

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL
REPORT NUMBER 142 OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD

March 30, 2006

To the Governing Council
University of Toronto

Your Board reports that it held a meeting on Thursday, March 30, 2006 at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall. In this report, items 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 and 15 are recommended to the Governing Council for approval, item 14 is recommended to the Executive Committee for confirmation, and the remaining items are reported for information.

Present:

Professor W. Raymond Cummins,
In the Chair
Professor David Naylor, President
Professor Vivek Goel, Vice-
President and Provost
Professor John Challis, Vice-
President, Research and Associate
Provost
Professor D. Farrar, Deputy Provost
and Vice-Provost, Students
Professor S. Zaky, Vice-Provost,
Planning and Budget
Mr. Navine K. Aggarwal
Professor Stewart Aitchison
Professor Derek Allen
Professor Jan Angus
Professor George Baird
Professor Sylvia Bashevkin
Professor Clare Beghtol
Professor David Begun
Professor Katherine Berg
Dr. Terry Blake
Professor Philip H. Byer
Mr. Ryan Matthew Campbell
Mr. Ewen Weili Chen
Professor David Clandfield

Absent:

Professor Rona Abramovitch
Mrs. Mubarka Alam
Professor Sidney Aster
Professor Gage Averill
Ms Marilyn Booth
Professor Donald Brean
Mr. Blake Chapman
Ms Maple Chong
Professor George Elliott Clarke
Professor John Coleman
Professor Brian Corman
Professor Raisa B. Deber
Professor Luc F. De Nil
Professor Miriam Diamond
Professor Robin Elliott
Professor Guy Faulkner
Dr. Shari Graham Fell
Mr. John F. Fraser
Professor Jonathan Freedman

Present: (cont'd)

Professor David Cook
Mr. Joe Cox
Miss Coralie D'Souza
Professor Marianne S.V. Douglas
Dr. Inez. Elliston
Ms Linda B. Gardner
Ms Bonnie Goldberg
Mr. Christopher Goode
Professor Wayne Hindmarsh
Ms Bonnie Horne
Mr. Kijun Kim
Professor Ronald H. Kluger
Professor Larry Leith
Professor Michael R. Marrus
Ms Susan C. McDonald
Professor Douglas McDougall
Professor Mark McGowan
Ms Vera Melnyk
Mr. Matto Miltenberger
Professor David Mock
Professor Mayo Moran
Professor Sioban Nelson
Professor Mariel O'Neill-Karch
Professor Janet Paterson
Professor Susan Pfeiffer
Professor Cheryl Regehr
Professor James A. Reilly

Absent: (cont'd)

Miss Livia Jozsa
Dr. Joel A. Kirsh
Professor Christina Kramer
Professor Hon C. Kwan
Ms Lesley Ann Lavack
Professor Robert Lewis
Professor Lori Loeb
Professor Roger L. Martin
Professor Diane Massam
Professor Brenda Y. McCabe
Professor Linda McGillis Hall
Professor John R. Miron
Professor Faye Mishna
Ms Carole Pinto
Mr. Andrew Poore
Ms Van Chau Quach
Professor Richard Reznick

Present: (cont'd)

Professor Robert Reisz
Professor Jolie Ringash
Dr. Jay Rosenfield
Mr. Paul Ruppert
Professor Andrea Sass-Kortsak
Professor Brian Cantwell Smith
Professor J.J. Berry Smith
Miss Maureen J. Somerville
Professor Lorne Sossin
Professor Suzanne Stevenson
Mr. Mahadeo Sukhai
Professor Tas Venetsanopoulos
Ms B. Elizabeth Vosburgh
Professor Melissa S. Williams
Dr. Cindy Woodland

Non-voting Assessors:

Professor A. Hildyard, Vice-President,
Human Resources and Equity
Professor Edith Hillan, Vice-Provost,
Academic
Ms Catherine Riggall, Vice-President,
Business Affairs
Ms Elizabeth Sisam, Assistant Vice-
President, Space and Facilities
Planning

Secretariat:

Mr. Henry T. Mulhall
Ms Cristina Oke, Secretary

In Attendance:

Mr. Geoffrey Matus, Member of the
Governing Council
Dr. Chris Cunningham, Special Advisor
to the President
Ms Sheree Drummond, Assistant
Provost
Professor Antoinette Gagné,
Coordinator, Concurrent Teacher
Education Program, Ontario
Institute for Studies in Education of
the University of Toronto
(OISE/UT)
Ms Mira Gambhir, Assistant
Coordinator, Concurrent Teacher
Education Program, OISE/UT

Absent: (cont'd)

Professor Eric Freeman
 Professor Jane Gaskell
 Professor Avrum Gotlieb
 Professor Hugh Gunz
 Mr. Syed Yaser Habeeb
 Mr. Martin Hycza
 Professor Jenny Jenkins
 Professor Yuki Mayumi Johnson
 Professor Charles Jones

Absent: (cont'd)

