

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO  
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

REPORT NUMBER 113 OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD

June 6, 2002

To the Governing Council,  
University of Toronto.

Your Board reports that it held a meeting on Thursday, June 6, 2002 at 3:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall. An attendance list is attached to this report. In this report, items 3 to 18 and 22 (f) are recommended to Governing Council for approval and the remaining items are reported for information.

**1. Report of the Previous Meeting**

A member suggested a change to the final paragraph in the discussion of item 2, the Copyright Policy. He suggested "...protection from "market forces" with respect to making decisions about their rights. He believed all faculty were capable of making such decisions without any need for social engineering."

The report of the previous meeting, dated May 7, 2002, as amended, was approved.

**2. Report Number 99 of the Agenda Committee**

The report was received for information. It was noted that the items concerning the terms of reference would appear later in this report.

**3. Capital Project: OISE/UT Institute of Child Study - Project Planning Report**  
(arising from Report Number 80 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Gottlieb explained that the Planning and Budget Committee considered reports from Project Planning Committees and recommended approval in principle. The Committee had unanimously recommended approval of the Project Planning Report on the OISE/UT Institute of Child Study.

A member noted that a filtration system for the drinking water was needed. She asked if there was a problem with the water. A member from OISE/UT responded that it was a cautionary measure only.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

**YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS**

1. THAT the Project Planning Report for the Institute of Child Study Expansion a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "A", be approved in principle.
2. THAT the project scope totaling 4310 gross square meters (of which 1250 gsm will be new construction), will allow for renovations to the existing 45 Walmer Road and 56 Spadina Road and the addition of a *connector* building between the two existing buildings, requiring municipal approvals.
3. THAT the University of Toronto initiate discussions with the City of Toronto for the rezoning of the proposed site for new construction.
4. THAT the project cost of \$8,000,000 be approved, with funding sources to be sought through fundraising.

**4. Administrative Priorities Fund: Allocations - Various**  
(arising from Report Number 80 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Gotlieb said that the Planning and Budget Committee had responsibility for consideration of allocations from special funds within the operating budget. This was a proposal for allocations from the Administrative Priorities Fund and again the Committee had unanimously supported the recommendation.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the following allocations from the Administrative Priorities Fund be approved:

- (a) Vice President, Human Resources: \$85,850 in base for 2002-03, a further \$65,000 in base in 2003-04 and \$119,000 OTO in 2002-03,
- (b) Vice President, Business Affairs: \$200,000 in base for 2002-03, a further \$50,000 in base in 2003-04 and \$50,000 OTO in 2002-03,
- (c) Vice President, Research and International Relations: \$205,000 in base for 2002-03, a further \$150,000 in base in 2003-04 and \$120,000 OTO in 2002-03,
- (d) Office of the Governing Council: \$30,000 in base for 2002-03, a further \$12,000 in base in 2003-04 and \$67,200 OTO in 2002-03.
- (e) Internal Audit: \$17,500 in base for 2002-03, a further \$10,000 in base for 2003-04 and \$25,000 OTO in 2002-03;
- (f) Vice-President, Government Relations: \$60,000 in base for 2002-03 and a further \$61,000 in base for 2003-04;
- (g) University of Toronto Archives and Records Management Services: \$54,000 OTO in 2002-03 and \$56,000 in base for 2003-04.

Documentation for this item is attached hereto as Appendix "B".

**5. University of Toronto at Scarborough: Division of Mathematical Sciences - Establishment**  
(arising from Report Number 80 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Gotlieb reported that the Committee had been informed that the resources for the new Division of Mathematical Sciences at the University of Toronto at Scarborough would be found within the existing budget of the Division of Physical Sciences. No additional University resources would be required.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the establishment of the Division of Mathematical Sciences at the University of Toronto at Scarborough, effective July 1, 2002, be approved.

Documentation for this item is attached hereto as Appendix "C".

**6. Framework for a New Structure of Academic Administration for the Three Campuses**  
(arising from Report Number 80 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Gotlieb reported that discussion of this proposal was positive. One concern shared by several members was whether it was appropriate to use the title Vice-Chancellor together with Principal to designate the chief executive officers of the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM) and the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC). In particular, the title could

6. *Framework for a New Structure of Academic Administration for the Three Campuses*  
(cont'd)

incorrectly signal to the external community an intent that these two campuses were moving toward independence. Beyond concern about the title, members strongly supported the framework as the basis for detailed discussion.

The President noted that a great deal of hard work had gone into the preparation of this document, beginning with a group chaired by Professor Tuohy and comprising Principals Thompson and McNutt and Dean Amrhein. The plan called for a structure better matched to the scale of the enterprise on the east and west campuses. He said that the newly begun Academic Resource Centre at Scarborough was the first significant addition to the campus since it was built in the 1960s. Both campuses needed a management structure better suited to the expected growth. Each would become a mid-sized university. At the same time, there would continue to be only one University. He believed the plan had accomplished this admirably. In closing, he noted that there had been a great deal of discussion and comment about the titles for the two principals; these were not fixed as yet.

