted that that thirty-six of the forty-five initiatives that had been identified in the 2003-04 plan had been completed. Twenty-three of the 2003-04 initiatives were being continued, while fourteen new initiatives had been identified. In addition, *A Statement of Commitment Regarding Persons with Disabilities* had been developed and would be considered by the University Affairs Board for recommendation to the November meeting of the Governing Council. The University had hosted two events related to accessibility – the "Breaking Down Barriers" Conference and "Claiming Disability: A Symposium on Disability Scholarship". A number of enhanced educational and awareness initiatives had been undertaken.

Professor Hildyard outlined the goals for 2004-05 and beyond, which included an assessment of signage/wayfinding, the development of an equity survey, and the identification of best practices with respect to chemical and environmental sensitivity. Issues relating to mental health and mental illness would be explored, as would furthering disability studies and scholarship.

At the conclusion of Professor Hildyard's presentation, Professor Gotlieb explained that the Planning and Budget Committee's responsibilities included reviewing and recommending approval of reports to external agencies that outlined new policy positions. The Committee had been given a presentation on the 2004-05 *Accessibility Plan* by Ms Guberman at its meeting on September 21, 2004. Members had commended Professor Hildyard and Ms Guberman for the work that had been done on the *Plan*, and the Committee had passed the motion unanimously.

A member noted the additional initiatives funded by students that were reported on page 63 of the 2004-05 Plan, and asked how sustainable these initiatives were. Ms Guberman agreed that sustainability of initiatives was a key concern.

A member observed that, to date, physical disabilities had been the main focus of accessibility initiatives, and asked what could be done to ensure accessibility for those with mental disabilities. For example, students who were registered as part-time as a result of their disabilities faced disincentives in pursuing their studies. Professor Hildyard agreed that mental disabilities were often invisible, and re-iterated that issues of mental health and mental illness would be a key focus in the coming year. Professor Goel noted that the question was also relevant to faculty and administrative staff. The accessibility plan had been an excellent catalyst in identifying issues that had to be addressed.

6. *Ontarians with Disabilities Act: University of Toronto Accessibility Plan, 2004-05* (cont'd)

A member asked whether accommodation of certain disabilities could result in a lowering of University standards. The member also suggested that symposia on disabilities should include a variety of perspectives. Professor Goel replied that it was the responsibility of the University to work to provide appropriate accommodation to individuals. It was noted that course loads were adjusted for students who were registered with a recognized disability. Another member commented that departments often made informal accommodations for individuals.

A member asked whether there were any updates to previous reports on barrier-free access. Professor Goel replied that a substantial investment had been made in capital projects to ensure accessibility. It was also noted that divisions had set priorities for accessibility and were working actively to resolve such issues.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDED

THAT the *Ontarians with Disabilities Act: University of Toronto Accessibility Plan, 2004-05*, the final version of which is attached hereto as Appendix “B”, be approved in principle.

7. *Capital Project: Terrence Donnelly Centre for Cellular and Bio-Molecular Research [CCBR]: Project Planning Report - Update*

Professor Gottlieb explained that the Planning and Budget Committee considered and recommended approval of Project Planning Reports for capital projects. This project had been approved in 2001 at a planned cost of \$85.1 million. The total cost of the project at that time was \$105 million. Since sufficient funds had not been available to complete the project, five floors of the facility were to be shelled in only.

Recently, an additional \$13 million had been contributed to the project by Terrence Donnelly. Part of this amount would be used to complete the five floors before the construction was completed in June 2005. The Committee had considered this updated project planning report, and was pleased to hear that the total cost of the project was now less than had been estimated in 2001.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDED

1. THAT the Users' Committee Report [currently referred to as the Project Planning Report] for the Terrence Donnelly Centre for Cellular and Bio-Molecular Research previously approved in February 2001 be fully implemented to complete the atrium and the five shelled-in floors and make them fully operational.
2. THAT the Terrence Donnelly Centre for Cellular and Bio-Molecular Research be completed at a cost of \$96,600,000 with funding sources as follows:

7. Capital Project: Terrence Donnelly Centre for Cellular and Bio-Molecular Research [CCBR]: Project Planning Report – Update (cont'd)