Professor John Scherk
 Professor Gareth Seaward
 Professor Anthony N. Sinclair
 Professor Pekka Sinervo
 Professor Tattersall Smith
 Professor Ron Smyth
 Professor Lisa Steele
 Professor Rinaldo Wayne Walcott
 Professor Catharine Whiteside

In Attendance: (cont'd)

Professor Normand Labrie, Associate
 Dean, Research, Ontario Institute for
 Studies in Education of the
 University of Toronto
 Ms Helen Lasthiotakis, Director,
 Policy and Planning, Office of
 the Vice-President and Provost
 Ms Rosanne Lopers-Sweetman,
 Director, Special Projects, Office of
 the Vice-President and Provost

Opening Remarks

The Chair welcomed members to the meeting and acknowledged the two new members who had recently been acclaimed in by-elections: Professor Lorne Sossin, Faculty of Law and Professor Faye Mishna, Faculty of Social Work.

1. Report 141 of the Meeting of February 16, 2006

The Chair noted that, at the request of a member, an amendment had been made to the Report. The paragraph at the top of page 7 had been revised to read:

A member noted that, in his view, the principles that had been applied by governance in the approval of degree names were that other Universities had degrees of the same name, the proposed name represented the degree honestly, or that the name sounded appropriate.

The report of the meeting of February 16, 2006, as amended, was approved.

2. Business Arising

There was no Business Arising from the previous meeting.

3. Report Number 125 of the Agenda Committee (March 10, 2006)

The Report was received for information. The Chair drew the attention of members to page 2 of the Report that listed the academic administrative appointments that had been approved by the Committee. There were no questions.

4. Report from the Vice-President and Provost

Professor Goel noted that, since the February meeting of the Board, a number of events linked to Islamophobia or racism had occurred on two of the University's three campuses. At its March 23rd meeting, President Naylor had addressed the Governing Council on these incidents, and his statement was currently on the University's home page.¹

Professor Goel reminded members that the University of Toronto had a long-standing commitment to equity and diversity. The Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity had led a review of how equity services were being delivered at the University, and it was anticipated that a statement on equity would be coming forward to governance before the end of the current academic year.

¹ <http://www.utoronto.ca/racistandoffensiveincidents.htm>

5. Budget Report, 2006-07

Presentation

Using a Powerpoint presentation, Professor Goel highlighted the following points in the Budget Report.

(i) Multi-Year Budgeting

- The University had developed a system of multi-year budgeting that had been in place for almost twenty years.
 - The University was currently entering the third year of a six-year budget cycle.
 - Multi-year budgeting allowed the University to cushion changes during the budget cycle.
- The University was in the midst of a period of significant change in revenues and expenditures.

(ii) Guidelines

- The *Policy on Surplus/Deficit at Fiscal year-End* required that the annual budget variance was no greater than 1.5% of gross operating revenue.
- Within the long-range budget guidelines, the Governing Council had allowed larger annual variances as long as the University exited each cycle with a balanced budget and the accumulated deficit did not exceed 1.5% in the final year of the budget cycle.

(iii) Budget Assumptions

- Revenue and expense assumptions were based on present circumstances and known Government policies.
- The assumptions did not reflect the University's advocacy objectives.

A. Revenue

- **Enrolment**
 - The budget assumed some reduction in overall undergraduate enrolment, resulting from the end of the double cohort, with increased international enrolment and a significant proposed expansion in graduate enrolment.
 - The province had not yet announced a decision on the allocation of graduate enrolment, therefore the budget assumed that the University's submission of an increase of 4,400 graduate student full-time equivalents (FTEs) would be funded and that this plan would be implemented, subject to approval by the Governing Council.
- **Government operating grants**
 - The budget assumed that the government would continue to provide full funding for undergraduate enrolment, as well as full funding for an additional 4,400 graduate full-time equivalents (FTEs).
 - The budget also assumed that allocations from the Quality Fund would remain at the current proportion.
 - There was a degree of uncertainty about government funding because the provincial government had not yet indicated how it would deal with enrolments and applications that were higher than anticipated.

5. Budget Report, 2006-07 (cont'd)

(iii) Budget Assumptions (cont'd)

A. Revenue (cont'd)

• Tuition fees

- The province had recently announced its Framework for Tuition Fees from 2006-07 until 2009-10.
 - The average increase across the University had been capped at 5% per year.
 - Increases for continuing students had been capped at 4% in program.
 - Increases for most incoming students had been capped at 4.5%.
 - Increases for professional and graduate programs could not exceed 8%.
 - Universities were required to provide to the provincial government a Student Access Guarantee which would replace the current requirement that 30% of the revenue resulting from tuition fee increases be directed toward student financial support.
 - The University's commitment to student financial support required a higher level of funding than the 30% set-aside.
- Tuition fees for international students would increase by 5% across all programs, as had been proposed in 2004-05.
- Summary of proposed increases:

2 %	4%	4.5%	6-8%
M.D.	All continuing students All graduate students, excluding MBA Commerce BBA (2006-07) CSC/CCIT/Bioinformatics (2006-07) Management (UTM) (2006-07)	Entering Students: Arts and Science Physical Education Music Education (B.Ed.) Nursing CSC/CCIT/Bioinformatics (2007-08) Management (UTM) (2007-08) Pharmacy, PharmD Radiation Sciences	Entering Students: Applied Science and Engineering (6%) J.D. (8%) D.D.S. (8%) M.B.A. (8%) Commerce BBA (8%: 2007-08)

- Summary of the impact of tuition revenue:

If tuition increase level:	Lost Revenue Without Proposed Increase	Additional cost containment required if revenue not achieved	# professorial positions at average professorial salary
0%	\$17.2M	3.0% base 1.5% OTO	135
2%	\$8M	1.0% base 1.5% OTO	63
5% - international 4.12% - domestic	\$0M	none	0

5. Budget Report, 2006-07 (cont'd)

(iii) Budget Assumptions (cont'd)

B. Expense

- **Compensation:**
 - Salaries and benefits were the major expenses of the University.
 - Assumptions reflected negotiated settlements and the current University position in ongoing negotiations, and the Consumer Price Index (CPI) thereafter.
 - There had been a small increase in pension deficit amortization as a result of recently negotiated settlements.
- **Significant changes in expense from last year:**
 - Increased cost of utilities;
 - Increased cost of compensation above CPI assumption;
 - Increased cost of benefits as a result of improvements to benefits and an increase in the number of individuals for whom benefits were paid;
 - New expenses:
 - Re-integration of the University of Toronto Innovations Foundation (UTIF) into the University;
 - Varsity Centre
 - Multi-Faith Centre
 - Student Experience Fund
 - Support for proposed graduate expansion
- **Student Experience Fund**
 - The enhancement of the student experience had emerged as a priority from the *Stepping UP* academic planning process.
 - The proposed Student Experience Fund was intended to support initiatives that would have an immediate positive impact on the student experience:
 - Student activity and study space;
 - Information and communications technology support, [eg. student portal, learning management system]
 - Small group experiences;
 - Student engagement opportunities [e.g., Tutors in the Classroom; Sustainability Office]
 - Pilot projects (with potential for wide-spread applicability).

(iv) Budget Issues

- Revenues were expected to increase by 30% in the next four years, but there were expenses associated with the increased revenue.
- Expenditures were projected to increase more rapidly than revenues, therefore expenditure containment was required.
- The Budget represented a significant reallocation of resources to the academic divisions, as they would receive most of the new revenue in the next few years.
- Although the provincial government was making a significant investment in post-secondary education, Ontario's rank of 10th out of the 10 provinces with respect to per student funding was likely to remain unchanged, since spending on post-secondary education was being increased by other provinces.
- When compared to peer public universities in the American Association of Universities (AAU), the University's grant and fee revenue was 50% lower, and its total funding per student was also 50% lower.

5. Budget Report, 2006-07 (cont'd)

(iv) Budget Issues (cont'd)

- Significant priorities for the University continued to be research and funding support for graduate students and increased funding of the indirect cost of research.

Introduction

Professor Mock reported that members of the Planning and Budget Committee had received a detailed briefing on the highlights of the 2006-07 Budget. Several questions had been raised during discussion, including the following:

- A member had asked for clarification of the assumptions of tuition and grant revenue. Professor Goel had replied that the budget model assumed that tuition fee increases in future years would be similar to those proposed in 2006-07, and that provincial grant revenue would be allocated based on previous approaches.
- A member had asked whether expense containment measures would result in the elimination of divisions or services. Professor Goel had replied that, given the new resources, it was not anticipated that there would be elimination of units or services, but that increased efficiencies and ongoing resource reallocation were being encouraged.
- In response to a question on the allocation of \$3 million to the restructuring of UTIF, members had been assured that regular reports on the status of the University of Toronto Innovations Foundation restructuring would be made to governance.
- Members had asked how support to enhance student experience from the proposed Student Experience Fund would fit in with support from other sources, such as the Academic Initiatives Fund, Hart House, and athletics. Professor Goel had replied that the methodology for determining allocations from the Student Experience Fund would be developed in consultation with Principals and Deans. This fund was intended to support projects that were not normally funded by other sources.
- It had been suggested that there be a review in the 2006-07 governance year of the policies related to fees that supported various aspects of the student experience, with a view to determining the areas of intersection among the bodies that were currently responsible for approving such fees.
- A member had asked how much student involvement there would be in determining allocations from the proposed fund. Professor Goel had replied that student opinion was gathered from a variety of sources including direct interaction, course evaluations, focus groups, and various surveys.
- A member had asked for clarification of the sources of divisional income. Professor Goel had replied that the chief source of divisional income was from continuing education courses.
- A member had asked whether costs associated with the central administration had been increasing over the past years. Professor Goel had replied that the proportion of expenses associated with the central administration had decreased.