Professor Tuohy gave a PowerPoint presentation, briefly highlighting the proposal for the new structure for academic administration for the three campuses. The need for change arose from the expanded scale of the east and west campuses, their offering of a fuller "suite" of programs and the need to build the graduate presence at both UTM and UTSC and to integrate graduate and undergraduate planning across the three campuses. The key characteristics of the new structure would include autonomy to allow for distinctive programming, unified graduate programs and symmetry of organizational levels and horizontal coordination for purposes of strategic planning. The Principal would become a Principal and Vice-Chancellor to indicate the increased scope of responsibility. A new position of Vice-Principal (Academic) and Dean would be created to handle the academic responsibilities. Departmental structures would be created on both campuses. This would involve a greater degree of change at UTM, where department structures would be created afresh, than at UTSC, where the existing divisional structure would be converted to a departmental structure. Planning had been focused in the first instance on the relationship with the Faculty of Arts and Science, but relationships with other faculties, particularly the Rotman School of Management, would follow. She referred members to the diagram showing the organizational chart. It clarified both the horizontal as well as vertical linkages. She concluded by reviewing the next steps in the process which included negotiations with the University of Toronto Faculty Association on changes to frozen policies, changes to UTM and UTSC constitutions, and the establishment of departmental structures, all requiring appropriate governance approval. The initiation of an academic planning process for the 2003-04 to 2007-08 cycle would follow.

A member re-iterated the concern expressed by others about the choice of title. The title, Vice-Chancellor, in both Britain and Australia referred to the principal officer of a University. The President repeated that the title was not fixed. The authors had wanted a title that would differentiate these principals from the other college principals and was consistent with their elevated status as heads of campuses that would be the same size as a mid-sized university. Another suggestion had been proposed at the Executive Committee. When asked, both Professors Thompson and McNutt said the description of the position was more important but they favoured Principal and Vice-President.

Professor Tuohy reminded members that the document had been written based on extensive consultation, starting with the senior administration and moving out to the divisions. She said that all comments and suggestions would be taken under advisement and that amendments to the document from the floor would not be appropriate at this time.

Another member also commented on the title and suggested that the President resume the title President and Vice-Chancellor. The UTM and UTSC principals could then be Principal and Deputy Vice-Chancellor. He also asked about which other faculties would form closer relationships with UTM and UTSC. Professor Tuohy speculated that these might include Medicine and Education as well as Management but the process was only in its early stages.

6. ***Framework for a New Structure of Academic Administration for the Three Campuses***  
(cont'd)

Another member referred to the problem of three departments with one graduate chair and the mechanism for choosing that chair and the fragmentation this might cause. Professor Sedra indicated that in 98 percent of the cases, the graduate chair would be the chair of the St. George department. Speaking as the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Science, Professor Amrhein said that departments with a graduate presence currently on the three campuses function extraordinarily well and he believed that they would continue to do so when both UTM and UTSC mapped out their departmental structures. He also noted that the Committee of Vice-Deans in Arts and Science has been working well for some time. Professor Tuohy added that for the first five years of this new structure, the graduate chair would be the chair of the St. George department. After that, the process for selecting the graduate chair would be reviewed. It was hoped that the three chairs would be in agreement as to who would be the graduate chair. In the case of a dispute, the matter would be resolved at the decanal or provostal level. Five years would provide the time to refine the process.

A member asked whether the problems of graduate administration on the three campuses would be considered and improved. As a graduate student at UTM, he had noted the lack of administrative support services. They had been fragmented between the UTM campus, the School of Graduate Studies and the St. George department, with the student often being sent from one place to another for help. He hoped the problems concerning administrative support would be reviewed.

A member said that this was an important document and a great deal of work and consultation had gone into its creation. To him, the proposal made eminent sense.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the *Framework for a New Structure of Academic Administration for the Three Campuses*, dated May 21, 2002, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "D", be approved in principle.

7. **Academic Appeals Committee: Terms of Reference - Revisions**  
(arising from Report Number 267 of the Academic Appeals Committee)

Ms Goldberg said that the Academic Appeals Committee recommended the revisions to its terms of reference, the major thrust of which was to make the terms more transparent and bring them into line with current practice.

The highlights of these changes included: the creation of the position of senior chair; specifying the appointments process and terms of members; clarifying the rules for hearings; setting out the duties of the chair and of the entire panel hearing an appeal; and clarifying the purpose of policy meetings and the governance route for reports resulting from policy meetings.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the proposed revised Terms of Reference for the Academic Appeals Committee, dated May 22, 2002, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "E", be approved, effective July 1, 2002.

**8. Committee on Academic Policy and Programs: Terms of Reference - Revisions**  
(arising from Report Number 95 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs)

Professor Gallop reported that the Committee had considered the revisions to its terms of reference. Members had suggested additional wording to clarify the Committee's function, and requested that information about the approval process be presented in a tabular format for easier reference. The Committee had recommended the revised terms of reference for approval, on the understanding that the document would be revised and circulated to members for comment before it was forwarded to the Academic Board for consideration. The revised document had been circulated to members, and no negative comments were received.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the proposed revised Terms of Reference for the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs, as amended May 23, 2002, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "F", be approved, effective July 1, 2002.

**9. Planning and Budget Committee: Terms of Reference - Revisions**  
(arising from Report Number 80 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Gotlieb said that as indicated in the covering memorandum from the Secretary of Governing Council, the revisions to the terms of reference were, by and large, not substantive. Rather, they were primarily to clarify the role of the Committee, to articulate more precisely what was already practice and to allow each set of terms of reference documents to stand alone in defining the roles and responsibilities of the body.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the proposed revised Terms of Reference for the Planning and Budget Committee, dated May 28, 2002, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "G", be approved, effective July 1, 2002.