- a. \$30,800,000 from the Canada Foundation for Innovation [CFI],
- b. \$30,000,000 from the Ontario Innovation Trust [OIT],
- c. \$2,000,000 from the I'Anson Fund,
- d. \$2,800,000 from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund,
- e. \$1,275,000 from the interest on funds received,
- f. \$11,500,000 contribution from Terrence Donnelly,
- g. \$4,522,000 Matching from the McLaughlin Fund [OIT/ U of T],
- h. \$2,500,000 Faculty of Medicine cash contribution
- i. A mortgage in the amount of \$11,203,000 to be amortized over 20-25 years and to be repaid by collective contributions from the Faculty of Medicine. Leslie Dan Faculty of Pharmacy and the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering through Ph.D. enrolments and/or the operating budgets of these Faculties.

Documentation is attached hereto as Appendix “C”.

8. Faculty of Medicine: Departmental Name Changes

(a) Department of Anaesthesia

Professor Goel explained that the proposed change in spelling was consistent with the current spelling used by all members of the Association of Canadian University Departments of Anesthesia (ACUDA) and across North America.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the Faculty of Medicine change the name of the Department of Anaesthesia to the Department of Anesthesia.

Documentation is attached hereto as Appendix “D”.

(b) Department of Otolaryngology

Professor Goel explained that the proposed new name would more accurately describe the department, as approximately 65% of the Departments of Otolaryngology in the United States were recognized under the name ‘Department of Otolaryngology – Head and Neck Surgery’. The change in name had the full support of both the Department of Otolaryngology and the Department of Surgery.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the Faculty of Medicine change the name of the Department of Otolaryngology to the Department of Otolaryngology – Head and Neck Surgery.

Documentation is attached hereto as Appendix “E”.

9. Items for Information

(a) Reports from the Vice-President and Provost

- (i) Appointments and Status Changes / Appointment of Professors Emeriti/Emerita**
- (ii) Post-65 Appointments**

The above two items were presented for information. There were no questions.

(iii) Performance Indicators for Governance, September 2004

The Chair reported that no questions on the Performance Indicators had been received prior to the meeting. He asked if members had any questions concerning the report.

A member noted that, on page 16 of the report, the scale on the Y axis of the chart illustrating the Retention Rate began at 80%, rather than 0%, as in the other charts in the section on retention and graduation rates.

A member stated that, in his opinion, 90 per cent of the students in the Faculty of Arts and Science did not experience a class of fewer than 100 students. It was the view of his friends that the data on class size was misleading. Professor Tuohy replied that number of classes in the 16 to 30 size group had remained constant. A member suggested that class size was not the best indicator of student experience. It was difficult to capture the range of class sizes in the Faculty of Arts and Science. A better indicator might be the size of classes taken by those graduating with an Honours degree over the course of their studies. Professor Goel added that the Performance Indicators were the first step in measuring how well the University was doing in enhancing student experience.

A member asked whether the double cohort would affect the performance indicator data in the coming year. Professor Tuohy replied that the first shoulder of the double cohort was reflected in the current report. The peak year of the double cohort would be 2003-04. She noted that the gap in entering averages between St. George, the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM) and the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC) had lessened in 2002-03.

A member asked if future reports would focus more on student experience and less on such matters as technology transfer, section 13 of the report. Professor Tuohy replied that results from the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) would be an important source of data on student experience. She stated that section 13 – Technology Transfer – would be included in future reports because it was an important indicator for a number of audiences.

A member asked why the time to completion remained so long, particularly in view of the fact that guaranteed funding for graduate students was only available for a limited number of years. Professor Tuohy replied that the doctoral cohort included in the time to completion data had entered the University prior to the funding guarantee. A number of factors affected the time to completion, including student satisfaction, supervision, and funding. The student/faculty ratio had increased over time, and was higher at the University than it was at other Canadian universities and Association of American Universities' (AAU) peers. The University needed additional resources to improve the student/faculty ratio. A member added that, in some disciplines, the time

9. Items for Information (cont'd)**(a) Reports from the Vice-President and Provost (cont'd)****(iii) Performance Indicators for Governance, September 2004 (cont'd)**

to completion was lengthened by the requirement to learn additional languages or by the accessibility of research material. Another member noted that, although the University provided up to five years of guaranteed funding, the average time to obtain a Ph.D. was six to seven years, which left a funding gap. The member also noted that, in the Faculty of Arts and Science, the number of students had increased by 40% since 1980, while the number of faculty had decreased by 15%.