5. Budget Report, 2006-07 (cont'd)

Discussion

A member asked what AAU peers were able to do with their additional resources. Professor Goel replied that those Universities had additional faculty, more student services and more residential students.

A member asked if there was a projection for student/faculty ratios at the University if the current funding situation continued. Professor Goel replied that the faculty/student ratio would not improve if the funding situation remained unchanged. Professor Naylor added that faculty/student ratio was a concern of the Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities. The rapid increase in the ratio had stabilized, but the ratio would not begin to decrease without additional funding.

A member asked whether funds from the Student Experience Fund could be used to address classroom size. Professor Goel replied that faculty/student ratios would not likely change during the budget period. While the University could not provide a small class experience for all first year courses, it could create more small group experiences for first-year students. The University could also make better use of technology and communicate more efficiently with students.

A member asked whether a particular amount of funding from the Student Experience Fund had been allocated to pilot programs or to divisions. Professor Goel replied that the mechanism for making allocations from the Student Experience Fund had yet to be decided. It was likely that allocations would focus on the undergraduate experience, but there also had to be an equitable distribution across the three campuses.

A member asked about the sources of other revenue received by the University's American peers. Professor Goel replied that most research grants received by peer institutions in the United States included funding for 55% of the indirect costs of research. The average indirect cost funding received by the University was 18%. Professor Naylor added that funding of indirect costs of research could sometimes be as high as 80% in the United States.

Professor Goel also noted that American peer universities received greater financial support on a more regular basis from their alumni than Canadian universities.

A member asked whether the increase in the graduate student funding guarantee from \$12,000 plus tuition to \$15,000 plus tuition, as proposed in *Stepping UP*, was still possible. Professor Goel replied that a committee on graduate student support had been convened to determine how to reach the funding target set in *Stepping UP*. The graduate student funding guarantee had been increased to \$13,000 for 2006-07. New revenues would be required to reach the guaranteed funding goal.

A member emphasized the importance of the University of Toronto Library in the recruitment of new faculty, and recalled that the Robarts Library had been intended as a provincial resource at the time of its construction. He asked whether the time was appropriate to make a request of increased funding for this provincial resource. Professor Goel replied that, while the acquisitions budget of the library had been retained, it was necessary to continue to examine the quality of services offered by the Library. Professor Naylor commented on the leadership role being played by the University's Library in the development of the Ontario Scholars Portal under the auspices of the Council of Ontario Universities (COU). The Universities continued to advocate that the Libraries were a provincial resource.

5. Budget Report, 2006-07 (cont'd)

Discussion (cont'd)

A member noted that the cost of library resources was increasing. Professor Goel commented that a few academic publishers controlled most of the leading journals and thus prices. The technology existed for open source publishing, but a change in culture was required as hiring and tenure procedures still focused on academic publications in sources controlled primarily by private publishers.

A member asked whether the cost containment measures within the University had been successful. Professor Goel replied that the cost containment requirements had been known to divisions for the past two years, and that there had been significant resource reallocation, which meant that most divisions were receiving new revenue. His office would be working with those units that had not been beneficiaries of new revenue. Professor Zaky added that, even after cost containment measures, a net amount of \$160 million would flow to the academic divisions.

Professor Goel stated that an information session on the new budget model would be held in May for members of the Governing Council and its Boards and Committees. In the new model, academic priorities would drive budget incentives.

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the "Budget Report for 2006-07" dated March 13, 2006, including the revisions to the long-range budget assumptions and the Contractual Obligation and Policy Commitments list, a copy of which is attached hereto as 'Appendix A' be approved.

6. Academic Initiatives Fund (AIF) Allocations - Round 3

Professor Mock reported that members of the Planning and Budget Committee had been reminded that the Academic Initiatives Fund (AIF) had been set up to assist in the implementation of initiatives arising from the academic planning process. In response to the third call for submissions, forty-one proposals had been received from seventeen University divisions. The requests had totaled \$11 million of base and \$55 million of OTO support.

Highlights of some of the proposals were included on pages 7 and 8 of Report 107 of the Committee.² A few questions of clarification had been asked by members, and these had been included in the report.

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the Third Round of the Academic Initiative Fund be allocated as per the table (Appendices 2 & 3) attached to the Memorandum from the Vice-President and Provost dated March 3, 2006, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "B".

² <http://www.utoronto.ca/govcncl/bac/details/pb/2005-06/pbr20060307.pdf>

7. Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto: Concurrent Teacher Education Program

Professor Smith explained that the Concurrent Teacher Education Program (CTEP) was a new program designed to expand teacher education across the University's three campuses. The program would be a collaborative partnership of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto (OISE/UT) with the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM), the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC), the Faculties of Music and Physical Education and Health, and two federated universities, St Michael's and Victoria. Over a five-year period, CTEP graduates would concurrently earn a Bachelor's degree in Arts, Science, Music, or Physical and Health Education, as well as a Bachelor of Education degree.