**10. Agenda Committee: Terms of Reference - Revisions**  
(arising from Report Number 99 of the Agenda Committee)

The Chair noted that the revised terms of reference had been presented to the Agenda Committee. The report of the meeting and the cover memorandum gave the details of the changes proposed. Members of the Agenda Committee had had no questions.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the proposed revised Terms of Reference for the Agenda Committee, dated April 23, 2002, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "H", be approved, effective July 1, 2002.

**11. Academic Board: Terms of Reference - Revision**  
(arising from Report Number 99 of the Agenda Committee)

The Chair again noted that the revised terms of reference for the Board had been presented to the Agenda Committee. Highlights of the proposed changes were presented in the report and on the cover memorandum.

**11. Academic Board: Terms of Reference - Revision (cont'd)**

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the proposed revised Terms of Reference for the Academic Board, dated May 23, 2002, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "I", be approved, effective July 1, 2002.

**12. Policies for Post-Doctoral Fellows - Establishment**

Professor Goel recalled that a task force on this issue had been chaired by Professor de Boni of the School of Graduate Studies. It had reported in the fall of 2000. From that report, a policy had been crafted. The key features of the policy were the setting of a minimum stipend, the designation of post-doctoral fellows as trainees not employees, and the specification of terms of engagement, namely 3 years, with a further 3-year term approved by the next administrative level. An administrative office for post-doctoral fellows would be established in the School of Graduate Studies (SGS) to co-ordinate such matters as training and workshops.

A member noted the discrepancies in the application of this policy between the University and the research institutes in the hospitals. She asked whether the issue would be integrated. Professor Goel commented that the University could not set policies for the independent research institutes but he was working with the Vice-Provost, Relations with Health Care Institutions, to bring about harmonization of various policies, including this one.

A member noted that there was no statement about the allocation of resources for post-doctoral fellows. He noted that the number of graduate students taken by a department was reviewed by a graduate committee. In the case of post-doctoral fellows, the decision was left to the principal investigator. He also asked whether the maximum term of 6 years for a post-doctoral fellow would be affected by time spent outside the University as a post-doctoral fellow. Professor Goel responded that the engagement of a post-doctoral fellow would in future require the approval of both the investigator and the chair. This would make the department aware of the resources being spent in this area. He noted that post-doctoral fellows would not pay tuition fees or other fees except for services like athletics. With respect to the second question, Professor Goel said that the decision to renew an appointment should take into account the total time an individual had spent as a post-doctoral fellow.

In response to a question about immigration, Professor Goel said that post-doctoral fellows came into the country under their own category. The Provost's Office would provide a template letter for visa purposes.

The President commented that he was happy to see the engagement of post-doctoral fellows regularized and their position in the University community confirmed. He congratulated all those who developed this policy.

A member noted that while graduate students knew exactly what was expected of them, post-doctoral fellows did not appear to have such clear-cut obligations. Professor Goel reported that this issue had been discussed by the task force and it had been decided to leave this matter in the hands of the individual departments where differences in disciplines would dictate the activities of the post-doctoral fellows. The office in SGS would be used as a resource to support these activities.

**12. Policies for Post-Doctoral Fellows - Establishment (cont'd)**

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the Policy on Post-doctoral Fellows, dated May 27, 2002, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "J", be approved, effective September 1, 2002.

**13. Policy on Appointment of Professor Emeritus - Amendment**

Professor Goel introduced an addition to the policy which would recognize holders of named chairs and permit them, when they retired, to be considered as chair emeritus. Approval of all appointments would continue to be required from the Provost and the appointments would be reported to the Academic Board for information.

A member referred to the first paragraph of the policy which was not being amended. He noted that the second sentence referred to a possible re-appointment to a post-retirement teaching position. He suggested that the word "teaching" be removed since there could be different kinds of post-retirement appointments. A member cautioned against changing something that had worked well for years without a proper consultation period. Professor Sedra agreed and took the matter under advisement. Another member suggested changing the title to Professor Emeritus /Emerita. That suggestion was also taken under advisement.

(Secretary's Note: Following consultation with former Vice-Provosts, Professor Goel agreed to remove the reference to "teaching". It was noted that post-retirement appointments were governed by the Memorandum of Agreement with the University of Toronto Faculty Association.)

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the Policy on Appointment of Professor Emeritus as amended with the addition of the second paragraph, dated May 27, 2002, amended June 6, 2002, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "K", be approved effective July 1, 2002.

**14. Capital Project: School of Continuing Studies - Project Planning Report**  
(arising from Report Number 81 the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Gotlieb reported that this was a proposal for a renovation and small expansion to the building housing the School of Continuing Studies on St. George Street. Members of the Planning and Budget Committee were enthusiastic in their support of this project, noting the tremendous difference it would make in providing a welcoming place for the division to grow. He noted that the motion had been revised at the Committee.

In response to a question, Professor Gotlieb explained that the motion had been revised as a result of a process issue. The intent was the same.

A member asked about the determination of interest rates and Professor McCammond responded that they were currently close to the debenture rate at 7 or 8 percent.

