

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL
REPORT NUMBER 143 OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD

May 4, 2006

To the Governing Council
University of Toronto

Your Board reports that it held a meeting on Thursday, May 4, 2006 at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall at which the following were present:

Professor W. Raymond Cummins, In
the Chair
Professor Brian Corman, Vice-Chair
Professor David Naylor, President
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
Professor Derek Allen
Mrs. Mubarka Alam
Professor Jan Angus
Professor Gage Averill
Professor George Baird
Professor Katherine Berg
Ms Marilyn Booth
Professor Philip H. Byer
Mr. Ryan Matthew Campbell

Regrets:

Mr. Navine K. Aggarwal
Professor Sidney Aster
Professor Sylvia Bashevkin
Professor Clare Beghtol
Professor David Begun
Dr. Terry Blake
Professor Donald Brean
Mr. Blake Chapman
Ms Maple Chong
Professor George Elliott Clarke
Professor Miriam Diamond
Professor Marianne S.V. Douglas
Miss Coralie D'Souza
Prof Luc F. De Nil
Dr. Raisa B. Deber
Professor Robin Elliott
Ms. Rivi Frankle
Mr. John A. Fraser
Professor Jonathan Freedman
Professor Eric Freeman
Professor Jane Gaskell
Ms Bonnie Goldberg
Professor Hugh Gunz
Mr. Syed Yaser Habeeb

Mr. Blake Chapman
Mr. Ewen Weili Chen
Professor David Clandfield
Professor John Coleman
Professor David Cook
Mr. Joe Cox
Dr. Inez N. Elliston
Professor Guy Faulkner
Dr. Shari Graham Fell
Ms. Linda B. Gardner
Mr. Christopher Goode
Professor Avrum Gotlieb
Professor Wayne K. Hindmarsh
Mr. Martin Hycza
Miss Livia Jozsa
Professor Ronald H. Kluger
Professor Hon C. Kwan
Dr. Lesley Ann Lavack
Professor Michael R. Marrus
Ms Susan C. McDonald
Professor Douglas McDougall

Regrets (cont'd).

Mr. Kijun Kim
Dr. Joel A. Kirsh
Professor Christina E. Kramer
Professor Larry Leith
Professor Robert Levit
Professor Robert Lewis
Professor Lori Loeb
Professor Roger L. Martin
Professor Diane Massam
Professor Brenda Y. McCabe
Professor Linda McGillis Hall
Professor Mark McGowan
Mr. Matto Mildenberger
Professor John R. Miron
Professor Mayo Moran
Professor Sioban Nelson
Professor Mariel O'Neill-Karch
Professor Ian Orchard
Professor Cheryl Regehr
Professor Robert Reisz
Professor Richard Reznick
Ms. Catherine Riggall
Dr. Jay Rosenfield
Professor John Scherk

Ms Vera Melnyk
Professor Faye Mishna
Professor David Mock
Professor Janet Paterson
Professor Susan Pfeiffer
Mr. Andrew Pinto
Ms Van Chau Quach
Professor James A. Reilly
Professor Jolie Ringash
Mr. Paul Ruppert
Professor Andrea Sass-Kortsak
Professor Anthony N. Sinclair
Professor Pekka Sinervo
Professor Tattersall Smith
Professor Ron Smyth
Professor Lorne Sossin
Professor Suzanne Stevenson
Mr. Mahadeo Sukhai
Professor Tas Venetsanopoulos
Ms B. Elizabeth Vosburgh

Regrets (cont'd).

Professor Gareth Seaward
Professor Kwong-loi Shung
Ms. Elizabeth Sisam
Professor Brian Cantwell Smith
Professor J.J. Berry Smith
Miss Maureen J. Somerville
Professor Lisa Steele
Professor Rinaldo Wayne Walcott
Professor Catharine Whiteside
Professor Melissa S. Williams
Dr. Cindy Woodland
Professor D. Farrar, Deputy Provost
and Vice-Provost, Students
Ms Catherine Riggall, Vice-
President, Business Affairs

Secretariat:

Mr. Henry T. Mulhall
Ms Cristina Oke, Secretary

Non-voting Assessors:

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

In Attendance:

Dr. Chris Cunningham, Special
Advisor to the President
Ms Sheree Drummond, Assistant
Provost
Professor Paul Thompson, COU
Colleague
Professor Rick Halpern, Principal-
designate, New College
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

In this report, item 7 is recommended to the Executive Committee for confirmation, and the remaining items are reported for information.