Professor Mock stated that the Planning and Budget Committee had assessed the planning and resource implications of the proposal. The Committee had been informed that this new program would combine existing programs, and thus be largely neutral in terms of revenue and resources. Courses would be redesigned, and revenue would flow differently than at present.

In response to a question, the Committee had been informed that the best exit point from the program would be at the end of the third year, when students could complete a primary degree without penalty.

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the Concurrent Teacher Education Program (CTEP) be offered at the University of Toronto, as described in the documentation dated February 3, 2006 and attached hereto as Appendix 'C', subject to approval of the University Faculties involved, and pending OISE/UT initial accreditation of CTEP by the Ontario College of Teachers and effective for the academic year 2007-2008.

Professor Goel noted that many academic divisions of the University had been involved in the development of this important program. He congratulated all the individuals who had worked on the proposal, and thanked them for their contributions.

8. Affiliation Agreement between the Governing Council of the University of Toronto and the University of Toronto Schools, July 1, 2006 to June 30, 2021

Professor Mock reminded members that an Interim Affiliation Agreement between the University and the University of Toronto Schools (UTS) had been approved by the Governing Council in 2003, for the period January 1, 2004 to April 30, 2006. The interim agreement was being extended for a two-month period to allow the proposed affiliation agreement to begin on July 1, the beginning of the fiscal year of UTS.

Professor Mock explained that three key issues had emerged during the negotiations leading to this proposed affiliation agreement:

- In order to become financially self-sufficient, UTS would have to increase tuition fees substantially.
- UTS would face significant cash flow problems as it moved to financial self-sufficiency.

8. Affiliation Agreement between the Governing Council of the University of Toronto and the University of Toronto Schools, July 1, 2006 to June 30, 2021 (cont'd)

- As tuition fees increased, a guarantee of an appropriate long-term location for UTS would become increasingly important to parents.

In response to these issues, the University's negotiating team had structured a proposal that:

- provided financial support when it was needed;
- established UTS on a financial model that clarified the actual operating costs of the school and provided explicit subsidies and an operating line of credit; and
- set a repayment schedule that was reasonable and encouraged the school to achieve financial self-sufficiency.

Professor Mock summarized the key terms of the affiliation agreement as follows.

Operating Subsidy

- Starting July 1, 2006, the University would pay UTS four annual payments in the amount of \$1.5 million.

Operating Costs

- Effective July 1, 2006, UTS would be required to pay an annual fee of \$615,000 per year for a license for the use of specified portions of 371 Bloor Street West.
- UTS would also pay the University for its share of utilities, cleaning and maintenance, and human resource and technology support.

Line of Credit

- The University would provide up to \$ 4 million as a line of credit to UTS at the rate of prime plus one-half percent.

Redevelopment of 371 Bloor Street West Site

- The possibility of a proposal for joint re-development of 371 Bloor Street West would be explored.

Professor Mock summarized the questions that had been raised by members of the Planning and Budget Committee:

- What would happen if no collective agreement had been reached by July 1, 2006? Professor Hildyard had replied that the University would work with UTS and the United Steelworkers (USW) to handle such a situation.
- Was there sufficient incentive under the proposed agreement for UTS to become self-sufficient? Ms Riggall had replied that the subsidy would end after four years, and the line of credit had to be paid completely by 2016.
- What was the University's long-term objective with respect to UTS? Professor Goel had replied that the current long-term objective of the University was for UTS to become a successful school affiliated with the University in a way similar to the federated Universities and the affiliated teaching hospitals.

8. Affiliation Agreement between the Governing Council of the University of Toronto and the University of Toronto Schools, July 1, 2006 to June 30, 2021 (cont'd)

- Would the existing endowments be sufficient to provide financial assistance to all students?

Professor Hildyard had replied that, although tuition fees were projected to rise significantly, the tuition for UTS would continue to be less than that for other private schools. A major goal of UTS was to double or triple the amount of the endowment, in order to meet the object of accessibility in its articles of incorporation.

- Why would the license be reviewed in 2011 if no redevelopment proposal for 371 Bloor Street West had been approved?

Professor Goel had replied that the date had been chosen to allow a ten-year period of transition that would allow UTS to move to a new location while the University proceeded on its own to determine the most appropriate use of the site.

Professor Mock noted that the motion had been passed unanimously by the Planning and Budget Committee.

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

1. THAT the Interim Agreement between the University and the University of Toronto Schools (UTS) be extended from April 30, 2006 to June 30, 2006;
2. THAT the Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity be given authority to execute an Affiliation Agreement between the Governing Council of the University of Toronto and the University of Toronto Schools, for the period July 1, 2006 to June 30, 2021, that is essentially in accordance with the principles and terms outlined in the Term Sheet (Appendix 1), attached hereto as Appendix 'D'.

Professor Goel acknowledged the historic significance of the affiliation agreement, and thanked Professor Hildyard and Ms Riggall for their efforts in negotiating the proposal.