**14. Capital Project: School of Continuing Studies - Project Planning Report (cont'd)**

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

## YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

1. THAT the Project Planning Report for the School of Continuing Studies, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "L", be approved in principle.
2. THAT the project scope of 102 gsm of new space and 1,646 gsm renovated space be approved at an estimated total project cost of \$7,100,000 (May 2003), with funding as follows:
  - (i) external funding raised by the School of Continuing Studies; and
  - (ii) a loan made available by the University of Toronto of up to \$4.5 million on terms to be approved by the Vice-President, Business Affairs, such loan to be repaid over a term not exceeding 17 years from income generated within the School of Continuing Studies.

**15. Capital Project: Lash Miller Chemistry Addition and Renovation - Update**  
(arising from Report Number 81 the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Gotlieb stated that the Committee had been pleased to support the completion of this project.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

## YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

1. THAT the Users' Committee Report for the Department of Chemistry that identified numerous projects including the Davenport Building and renovation of facilities within the Lash Miller Building be fully implemented.
2. THAT the remaining funds originally provided from contributions from the Davenport Family, and the Canada Foundation for Innovation (CFI) and the Ontario Research and Development Challenge Fund (ORDCF) be approved in the amount of \$4,704, 927 and directed to each of the listed projects to be approved by the Accommodation and Facilities Directorate (AFD), according to policy procedures. (This allocation will exhaust all current funding available in support of these improvements directed to the Davenport and Lash Miller Buildings initiated in 1998.)

Documentation for this item is attached hereto as Appendix "M".

**16. Academic Priorities Fund: Allocation - Faculty of Law *Raising Our Sights* Plan**  
(arising from Report Number 81 the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Gotlieb commented that with the assurance in the motion and from the Provost that the proposed allocations beyond 2002-03 would flow only if the Governing Council approved the tuition fees increases annually, the Committee had fully supported the recommended allocation.

A member stated his understanding that the revenues from increased tuition fees would be placed in a central pot and re-distributed. It seemed to him that the Faculty's plan tied specific academic improvements to tuition fee levels. Did this set a precedent? Professor Sedra commented that there had been a system since 1998 for sharing revenue from increased tuition fees. It covered fee increase revenue above that of the regulated programs. He said that the additional revenue was not distributed as a matter of course to the division but rather an allocation was made on the basis of an academic plan, reviewed by the Provost's Office. The same process had been carried out in other professional divisions where the fees were deregulated.



---

**16. Academic Priorities Fund: Allocation - Faculty of Law *Raising Our Sights Plan***  
(cont'd)

A member asked to divide the recommended allocation into two separate parts. The Chair ruled that the motion contained a single allocation and that it was not divisible. The Chair suggested that the member move to refer it back or speak against the motion. The member chose the latter and indicated that he was not against increasing faculty members' salaries. He was concerned that the career choices of the graduating students would be affected. Students could not pay more. He said that the increased salaries should be paid from operating grant funds.

A member noted that the Planning and Budget Committee had amended the motion by the addition of the word "annual" and asked its significance. Professor Sedra stated that the tuition fee for the J.D. program was scheduled to increase by \$2000 per year for 5 years. The Governing Council had recently approved the increase for 2002-03 only. Before the increase for each of the following years could be considered, the Governing Council would receive a report on the effects of the fee increases on accessibility and career distortion. The addition of the word "annual" recognized this yearly vote on fees. The allocation would be distributed to the Faculty as the funds were generated. If the fees were not approved, the allocation would be adjusted.

A member asked about student aid guarantees in the Faculty. Professor Daniels, Dean of the Faculty of Law, said that the Faculty was concerned with the challenges higher tuition fees posed to accessibility and career choices. Increased fees without a financial aid program would affect accessibility and mean higher debt loads for graduating students, affecting their career choices. The Faculty had a long-standing commitment to accessibility and had grappled with these issues over the past 5 years as tuition fees rose. A new 5-year period of increasing fees was just beginning. He reported that the Faculty had a comprehensive student financial aid plan. Funding available for aid had risen to \$1.6 million, distributed based on need. Forty students attended tuition-free and about 170 students received aid in the form of bursaries and subsidized loans. In terms of the composition of classes, the percentage of visible minorities has risen to 30 percent from 20 percent 5 years ago. A review of the applications for aid showed that the number of students applying from families whose income was less than \$60,000 had remained constant as had the number of offers accepted by those students. He believed the financial aid program was working in terms of accessibility. With respect to the second issue, career distortion, he referred to the back-end debt relief program instituted in the Faculty. Students were providing input on improvements not only in the funding portion but also in terms of eligibility rules. He noted that of the APF allocation, 37 percent would be spent on salaries but the remainder would be spent on a number of student services.

A member expressed his general unease about tuition fee levels in general. Some adjustment might be in order but he was concerned about the magnitude of the increase and the trickle-down effect. The University of Toronto might be able to manage higher tuition fees because of the extensive student aid program but did the University have an obligation to set the tone? If the government did not supply sufficient operating grants, must the funding be provided by increased fees? If this was the direction to be taken, it should be done under protest.

Professor Sedra reminded members that tuition fees were not within the jurisdiction of the Academic Board and indeed members were repeating discussions already held in the Business Board and the Governing Council. He noted that 30 percent of revenue from increased tuition fees must be set aside for student aid. It was a government regulation.