1. Opening Remarks

The Chair welcomed members to the meeting, and noted that Professor Robert Levit had recently been elected to the Board from the Faculty of Architecture, Landscape, and Design.

The Chair announced that the Agenda Committee had met earlier in the afternoon and had approved the appointment of Professor Rick Halpern as Principal of New College for a five-year term, effective July 1, 2006. The Chair invited the Provost to introduce Professor Halpern.

Professor Goel noted that Professor Halpern was a specialist in modern U.S. history who had come to the University in 2001 as the first Bissell-Heyd Professor of American Studies in the Department of History. In 2004, he had become director of the Centre for the Study of the United States at the Munk Centre for International Studies after having previously served as associate director and acting director.

Professor Halpern had earned a BA from the University of Pennsylvania and an MA from the University of Wisconsin-Madison before returning to the University of Pennsylvania for his PhD. His teaching interests focussed on popular culture, social protests and oral history, among others. His research had been supported by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

At the invitation of the Chair, Professor Halpern thanked members for the opportunity to serve as Principal of New College. He noted the diversity of the academic programs, staff and student body of the college, and thanked Professor Clandfield, the current Principal, for his leadership.

2. Report Number 142 of the Meeting held on March 30, 2006

The report of the meeting of March 30, 2006 was approved.

3. Business Arising Out of the Report

There was no business arising from the previous meeting.

4. Report Number 126 of the Agenda Committee (April 21, 2006)

The Report was received for information. The Chair drew the attention of members to the list of approved academic administrative appointments on pages 2 and 3 of the Report. There were no questions.

5. Report of the Vice-President and Provost**(a) Federal Budget**

Professor Goel indicated that the administration of the University was pleased with the support for post-secondary education that had been included in the federal budget that had been announced on May 2, 2006, and he highlighted the following provisions.

i. Research Funding

The federal budget had included \$100 million per year in base funding for research: \$40 million for the Indirect Costs of Research program; \$20 million for the Leaders Opportunity Fund of the Canada Foundation for Innovation (CFI); \$17 million for the Canadian Institutes for Health Research (CIHR); \$17 million for the National Sciences and Engineering Research Council (NSERC); and \$6 million for the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC).

ii. Student Financial Support

The federal budget had included expanded eligibility for Canada Student Loans through a reduction in the expected parental contribution, starting in August 2007. The budget also had included a new tax credit for the cost of textbooks, which would provide a tax reduction of about \$80 per year for a typical full-time post-secondary student. As well, the budget had eliminated the current \$3,000 limit on the amount of scholarship, bursary and fellowship income a post-secondary student could receive without paying federal income tax.

A member asked whether graduate students were considered to be post-secondary students, and suggested that post-doctoral fellowships be considered as income from which the limit on tax payable had been removed. Professor Goel replied that graduate students were indeed considered to be post-secondary students and would benefit from the elimination of the \$3,000 limit on such income. He noted that Dean Pfeiffer would provide further information with regards to eligibility for this provision for different forms of income including post-doctoral fellowships.

5. **Report of the Vice President and Provost
(a) Federal Budget (cont'd)**

iii. Other Initiatives

Post-Secondary Education Infrastructure Trust

Included in the federal budget was a one-time payment of \$1 billion, to be paid into a third-party trust, contingent on sufficient funds from the 2005–06 surplus in excess of \$2 billion. The Post-Secondary Education Infrastructure Trust was intended to support critical and urgent investments to promote innovation and accessibility, particularly investments that would enhance universities' and colleges' infrastructure and equipment (e.g. modernizing classrooms and laboratories; updating training equipment), as well as related institutional services (e.g. enhancing library and distance-learning technologies).

Professor Naylor commented that the Council of Ontario Universities (COU) was taking a proactive approach on the distribution of these funds.

Foreign Credential Recognition

The federal budget had set aside \$18 million over two years to establish an agency to ensure that foreign-trained immigrants met Canadian standards, and, at the same time, to ensure that those who were trained and ready to work in their fields of expertise moved more quickly into the workforce.