9. Capital Project: Energy Efficiency Project on Lighting Retrofit and Chiller Replacement, St. George Campus: Project Planning Report

Professor Mock informed members that the proposal combined infrastructure renewal, involving 18 chillers serving 23 buildings, with an imminent major lighting retrofit of 70,000 lamps in three buildings (Robarts Library, Medical Sciences Building and the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto (OISE/UT)). The proposed project would reduce energy use, energy costs and the demand on the University's near-capacity electrical distribution system. The project would also reduce greenhouse gas emissions from the University by 3,100 tonnes of CO₂ per year – the equivalent of permanently removing 600 cars from the road.

Professor Mock added that the University had qualified for grants totaling \$2.93 million. The proposal would result in a major deferred maintenance project with a value of almost twenty million dollars being accomplished with virtually no overall long-term cost to the University's cash reserves, while providing a continuing positive cash flow to the operating budget.

9. Capital Project: Energy Efficiency Project on Lighting Retrofit and Chiller Replacement, St. George Campus: Project Planning Report (cont'd)

Professor Mock summarized the points that had arisen in discussion at the Planning and Budget Committee.

- It was estimated that the project would take three years to complete.
- The Energy Infrastructure Renewal Plan referred to in the Project Planning Report was expected to come to governance in the fall.
- It was expected that special arrangements would be made with Principal Investigators to schedule the work in research laboratories during the night so as not to inconvenience students.

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

That the Project Planning Report for the St. George Campus Cooling Infrastructure Upgrade and Major Lighting Retrofit Project, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix 'E', be approved in principle at an estimated total project cost of \$19.87 million, with sources of funding as follows:

NRCan grant	\$ 0.25-million
Toronto Hydro grant	0.68-million
Facilities Renewal funds	2.00-million
Interest-free loan from the City of Toronto Better Buildings Partnership to be repaid by the operating budget from energy savings	2.74-million
Debt financing to be repaid by the operating budget from energy savings	14.20-million

10. Capital Project: University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC) Infrastructure Upgrades Phase V: Project Planning Report

Professor Mock advised members that the Campus Master Plan for University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC), approved in May, 2001, had included the construction of several new buildings to accommodate projected increases in student enrolment. The existing electrical and mechanical infrastructure had been assessed and several potentially critical conditions and deficiencies had been identified. UTSC had directed a total of \$10.725 million towards Phases 1, 2, 3 and 4 of the infrastructure upgrades plan. The original projected total cost of \$17.351 million had been reduced to \$15.255 million, because Phase 5C had made Phase 6 unnecessary.

Professor Mock explained that the approval of the project was required now to allow for heating and emergency power backup for the New Science Building that was scheduled to open in January 2008, as well as meeting the federal legislation regarding PCB removal. The work would be implemented in the 2006-07 fiscal year.

10. **Capital Project: University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC)
Infrastructure Upgrades Phase V: Project Planning Report (cont'd)**

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the Project Planning Report for the Electrical and Mechanical Infrastructure Upgrades at the University of Toronto at Scarborough, Phase 5, comprising the replacement of the existing electronic controls for the two existing boilers, the replacement of the existing 200 kW diesel generator, and the replacement of the 6 existing PCB transformers, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix 'F', be approved in principle at an estimated total project cost of \$4.530 million, with the sources of funding as follows:

Funding for the new UTSC Science Building provided by the UTSC operating budget	\$ 3.785-million
Enrolment Growth Fund	.320-million
Deferred Maintenance Funds	.425-million

The Chair noted that the motion had been passed unanimously.

11. **Capital Project: University of Toronto at Scarborough: East Arrival Court: Project Planning Report**

Professor Mock reported that, due to intensive development at UTSC in recent years, the conditions of pedestrian pathways, the east parking lots, open space and roadways had deteriorated, creating unsafe conditions. The East Arrival Court would provide a new entrance from Military Trail. The parking area would be re-organized to provide twenty-one barrier free spaces for patrons with disabilities and increased visitor parking capacity.

Professor Mock noted that, in response to a question about how the bridge funding would be managed, it had been explained that, when the project had been completed, a loan from the budget carry forward would be made to the parking ancillary. The ancillary would repay the UTSC budget over a twelve-year period.

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the Project Planning Report for the East Arrival Court at the University of Toronto at Scarborough at an estimated total project cost of \$3,112,642, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix 'G' be approved in principle, with the sources of funding as follows:

Cash allocation from carry-forward	
Funds in the UTSC operating budget	\$ 232,763
Capital investment by the UTSC ancillary operations budget	249,961
Debt financing to be provided by the UTSC operating budget and repaid by the UTSC ancillary operations budget	2,629,918

The Chair noted that the motion had been passed unanimously.

12. Capital Project: University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC) New Science Building: Change in Scope

Professor Mock advised members that the Project Planning Report for the UTSC Science Building had been approved in principle by the Committee in May 2005. At that time, a \$3 million cash allocation had been approved for detailed planning to be completed, through to the concept design and detailed costing. The detailed planning exercise had identified opportunities to link the new Science Building with the existing John Andrews Science Wing, and the Leah Brown Theatre at the end of the wing, and to construct low-cost basement space, originally not in the space program.