A member commended Professor Tuohy on the report, and asked if it would be possible to include data on faculty experience and satisfaction. Professor Tuohy replied that quantitative data on faculty experience and satisfaction was not currently available.

A member noted that the report included data on part-time enrolment at AAU institutions, and asked whether it would be possible to include data on part-time enrolment at other Canadian institutions, particularly those in Ontario.

(b) Items for Information in Report Number 110 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs

Members had been provided with an excerpt from this report rather than the full report which would be provided for the next meeting. No questions were raised based on the excerpt.

(c) Items for Information in Report Number 98 of the Planning and Budget Committee

There were no questions.

(d) Report Number 291 of the Academic Appeals Committee

The Chair noted that the Secretary had not been informed of any questions.

(e) Report on Approvals under Summer Executive Authority**I. Academic Administrative Appointments**

At the June meeting, the Board approved a delegation of authority to the Provost, the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Board and the student member of the Agenda Committee, to approve on behalf of the Board academic administrative appointments until the first meeting of the next academic year.

The following academic administrative appointments were approved under the Academic Board's summer executive authority:

9. Items for Information (cont'd)**(e) Report on Approvals under Summer Executive Authority (cont'd)****I. Academic Administrative Appointments (cont'd)**

FACULTY OF APPLIED SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING

Institute of Biomaterials and Biomedical Engineering

Professor Michael Sefton

Director from July 1, 2004 to June 30, 2005 (extension)

FACULTY OF ARCHITECTURE, LANDSCAPE, AND DESIGN

Professor Charles Waldheim

Associate Dean from July 1, 2004 to June 30, 2009

FACULTY OF ARTS AND SCIENCE

Department of East Asian Studies

Professor Andre Schmid

Chair from July 1, 2004 to June 30, 2009

Department of Economics

Professor Donald Dewees

Interim Chair from July 1, 2004 to June 30, 2005

Department of Fine Art

Professor Marc Gotlieb

Chair from July 1, 2005 to June 30, 2010 (re-appointment)

Professor Jill Caskey

Acting Chair from July 1, 2004 to June 30, 2005

Department of History

Professor Jane Abray

Chair from July 1, 2004 to June 30, 2009

Department of Physics

Professor Michael Luke

Interim Chair from July 1, 2004 to June 30, 2005

Department of Spanish and Portuguese

Professor Stephen Rupp

Chair from July 1, 2004 to June 30, 2010 (includes one year of administrative leave)

SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

Professor Susan Pfeiffer

Dean from September 1, 2004 to June 30, 2009

Centre for Industrial Relations

Professor Frank Reid

Director from July 1, 2004 to June 30, 2009 (re-appointment)

Institute for Human Development, Life Course and Aging

Professor Lynn McDonald

Director from July 1, 2004 to June 30, 2008

9. Items for Information (cont'd)**(e) Report on Approvals under Summer Executive Authority (cont'd)****I. Academic Administrative Appointments (cont'd)**

JOSEPH L. ROTMAN SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT

Mr. James D. Fisher

Associate Dean, Executive Education from
July 1, 2004 to June 30, 2007
(re-appointment)

Professor Glen Whyte

Associate Dean, Curriculum from July 1,
2004 to June 30, 2009 (re-appointment)

FACULTY OF MEDICINE

Department of Rehabilitation Sciences (Graduate)

Professor Helene Polatajko-Howell

Interim Chair from July 1, 2004 to
December 31, 2004

OISE/UT

Institute of Child Study

Professor Carl Corter

Director from July 1, 2004 to June 30, 2005
(extension)

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO AT MISSISSAUGA

Department of Philosophy

Professor Marleen Rozemond

Acting Chair from July 1, 2004 to December
31, 2004

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO AT SCARBOROUGH

Professor Ragnar Buchweitz

Vice-Principal (Academic) and Dean from
July 1, 2004 to June 30, 2009*Department of Social Sciences*

Professor John Miron

Chair from July 1, 2004 to June 30, 2008

II. Matters approved under the Governing Council's Summer Executive Authority**(i) Matters within the Terms of Reference of the Planning and Budget Committee**

There was one matter approved under the Governing Council's provisions for summer executive authority that would, in the normal course of events, have come to the Board for approval through the Planning and Budget Committee.