Donations of Listed Securities to Public Charities

The federal budget proposed to exempt donations of publicly listed securities to public charities from capital gains tax, effective immediately.

(b) *Maclean's* Magazine

Professor Goel informed members that a number of universities, including the University of Toronto, had declined to participate in the survey of graduates two, three and four years out of university that would be published in June 2006 in *Maclean's* magazine. The University was participating in a number of surveys, and the survey results, as well as the University's Performance Indicators, were publicly available. COU had recently released the Report of the Quality and Productivity Task Force, which had been chaired by Professor Goel.¹ Omnibus rankings obtained from various items with arbitrary weights did not usually provide useful information about individual departments or programs. Performance indicators were more appropriate than a 'report card'.

A member asked whether the model of ranking used by the United Kingdom (U.K.) was being discussed. Professor Goel replied that the research allocation model used in the U.K. had raised some concerns. Once funding was tied to performance indicators, problems arose. The U.K. was now considering moving towards models closer to that already in place in Canada.

¹ Available at <http://www.cou.on.ca>.

**5. Report of the Vice President and Provost
(b) MacLean's Magazine (cont'd)**

A member asked whether the information on survey results and performance indicators that was currently available could be packaged in an accessible way for the public. He also asked whether the University could rank itself against its peers. Professor Goel replied that discussions were underway regarding the packaging of new information for easier public consumption. He noted that rankings were difficult to compile due to the complexities of funding and the composition of academic units. Nevertheless, the Performance Indicators report did include many peer comparisons for a variety of measures. Professor Naylor added that, in the past, substantial resources had been invested in providing data to *Maclean's* for its annual rankings issue. This meant that resources supported in the main by tuition fees and public funding were repeatedly being used to subsidize the under-investment in analytical capacity by a for-profit media outlet.

A member noted the volume of information that was included in reviews conducted by the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies (OCGS), and asked whether that data could be used as part of performance indicators for universities. Professor Naylor replied that there had been some discussion at COU about the use of OCGS data.

A member noted that the results of previous surveys had received publicity and official celebration from the University. He hoped that the survey results would now simply be acknowledged as a piece of news that was a matter of public record and not a cause for celebration or advertising. Professor Naylor replied that the current weightings used by *Maclean's* in its ranking method neither fully reflected the University's specific strengths, nor adequately illuminated the University's specific weaknesses. This was a basic conceptual problem with aggregate measures. Professor Goel observed that there was no doubt that more information had to be provided to the public to explain the ongoing assessments of the University from a variety of sources.

(c) Student Experience Fund

Professor Goel informed members that the allocation of the Student Experience Fund was currently being discussed with Principals and Deans. There was no shortage of excellent ideas for this fund. The discussion had reflected that much was being done that could be expanded in scope and/or adopted as models for other units.

A member suggested that publications describing the University's programs and achievements be written in language directed towards high school students who were the major group that was applying for admission to the University.

Professor Sinervo, Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Science, observed that his Faculty was currently grappling with issues of communicating with students. The Faculty conducted surveys of students to find out about their experiences with such activities as registration, admission, and residence life, with a view to using the information to improve the student experience.

6. Report of the Council of Ontario Universities' (COU) Colleague

The Chair reminded members that each year, the Academic Board appointed an Academic Colleague and an alternate to the Council of Ontario Universities (COU). The Academic Colleague could accompany the President to COU meetings. For 2005-06, the Academic Colleague had been Professor Paul Thompson, and the alternate had been Professor Glen Jones.

Report

Professor Thompson explained that the COU academic colleagues met during the afternoon before the COU meeting and in the morning prior to the Council meeting. At that time, the colleagues received an "Issues Update" from the COU Vice-President, Policy and Analysis. He acknowledged that, for most faculty, the visibility of COU was through one or more of the common services it provided to universities:

Ontario Council on Graduate Studies (OCGS)
Council of Senior Administrative Officers - Universities of Ontario (CSAO-UO)
Ontario Universities' Application Centre (OUAC).

Professor Thompson summarized the major issues that had been discussed during the year. These included the division of funding for post-secondary education between Colleges and Universities, the admission to graduate programs from applied degree programs offered by Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology (CAATs), athletic scholarships, federal funding of postsecondary education, and graduate enrolment expansion.