Professor Mock explained that the current proposal increased the space program to approximately 3000 nasm from the originally approved 2543 nasm. This would increase the cost of the new building by approximately \$1.59 million. Additional sources of funding had been identified as an allocation of \$10.089 million from the UTSC operating budget and a debt of \$20 million to be repaid by UTSC from its operating budget. UTSC had been aggressively seeking additional support from the Canada Foundation for Innovation and other agencies for strategic research projects that could be included as a second phase to this project.

A member of the Planning and Budget Committee had asked about the assumptions underlying the allocation and repayment of debt from the operating budget. Professor Goel had explained that UTSC had completed multi-year budget projections for the project. If the Science Building was not built, enrolment could not increase and less revenue would be realized.

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

1. THAT the February 2006 revised change in scope for the Science Building at UTSC, approximately 2982 nasm and 6041 gross, increasing the total project cost to \$33,089,000, be approved in principle.
2. THAT the additional sources of funding identified below be approved:
 - a. An allocation of \$10,089,000 from the UTSC operating budget;
 - b. Debt of \$20 million to be repaid by UTSC from its operating budget.

Documentation is included as Appendix 'H'.

13. Policy on Official Correspondence with Students

Professor Smith explained that the purpose of this new *Policy* was to specify students' responsibilities with respect to both postal mail and electronic communications, in order to ensure that the University had a reliable means of communicating with students. The Committee on Academic Policy and Programs had been informed that many of the University's peer institutions had similar policies in place.

At the Committee, a concern had been raised that not all students owned their own computers. In response, the Committee had been advised that there were numerous locations on campus where students could access computers and their email accounts.

13. Policy on Official Correspondence with Students (cont'd)

Members had urged that care be taken to ensure that students were fully informed of the new Policy. The Committee had been advised that the change would be communicated by means of University calendars, the student portal, and *Getting There*, a publication of Student Affairs.

It was duly moved and seconded

THAT the *Policy on Official Correspondence with Students* be approved, effective September 1, 2006.

A member commented that the proposed *Policy* was very timely and very much appreciated. Many students, faculty and staff appreciated the increase in speed of email and other messaging systems over traditional postal mail, and they were using email, instant messaging, bulletin boards, voicemail and text messaging to communicate with each other. He noted that the University was rolling out an Emergency Response Management System that would get information to the appropriate people in the format that they chose.

The member outlined some implementation challenges with this proposed *Policy*. Currently there were more than 150 email systems at the University of Toronto, as well as thousands of web pages and bulletin pages. However, only one email system at the University had a defined standard of service, unlike the postal service, which was covered by federal laws. The member expressed his concern that there was no statement included in the section of the University's Rights and Responsibilities that the University would offer a Service Level Agreement (SLA) for campus messaging systems. He asked whether the implementation of this policy would require the University's systems to have a defined level of service.

The member described a danger of student forwarded communications. Many Internet Service Providers considered, on a regular basis, all mail coming from a University of Toronto domain to be "spam" and blocked the messages. In his opinion, the Student Rights and Responsibilities section of the *Policy* should provide for informed consent by the student, and indemnify the University for messages not received for reasons beyond its control. He suggested that the *Policy* be amended to include wording to that effect.

Professor Goel thanked the member for his comments. He suggested that the *Policy* be reviewed by legal counsel to confirm that the member's concern was addressed in the current wording of the proposed *Policy*.

It was duly moved and seconded

THAT the *Policy on Official Correspondence with Students* be amended by the addition of the following sentence:

The University is not responsible for delayed or lost communications if forwarded to an external or university departmental system.

A member spoke against the amendment, stating that the interpretation of the *Policy* would be constricted by the proposed limitation.

The Chair called the question. The motion to amend was defeated.

13. Policy on Official Correspondence with Students (cont'd)

To address the other concern that had been raised, Professor Goel proposed that a phrase concerning a standard of service be added to the *Policy*. Professor Smith, who had introduced the item and had made the motion, agreed that such an amendment would be in keeping with the spirit of the proposed *Policy*.

It was duly moved and seconded

THAT the third paragraph of *the Policy on Official Correspondence with Students* be revised to read:

Students are responsible for maintaining and advising the University, on the University's student information system (currently ROSI), of a current and valid postal address as well as the address for a University-issued electronic mail account that meets a standard of service set by the Vice-President and Provost.

The vote was taken on the motion to amend. The amendment was CARRIED.

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the *Policy on Official Correspondence with Students* as amended, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix 'I', be approved, effective September 1, 2006.

14. Constitution: School of Graduate Studies

Professor Goel reminded members that the Academic Board was responsible for approving divisional Constitutions. The revisions to the Constitution of the School of Graduate Studies were required as a result of the changes to graduate education governance and to the administration of the School of Graduate Studies.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDED

That the Executive Committee Confirm

THAT the Constitution of the School of Graduate Studies, as revised on February 28, 2006, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix 'J', be approved.