A member noted that although the students might have lost the battle on increased fees in the Faculty, the motion before the Board stated that if fee increases were not approved based on the report on accessibility and career distortion, the Faculty's APF allocation would be adjusted. He thought this was very good protection for the students.

**16. Academic Priorities Fund: Allocation - Faculty of Law *Raising Our Sights Plan***  
(cont'd)

A member stated that the core of the academic integrity of the University was the professoriate. Students came here because of the excellent faculty. Increased revenue was necessary to attract and retain quality faculty. This was an issue for the entire University.

A member said that he was not arguing against the tuition fees. The fees and the APF allocation would pay for a number of very good programs for students. However, he believed that this was not the time to increase the salaries for faculty. He said that the case had not been made for the amount of increase proposed.

Professor Daniels recalled that the academic plan had resulted from wide consultation and debate within the Faculty over an 18-month period. Students had been represented. A great deal of concern was expressed about faculty retention. Programs might disappear in several years if the core faculty were lost. He noted that the Faculty had recently lost a prospective faculty member - a relatively new graduate - to New York University because it was able to offer \$156,000 US plus an array of benefits. He too would like to have the provincial government provide more funding but he could not afford to wait and risk losing his faculty members.

The President congratulated Dean Daniels for the honesty and courage he had shown in the way he had brought forward his Faculty's plan. It was a coherent plan and it has been presented in a very open manner. He said that members of the University community should admire the conduct in the presentation of the plan whether or not they agreed with the substance of the plan.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT an allocation of \$3,722,182 in base for the Faculty of Law from the Academic Priorities Fund be approved. The recommendation is subject to annual Governing Council approval of the J.D. tuition fees rising to planned levels as described in the University's *Tuition Fee Schedule for Publicly Funded Programs for 2002-03*.

Documentation for this item is attached hereto as Appendix "N".

**17. Academic Priorities Fund: Allocation - Joker's Hill**  
(arising from Report Number 81 the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Gotlieb said that the Committee had supported this allocation for Joker's Hill.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT a \$150,000 base allocation from the Academic Priorities Fund in support of research infrastructure at Joker's Hill be approved.

THAT a \$150,000 one-time-only allocation for each of three years from the Academic Priorities Fund in support of non-research related expenses at Joker's Hill be approved.

Documentation for this item is attached hereto as Appendix "O".

**18. University Infrastructure Investment Fund: Allocation - Varsity Stadium**  
(arising from Report Number 81 the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Gottlieb said that with the failure of the referendum on Varsity Centre and in light of the unsafe condition of the existing stadium, there was an urgent need to demolish the stadium to allow for establishment of a fenced-in playing field in time for September 2002.

In response to a questions, Professor Venter indicated that the cost was based on quotes that had been received. It was hoped to demolish the stadium and do minimal damage the playing field.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

**YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS**

THAT an allocation of \$1,700,000 from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund towards the demolition cost of Varsity Stadium and the establishment of a fenced-in open playing field be approved.

Documentation for this item is attached hereto as Appendix P”.

**19. Summer Executive Authority**

The Chair noted that during the period between now and the first meeting in the fall, academic administrative appointments would be approved by a small group on behalf of the Board. A full list of such approvals would be given to the Board at the first meeting.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

**YOUR BOARD APPROVED**

THAT between the last meeting of the Academic Board and the first meeting in the next academic session, proposals for approval of academic administrative appointments to be made under Summer Executive Authority be recommended to the President on behalf of the Academic Board by a subgroup consisting of the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Board, the Vice-President and Provost, and the student member of the Agenda Committee.

**20. Items for Information**

(a) Report of the Vice-President and Provost

Professor Sedra indicated that he would like to report on three matters:

The first was an update on funding for enrolment expansion. At the last meeting, it was reported that the province had provided only 43 percent of the full average funding promised for enrolment growth in the May 2001 provincial budget. However, in the May 2002 throne speech, the government had indicated that it was prepared to move on its previous commitment. For this year, based on new enrolment, the system was short \$28 million. It was hoped that this funding would be provided on a one-time-only basis this year and folded into the base next year. The President reported that recent meetings with the Minister were relatively positive and the University might expect to receive retroactive funding for the new students enrolled this year. The capital funding question was still not resolved but that situation too was more optimistic. The University had received confirmation that funding for Pharmacy enrolment expansion would be part of the undergraduate funding envelope. This was very positive news and specific to this University, which had the only Pharmacy program in the Province.

---

**20. Items for Information (cont'd)****(a) Report of the Vice-President and Provost (cont'd)**

The second item concerned the discontinuation of admission to the 3-year bachelor of arts and bachelor of science programs at UTM. When this issue was discussed in April, 2000 and the discontinuation of admission to these programs in the Faculty of Arts and Science was approved by Governing Council, the recommendation indicated that a discontinuation of admission at UTM would occur at a time to be determined by the Vice-President and Provost. Professor Sedra reported that he and Principal McNutt had agreed that entry to these programs would cease effective September 2003.