Professor Thompson reported that he had been the lead author of *Academic Citizenship*, one of the Working Papers published by COU in 2005-06.² He had also served on the Standing Committee on Relationships with other Post Secondary Institutions.

Professor Thompson said that he had enjoyed his two years as an academic colleague and was grateful to the Academic Board for the opportunity. It was his view that his successor was joining an excellent group of colleagues. He noted that, even in the inevitable times of disagreement, the collegial atmosphere remained.

Discussion

A member asked if the position of Academic Colleague was a good idea. Professor Thompson replied that the COU Academic Colleagues provided a useful forum for issues of interest to faculty members. He suggested that, in future, the Academic Colleague report to Academic Board twice during the academic year – once in the fall and once in the spring.

A member asked whether the matter of admission to graduate programs from applied degree programs had been resolved. Professor Thompson replied that there had been no resolution to this issue. In his personal view, it would not be fair to give special status to certain degrees for admission to graduate studies.

² The Working Papers are available at <http://www.cou.on.ca/bin/homepageFiles/news/LatestNews/April07.cfm>. A complete list of COU publications is available at <http://www.cou.on.ca/bin/publications/onlinePublications.cfm>.

6. Report of the Council of Ontario Universities' (COU) Colleague (cont'd)

Discussion (cont'd)

Professor Goel added that this was a serious matter for institutions across Canada, and one that required careful consideration.

7. Constitution: Faculty of Arts and Science

The Chair reminded members that the Academic Board was responsible for approving divisional Constitutions. Professor Goel noted that the revisions to the Constitution of the Faculty of Arts and Science were the result of a long and extensive process undertaken by the Faculty. In the fall of 2004, a Governance Task Force had been struck by the General Committee of the Faculty to review the governance structures and procedures, to identify their strengths and weaknesses, and to make recommendations regarding how the Faculty could improve governance. The recommendations of the Task Force were presented in its report in June 2005. After an extended period of further consultation, a revised constitution was approved by the Faculty Council in April 2006. The main change in the constitution was the disbanding of the Faculty Council and its General Committee, and the creation of an Arts and Science Council which would be composed predominantly of elected members.

The Chair noted that, prior to the meeting, a member had raised a question concerning the membership of the proposed Council, which included, as voting members, "five administrative and technical staff including at least one College Registrar" and, as non-voting *ex-officio* members, the Registrars of the St. George colleges. At the invitation of the Chair, Professor Sinervo, Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Science, explained that the intent was to ensure that there would be a registrarial 'voice' on the Council. All seven college registrars would be members of the Council, and at least one would be a voting member. Professor Sinervo also noted that the Registrar of the Faculty of Arts and Science served as the Secretary of the Arts and Science Council.

Professor Sinervo commented that the membership of the newly-created Arts and Science Council included twenty-three students – 12 full-time undergraduate, 2 part-time undergraduate, and 6 graduate students – as voting members and the Presidents of the Arts and Science Students' Union, the Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students, and the Graduate Students' Union as non-voting *ex officio* members. The student voting members represented 29% of the total voting membership.

A member asked who had ultimate authority over curriculum matters in the Faculty. Although authority for undergraduate curriculum was clear, the authority for graduate curriculum was less clear to the member. Professor Sinervo replied that the graduate curriculum for the Faculty of Arts and Science involved teaching staff and students across three campuses. A Three-Campus Graduate Curriculum Committee had been established by the Faculty, and had been given delegated authority by the Arts and Science Council, subject to the approval of Governing Council, for all matters pertaining to graduate programs.

The member referred to the provision for the Arts and Science Council to move into closed session, and asked whether the University had a policy concerning the use of *in camera* sessions. It was noted that Section 37 of *By-Law Number 2* of

7. Constitution: Faculty of Arts and Science (cont'd)

the Governing Council³ required that any part of a meeting during which intimate financial or personal matters of any person might be disclosed must be held *in camera* unless the individual requested that such part of the meeting be open to the public. Professor Sinervo added that it was difficult to anticipate all possible circumstances that might arise at a Council meeting, and the option of moving to closed or *in camera* session⁴ was important. Professor Goel commented that the *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act* (FIPPA) legislation that would come into effect in mid-June, 2006, would help to define the circumstances under which closed session would be appropriate.