15. Committee on Academic Policy and Programs: Terms of Reference

Professor Smith explained that the change to the Terms of Reference of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs (AP&P) was being proposed in the interest of streamlining the governance process for graduate programs. It was proposed that the Governing Council delegate authority to the new Graduate Education Council of the School of Graduate Studies (SGS) to approve changes to admission requirements to

15. **Committee on Academic Policy and Programs: Terms of Reference** (cont'd)

graduate programs, and to approve the establishment of direct admission options for existing Ph.D. programs. All changes approved under this new authority would be included in an annual report, for information, to the Committee.

A member asked whether changes to general requirements would be considered by AP&P. Professor Pfeiffer explained that changes ranged from minor to major. Minor changes would be considered by divisional councils. Two changes that had been considered by AP&P would now be considered by the Graduate Education Council and reported to AP&P for information. A member expressed her hope that the annual report would not diminish the opportunity to discuss such changes at the Committee.

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

Subject to approval of amendments to the Statute of the School of Graduate Studies (i) to devolve certain responsibilities for graduate education to the Faculties and other divisions offering graduate degree programs, and (ii) to identify the School of Graduate Studies Council as the Graduate Education Council,

- (a) THAT, effective July 1, 2006, section 4.1 of the Terms of Reference of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs be amended to add the following second paragraph:

Proposals from divisional councils to approve changes to admission requirements to graduate programs, and to approve the establishment of direct admission options for existing PhD programs, may be approved by the Graduate Education Council.

- (b) THAT, effective July 1, 2006, the "Committee on Academic Policy and Programs: Guidelines Regarding levels of Approval" be amended to add the following statement in the row entitled "Admission policies" in the column headed "Received by AP&P for information"

Changes to admission requirements for graduate programs and approval of direct entry options to existing PhD programs, as approved by the Graduate Education Council, are included in an annual report of changes to graduate programs submitted to the Committee for information

- (c) THAT, effective July 1, 2006, section 3 of the Terms of Reference of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs, Function, be amended to replace the following third and fifth paragraphs:

The Committee is responsible for reviewing and, at times, approving, changes to admission and program regulations, curriculum, degree requirements and academic regulations. Much of the Committee's work concerning curriculum and regulations arises from deliberations of divisional councils. The Committee will not normally amend such a proposal forwarded by a divisional council unless the amendment(s) is (are) deemed by the Chair or the senior Presidential assessor to be minor. Rather, a proposal requiring amendment will be referred back to the divisional council.

15. Committee on Academic Policy and Programs: Terms of Reference (cont'd)

In order to carry out its mandate, the Committee receives for its consideration proposals from the academic divisions of the University which have been approved by the relevant divisional councils. Proposals may be accepted, rejected, or referred back to the originating body by the Committee. If accepted by the Committee, the proposal may be received for information, approved by the Committee, or recommended to the Academic Board for approval, depending on the nature of the proposal.

With a new third paragraph as follows:

The Committee is responsible for reviewing and, at times, approving, changes to admission and program regulations, curriculum, degree requirements and academic regulations. Much of the Committee's work in those areas arises from proposals from the academic divisions, which have been approved by the relevant divisional councils. The Committee will not normally amend proposals forwarded by a divisional council unless the amendment(s) is/are deemed by the Chair or the senior Presidential assessor to be minor. Such proposals may be accepted, rejected, or referred back to the divisional council. If accepted by the Committee, the proposal may be received for information, approved by the Committee, or recommended to the Academic Board for approval, depending on the nature of the proposal.

Documentation is attached hereto as Appendix 'K'.

16. Items for Information

The following documents were received for information by the Board.

- a) Appointments and Status Changes
- b) Procedures for Clinical Faculty
- c) Selection Committee for President's Teaching Award
- d) University Professors' Selection Committee
- e) Report Number 120 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs (February 1, 2006)
- f) Report Number 121 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs (March 1, 2006)
- g) Report Number 107 of the Planning and Budget Committee (February 7, 2006)
- h) Report Number 108 of the Planning and Budget Committee (February 28, 2006)
- i) Report Number 109 of the Planning and Budget Committee (March 7, 2006)

A member expressed her thanks for providing the *Procedures for Clinical Faculty* to the Board.

17. Date of Next Meeting

The Chair reminded members that the next meeting of the Board was scheduled for May 4, 2006.

18. Other Business

(a) Elections

The Chair advised members that there were still three vacancies on the Academic Board for terms beginning July 1, 2006, one in each of the following Faculties:

- o Dentistry
- o Medicine
- o OISE/UT

The Chair also reported that nominations would close at noon on March 31, for the by-election in the Faculty of Architecture, Landscape and Design, for a term that began immediately upon election and ended on June 30, 2007.

19. Quarterly Report on Donations November 1, 2005 – January 31, 2006

Members received for information the Quarterly Report on Donations from November 1, 2005 to January 31, 2006.

The meeting adjourned at 6:25 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

April 10, 2006