The final item Professor Sedra wished to raise concerned the long-range budget guidelines for 2003-2008. Work had begun in earnest to draft the guidelines which would come to governance in late 2002 or early 2003. Projections for the last two years of the current period 1998-2004 had already been seen. The approved budget for 2002-03 included a budget reduction of 2.75 percent. The projections for 2003-04 called for a further reduction of 1.5 percent. The administration had predicted that budget reductions would end with the 1990s but the future was not as rosy as first thought. The provincial government had not responded to the University's request to provide funding for increased costs, an amount of Consumer Price Index (CPI) plus 1-2 percent. Apart from government funding, the other major source of funding was tuition fees and the large majority of fees were regulated to a 1.97 percent increase for the past 3 years and the cap would continue for a further 2 years. There was a real constraint on revenue. The future depended on the assumptions used with respect to revenue and expenses.

On the expense side, there were a few areas where further study was underway. Benefits costs were increasing, especially health benefits; utilities costs were increasing as were the costs of library acquisitions. Another issue concerned the funding of capital growth. Allocations were made through the University Infrastructure Investment Fund. The University had borrowed \$30 million a year for 3 years to help finance capital activities including new construction, renovations and deferred maintenance projections. Should the University consider setting aside 1 percent of the operating budget (about \$10 million) to finance capital projects? Should it borrow more money? How much was enough? It would be necessary to develop a policy direction.

On the revenue side, for the period 2003 to 2008 there would be a cap on tuition increases in regulated programs for the first two years. The assumption would be that the grant would increase by CPI for the first 2 years, and after the cap on tuition was removed, the combination of grant and the fees would increase by CPI for the remaining 3 years. With these assumptions plus increased enrolment, the result would be a further budget reduction of 1 percent per year plus the possibility of clawbacks. This could be characterized as a gradual descent into mediocrity. Modeling had shown that in order to hold the line and not deteriorate, with no more reductions after the 2.75 percent scheduled for 2002-03, the revenue from grants would have to increase by 3.5 percent for the 2 years left on the tuition fee cap and the 3.5 percent blended increase on fees and grants for the remaining 3 years of the period. Professor McCammond was working on other scenarios, such as what would the University require in terms of funding support to reach the average funding per student available to peer institutions in the U.S.

Professor Sedra recalled that in the mid 1990s, a three-pronged strategy was employed to deal with the significant reduction in government funding: first, to reduce costs as much as possible through the process of academic planning; second, to increase revenue from tuition fees while maintaining accessibility through increased financial aid; and third, to increase revenue from private funding through the development campaign. This strategy had worked extremely well in the past few years and as a result the University had emerged from the very difficult period of the 1990s in a relatively strong position. At this time, however, the University needed to

**20. Items for Information (cont'd)**

## (a) Report of the Vice-President and Provost (cont'd)

consider a new strategy to enable it to achieve its aspirations. This had to be a revenue-generating strategy for there was little left in the way of cost savings. Furthermore, there was not a lot of room left on the tuition front - perhaps some in the regulated programs but not in the deregulated professional programs. The challenge then was to develop a new approach to enhancing government funding to levels commensurate with the University's considerable aspirations. Of course, the campaign should still be pursued for further enhancing private funding. The scenarios developed in the 2003-08 Budget Guidelines should serve as benchmarks for developing this new revenue enhancement strategy.

## (b) Items for Information in Report Number 95 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs

There were no questions or comments.

## (c) Items for Information in Report Number 80 of the Planning and Budget Committee

There were no questions or comments.

## (d) Report Number 266 of the Academic Appeals Committee

There were no questions or comments.

## (e) University Tribunal: Individual Cases

There were no questions or comments.

## (f) Quarterly Report on Donations over \$250,000

There were no questions or comments.

The Board moved *in camera*.

**21. Academic Administrative Appointments**

The following academic administrative appointments were approved:

**FACULTY OF APPLIED SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING**

## Division of Mineral Engineering

Professor Will Bawden

Chair from July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2008  
(re-appointment)

Professor John Curran

Acting Chair from July 1, 2002 to June 30, 2003

**FACULTY OF ARTS AND SCIENCE**

Professor Sue Howson

Vice-Dean, Undergraduate Education and Teaching, from July 1, 2002 to June 30, 2006

**21. Academic Administrative Appointments (cont'd)**

## FACULTY OF DENTISTRY

Professor Richard P. Ellen	Associate Dean, Graduate Studies, from July 1, 2002 to June 30, 2003 (extension)
Professor Johannes Heersche	Associate Dean, Research, from July 1, 2002 to June 30, 2003 (extension)

## JOSEPH L. ROTMAN SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT

Professor Peter Pauly	Associate Dean, Academic, from July 1, 2001 to June 30, 2006 (re-appointment)
-----------------------	---

## FACULTY OF MUSIC

Professor David Beach	Dean from July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004 (extension)
-----------------------	---

## FACULTY OF NURSING

Professor Diane Doran	Associate Dean, Research, from July 1, 2002 to June 30, 2007
Professor Edith Hillan	Associate Dean, Academic Programs, from July 1, 2002 to June 30, 2005

## OISE/UT

Professor Carol Rolheiser	Associate Dean, Academic Development, from January 1, 2003 to December 31, 2007
---------------------------	---

*Department of Sociology and Equity Studies in Education*

Professor George Dei	Chair from July 1, 2002 to June 30, 2007
----------------------	--

## LESLIE DAN FACULTY OF PHARMACY

Professor Jake Thiessen	Associate Dean, Professional Affairs, July 1, 2002 to June 30, 2005 (re-appointment)
-------------------------	--