The member noted that the revised Constitution of the Faculty of Arts and Science could serve as a model constitution for other faculties that were currently revising their constitutions in light of the changes in graduate governance. Professor Goel replied that a constitutional review group had been providing guidance and advice to faculty representatives involved in governance since January 2006.

A member expressed his pleasure at the provision for increased student involvement in the Arts and Science Council. He asked for clarity concerning the referendum procedure for teaching staff that was outlined in the proposed constitution. Professor Sinervo replied that the referendum process had been included to provide an opportunity for teaching staff members who were not elected members of the Arts and Science Council to express their views.

A member commented that the proposed 29% student membership of the Arts and Science Council was the same proportion as the student membership of the Graduate Education Council (SGS Council) of the School of Graduate Studies, and commended the consistency. He noted that the undergraduate student members of the proposed Council had been broken out into divisions, while there were no such specifications for the membership of graduate students on the Council. Professor Sinervo replied that the division of the undergraduate student members reflected past practice and the curriculum structure within the Faculty. No problem was expected with graduate student representation on the Council.

A member referred to the membership total in Appendix 1 of the proposed Constitution and inquired about the possible double-counting of college registrars.

³ Whereas *The University of Toronto Act, 1971*, as amended, requires that meetings of the Governing Council be open to the public, and also requires that any part of a meeting during which intimate financial or personal matters of any person may be disclosed shall be held *in camera* unless such person requests that such part of the meeting be open to the public, the Council shall be bound by the provision of the said *Act* notwithstanding any amendment to this By-law.

⁴ Secretary's Note: The *Guidelines on Attendance at Meetings of the Governing Council* (<http://www.utoronto.ca/govcncl/tgc/2.03.07.pdf>) describe closed meetings or sessions as those that are restricted to members of the board or committee, members of the Governing Council who are not members of the board or committee, members of a board to which the committee reports and other individuals whose presence is considered by the board or committee to be necessary to facilitate its work. A meeting of a board or committee may be held *in camera* where 'intimate financial or personal matters of any person may be disclosed' or where 'where matters may be disclosed at the meeting of such a nature ... that the desirability of avoiding open discussion thereof outweighs the desirability of adhering to the principle that meeting be open to the public'.

7. Constitution: Faculty of Arts and Science (cont'd)

Professor Sinervo acknowledged that the number of Registrars elected to the Council would have an impact on the number of members of the Council.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDED

That the Executive Committee Confirm

THAT the Constitution of the Faculty of Arts and Science, approved by the Faculty Council and General Committee on April 3, 2006, be approved.

8. Appointments and Status Changes (for information)

A number of tenure awards and promotions were reported for information.

9. Reports for Information

- a. Report Number 110 of the Planning and Budget Committee (March 28, 2006)
- b. Employment Equity: Annual Report, 2005-06

The Board received the above-noted reports for information. There were no questions.

10. Date of Next Meeting – June 1, 2006 at 9:30 am

The Chair reminded members that the next meeting was scheduled for June 1, 2006, and would begin at **9:30 a.m.**

11. Other Business

On behalf of the Board, the Chair congratulated Professor Ronald Kluger for being awarded the Gold Medal of the Chemical Institute of Canada, which had been presented as a mark of distinction and recognition for Professor Kluger's outstanding contribution to the science of chemistry in Canada. Members applauded Professor Kluger.

The Board moved *in camera*.

12. Appointment of University Professors

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT Professor Geoffrey Hinton and Professor Trevor Levere be appointed as University Professors, effective July 1, 2006.

13. President's Teaching Award Recipients

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT Professor Ken Bartlett, Professor John Percy, Professor Richard Reznick, Professor Keren Rice, and Professor Carol Rolheiser receive the inaugural President's Teaching Award for 2005-06.

14. Report of Striking Committee

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the President's Academic Colleagues on COU for 2006-2007 be:

Professor D. W. Lang, OISE/UT
Professor P. Thompson, IHPST (alternate)

The meeting adjourned at 6:15 p.m.

Secretary

May 29, 2006

Chair