School of Graduate Studies: Discontinuation of the Combined Master in Science in Biomedical Communications (M.Sc.B.M.C.) and Post-Graduate Certificate in Biomedical Communication and Computer Animation at the University of Toronto and Sheridan College

9. Items for Information (cont'd)

(e) Report on Approvals under Summer Executive Authority (cont'd)

II. Matters approved under the Governing Council's Summer Executive Authority (cont'd)

(i) Matters within the Terms of Reference of the Planning and Budget Committee (cont'd)

THAT the Institute of Medical Science discontinue the Combined Master in Science in Biomedical Communications (M.Sc.B.M.C.) and Post-Graduate Certificate in Biomedical Communication and Computer Animation at the University of Toronto and Sheridan College, effective September 2004.

(ii) Matters within the Terms of Reference of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs

A number of items were approved under summer executive authority that would have been approved by the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs and reported to the Board for information. These include:

(1) School of Graduate Studies: Proposal from the Department of Physical Therapy to Establish an E-Learning Advanced Standing Option, within the existing Master of Science in Physical Therapy (M.Sc.P.T.) Program

THAT the Department of Physical Therapy establish and E-learning Advanced Standing option, within the existing Master of Science in Physical Therapy (M.Sc.P.T.) Program, effective September 2004.

(2) School of Graduate Studies: Proposal for the Centre for Industrial Relations (CIR) to change the name of the Master of Industrial Relations Program to the Master of Industrial Relations and Human Resources Program.

THAT the Centre for Industrial Relations change the name of the Master of Industrial Relations Program to the Master of Industrial Relations and Human Resources Program, effective September 2004.

(3) School of Graduate Studies: Proposal of the Division III Executive Committee, Physical Sciences, to change the standards of English Language Facility required for admission to Division III graduate programs

THAT the Division III Executive Committee, Physical Sciences, change the standards of English Language Facility required for admission to Division III graduate programs, effective September 2004.

9. Items for Information (cont'd)**(f) Calendar of Business 2004-05**

The Board's Calendar of Business for 2004-05 had been included in the agenda package. There were no questions.

(g) Quarterly Report on Donations May - July, 2004

This report was presented for information in accordance with the Provost's Guidelines on Donations. A member noted that the report was marked 'strictly confidential' and asked whether the report became public after it had been received by the Board for information. At the request of the Chair, the Secretary replied that the report remained confidential at the request of the Division of University Advancement, to protect the privacy of donors.

10. Date of Next Meeting - November 11, 2004**11. Other Business**

No items of other business were raised by members.

12. Academic Administrative Appointments

The following academic administrative appointments were approved:

FACULTY OF ARTS AND SCIENCE**Department of German**

Professor Willi Goetschel

Acting Chair

January 1, 2005 to June 30, 2005

SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

Professor Umberto De Boni

Acting Associate Dean, Humanities

October 1, 2004 to June 30, 2005 or until the position is filled, whichever comes first (extension)

FACULTY OF MEDICINE

Professor David Davis

Associate Dean, Continuing Education

July 1, 2004 to June 30, 2005 (extension)

Professor Richard Frecker

Associate Dean, Undergraduate Medical Education

July 1, 2004 to June 30, 2005 (extension)

Professor Jay Rosenfield

Acting Associate Dean, Undergraduate

Medical Education, July 15, 2004 to

November 31, 2004 or until the end

of the Associate Dean's leave, whichever is first

Professor Murray Urowitz

Associate Dean, Postgraduate Medical Education

July 1, 2004 to June 30, 2005 (extension)

12. Academic Administrative Appointments (cont'd)

FACULTY OF NURSING

Professor Souraya Sidani

Associate Dean of Academic Programs
September 1, 2004 to June 30, 2005

13. Appointment of Assistant Discipline Counsel

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT Mr. Robert A. Centa be appointed Assistant Discipline Counsel,
effective immediately.

The meeting adjourned at 6:15 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

October 12, 2004