## FACULTY OF SOCIAL WORK

Professor Lilian Wells	Acting Associate Dean from July 1, 2002 to December 31, 2002
------------------------	--

## UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO AT SCARBOROUGH

*Division of Mathematical Sciences*

Professor Ragnar Buchwietz	Acting Chair from July 1, 2002 to December 31, 2002 or until a new Chair is appointed, which ever comes first
----------------------------	---

---

**22. Report of the Striking Committee**

\* 2001-02 member of the Board or Committee

**a) Co-opted Membership of the Academic Board**

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the following be appointed as co-opted members of the Academic Board for 2002-03:

Administrative and Professional Staff

\*Ms V. Melnyk (3 years)  
Ms S. McDonald

Alumni

Mr. M. Bonham (3 years)  
\*Mr. G. Chan  
\*Mr. B. Greenspan  
Mr. R. Saunders

Students

*Full-time Undergraduate*

Ms A. Avard, UTSC  
Ms H. Brabazon, Trinity  
Ms R. Ghosh, SMC  
\*Mr. J. Hunter, Management/Law  
\*Mr. M. Hycza, Medicine  
Mr. V. Sekhar, Engineering  
Mr. N. Turk-Browne, UC

*Part-time Undergraduate*

\*Ms M. Jackman, Wdw  
\*Ms C. Scymour, Wdw

*Graduate*

\*Mr. A. Chapnick, History  
\*Mr. A. Hamoui, Engineering  
Mr. C. Purchase, Biology, UTM

**b) Membership of Committees of the Board**

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the following be appointed to committees of the Board for 2002-03:

---

**22. Report of the Striking Committee (cont'd)**

## i) Agenda Committee

*Student*

\*Mr. J. Hunter, f/t, L.L.B./M.B.A.

*Teaching Staff*

Professor E. Hillan, Nursing

\*Professor P. Perron, Faculty of Arts and Science (French)

## ii) Academic Appeals Committee

## 4 Acting Chairs:

\*Ms B. Goldberg

\*Ms J. Kidner

\*Professor E. Morgan

\*Professor Emeritus R. Scane

\*Professor C. Beghtol, Faculty of Information Studies

Professor J. Furedy, Faculty of Arts and Science (Psychology)

\*Professor G. Kerr, Faculty of Physical Education and Health

Professor C. Misak, Faculty of Arts and Science (Philosophy)

## iii) Committee on Academic Policy and Programs

*Administrative and Professional Staff*

\*Ms V. Melnyk, Faculty of Arts and Science

*Students*

Ms H. Brabazon, f/t, Trinity

\*Mr. A. Chapnick, graduate, Department of History

Ms R. Ghosh, f/t, SMC

Mr. J. Hunter, f/t/grad, L.L.B./M.B.A.

Mr. V. Sekhar, f/t, Engineering

*Teaching Staff*

Dr. S. Ahmed, UTSC (Management)

Professor D. Allen, Faculty of Arts and Science (Philosophy)

\*Professor M. Chipman, Faculty of Medicine (Public Health Science)

\*Professor J. Donaldson, Faculty of Arts and Science (Chemistry)

Professor A. Haasz, Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering (Aerospace)

Professor W. Hindmarsh, Faculty of Pharmacy

\*Professor L. Howarth, Faculty of Information Studies

Professor A. Johnston, Faculty of Arts and Science (English) **Vice-Chair**

\*Professor C. Regehr, Faculty of Social Work

\*Professor R. Reisz, University of Toronto at Mississauga (Zoology)

\*Professor K. Rice, Faculty of Arts and Science (Linguistics)

\*Professor J. J. B. Smith, Faculty of Arts and Science (Zoology) **Chair**

Professor D. Thiessen, OISE/UT (CTL)

Professor A. Venetsanopoulos, Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering



22. Report of the Striking Committee (cont'd)

iv) Planning and Budget Committee

*Student*

Mr. N. Turk-Browne, f/t, UC

*Teaching Staff*

\*Dean C. Amrhein, Faculty of Arts and Science (Geography)

Professor M. Berkowitz, Faculty of Arts and Science (Economics)

\*Professor A. Gotlieb, Faculty of Medicine (Lab. Med. and Pathobiology) (**Chair**)

\*Professor P. Halpern, Rotman School of Management

Professor E. Hillan, Faculty of Nursing

\*Professor S. Horton, UTSC (Economics) (**Vice-Chair**)

\*Dean B. Kidd, Faculty of Physical Education and Health

Professor J. McDonald, Faculty of Medicine (Physiology)

\*Dean D. Mock, Faculty of Dentistry

Principal I. Orchard, UTM

Additional members of the Agenda Planning Group

\*Professor P. Halpern, Rotman School of Management

Dean D. Mock, Faculty of Dentistry

c) **Provost's Advisory Committee on the University of Toronto Library**

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the following be appointed as the Board's representatives on the Provost's Advisory Committee on the University of Toronto Library for 2002-03:

\*Professor M. Gotlieb, Faculty of Arts and Science (Fine Arts)

Professor M. O'Neill-Karch, Faculty of Arts and Science (French)

d) **Discipline Appeals Board**

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the following be appointed to the Discipline Appeals Board for 2002-03:

*Students*

Ms A. Avar, UTSC

Mr. A. Hamoui, Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering

\*Ms S. Safa, Faculty of Dentistry

*Teaching Staff*

\*Professor J. Browne, Faculty of Medicine

\*Professor J. Mayhall, Faculty of Dentistry

\*Professor L. Weinrib, Faculty of Law

---

22. **Report of the Striking Committee (cont'd)**

e) **Council of Ontario Universities - Academic Colleagues**

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the President's Academic Colleagues on COU for 2002-2003 be:

Professor P. Perron, Faculty of Arts and Science (French)

Professor I. Orchard, Faculty of Arts and Science (Zoology) (alternate)

f) **Committee for Honorary Degrees**

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the recommendation from the Striking Committee for membership on the Committee for Honorary Degrees for 2002-2003 be forwarded to the Governing Council for approval.

The meeting adjourned 5:40 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

June 7, 2002

**Present**

Professor J. Carr, Chair  
 Ms W. M. Cecil, Chairman, Governing Council  
 Dr. T. Simpson, Vice-Chair, Governing Council  
 Professor R. J. Birgeneau, President  
 Professor A. S. Scdra, Vice-President and Provost  
 Professor V. Goel, Vice-Provost, Faculty  
 Professor C. Tuohy, Vice-President - Policy Development and Associate Provost  
 Professor D. Affonso  
 Professor C. Amrhein  
 Professor D. Beach  
 Professor M. Beattie  
 Professor C. Beghtol  
 Professor B. Benhabib  
 Professor J. M. Boyle  
 Professor N. Camerman  
 Mr. G. Chan  
 Mr. A. Chapnick  
 Professor D. Clandfield  
 Professor D. Cook  
 Professor D. E. Cormack  
 Professor B. Corman  
 Professor W. R. Cummins  
 Professor F. Cunningham  
 Professor R. Daniels  
 Professor L. De Nil  
 Professor J. Donaldson  
 Professor C. Dyer  
 Professor D. Edwards  
 Professor M. Eichler  
 Dr. I. Elliston  
 Ms E. Fillion  
 Professor E. Fiume  
 Professor E. Freeman  
 Professor J. J. Furedy  
 Professor R. Gallop  
 Ms B. Goldberg  
 Professor A. I. Gotlieb  
 Professor M. Gotlieb  
 Professor H. Gunz  
 Mr. A. Hamoui  
 Professor W. Hindmarsh  
 Ms B. Horne  
 Professor S. H. Horton  
 Mr. J. Hunter  
 Mr. M. Hyrcza  
 Ms M. J. Jackman  
 Professor A. R. Jones  
 Professor A. Jorgensen

Professor B. Kidd  
 Professor R. Kluger  
 Dr. M. Letarte  
 Ms K. Lewis  
 Professor R. McNutt  
 Ms V. Melnyk  
 Mr. D. Melville  
 Professor D. Mock  
 Mr. A. Morgan  
 Professor V. K. Murty  
 Professor M. O'Neill-Karch  
 Professor P. Perron  
 Professor C. Regehr  
 Professor R. Reisz  
 Professor K. Rice  
 Professor C. Rolheiser  
 Professor B. Sampson  
 Ms C. M. Seymour  
 Professor A. Sheps  
 Professor W. Shera  
 Professor B. Sherwood-Lollar  
 Professor J. J. B. Smith  
 Ms J. Snow  
 Professor P. Thompson  
 Professor A. Venetsanopoulos  
 Professor D. Vincent  
 Professor L. Wilson-Pauwels

**Non-Voting Member**

Mr. L. R. Charpentier

**Non-Voting Assessors**

Professor A. Hildyard  
 Dr. S. Levy  
 Professor D. McCammond  
 Professor R. Venter

**Secretariat**

Ms S. Girard, Secretary  
 Ms C. Oke

**Absent**

Professor B. J. Adams  
 Mr. M. F. Ahmad  
 Professor G. Allen  
 Professor B. Baigrie

Professor C. Barnes  
Dr. M. Barrie  
Professor N. Bascia  
Ms R. Bhavnani  
Mr. E. Brock  
Professor R. Bryan  
Mr. J. Burnett  
Professor M. Chipman  
Professor J. J. Connon  
Dr. R. B. Deber  
Professor S. Desser  
Professor M. Diamond  
Dr. S. Graham Fell  
Mr. J. A. Fraser  
Professor M. Fullan  
Dr. R. Geist  
Mr. B. Greenspan  
Professor P. Halpern  
Mr. D. Herbert  
Professor L. Howarth

Professor G. Kerr  
Professor C. La Vigna  
Professor R. L. Martin  
Professor S. G. Matthews  
Professor C. Misak (on sabbatical)  
Professor E. Morgan  
Professor H. Munroe-Blum  
Professor D. Naylor  
Professor P. Pennefather  
Professor R. W. Pruessen  
Professor O. Pugliese  
Ms S. Reichert  
Ms P. Ricci  
Professor L. Richards  
Mr. J. Satkunasingham  
Dr. K. Stangeby  
Ms. S. Stringer  
Professor V. R. Timmer  
Mr. A. Vered  
Professor D. Wells, Vice-Chair

**In Attendance:**

Professor R. Abramovitch, Director, Transitional Year Program  
Dr. B. Fitzpatrick, Director of the Office of the President and Assistant Vice-President  
Professor M. Levin, Acting Director, Institute of Child Study  
Ms M. McGee, Assistant Provost