

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

REPORT NUMBER 96 OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD

October 21st, 1999

To the Governing Council,
University of Toronto.

Your Board reports that it held a meeting on Thursday, October 21st, 1999 at 4:15 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall. An attendance list is attached to this report. In this report, items 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14 and 15 are recommended to Governing Council for approval, item 7 is presented for Executive Committee confirmation and the remaining items are reported for information.

Introductory Remarks

The Chair welcomed the members to the first meeting of the Academic Board for 1999-2000. He introduced Professor Ray Cummins, the Vice-Chair of the Board, Professor Adel Sedra, the Vice-President and Provost and the Board's senior administrative assessor, the President and the Chairman of Governing Council.

The Chair said that notes about the Board's structure, its rules and procedures had been distributed to members as they arrived. He invited members to contact him, the Provost or the Secretariat at any time throughout the year if they had questions about the Board. He asked that members stand and identify themselves when addressing the Board. When discussing a proposal, members would be invited to ask questions for clarification first followed by debate. Members could speak only once to an item and for no more than five minutes.

1. Time of Adjournment

It was duly moved and seconded,

THAT the meeting adjourn no later than 6:30 p.m.

The vote was taken on the motion.

The motion was carried.

2. Report of the Previous Meeting

The report of the previous meeting, dated June 3rd, 1999, was approved.

3. Report Number 81 of the Agenda Committee

Item 3: Performance Indicators - Notice of Motion

The Chair recalled that at the April meeting, a member had proposed a notice of motion concerning the development of performance indicators. The motion was reproduced in the Agenda Committee's report. The Committee received a report from Professor Tuohy, a copy of which is attached to Report 81, on the action that was being taken with respect to the member's points. The Committee agreed to accept the report and to take no further action at this time.

The member who moved the motion indicated that he was satisfied with the report on current activity. He was not, however, as convinced as Professor Tuohy and her equity officer colleagues that the climate in the working environment was not capable of being quantitatively measured.

The remainder of the report was received for information.

4. "The Year Ahead" : The Provost's Address

Professor Sedra also welcomed members to the Academic Board for this academic year. He noted that it was the twelfth year of the Board's existence and that the Board made this unique unicameral system of governance workable.

There was an exciting year ahead. He believed that the University was entering the third most important period of growth since World War II. The previous two periods had been that after the war and the expansion of the mid-to-late 1960s. This year and the first two of the next decade would be pivotal. He said that he would speak about the current situation and the five key priorities for the Provost's office in the coming year. He noted that the President wished to address the Board on government relations and the public policy environment.

The University entered 1999-2000 in very good shape:

- the University had come through a difficult period of financial constraint (since the early 1990s) and government decisions and directions were turning in the University's favour; the University's financial position was relatively strong
- this was the last year of the current six-year planning period begun in 1994
- this was the last year of large budget reductions of 4.5%
- it was the second year in the new long-range budget framework for 1998-2004
- there would be a balanced budget this year and the accumulated deficit would be within the limits defined by Governing Council policy
- most major tuition fee increases had been instated; future increases for most fees would be smaller and of the order of the cost of living
- the University would spend \$57 million on student financial aid this year, ensuring that it met its guarantee on student support

4. "The Year Ahead" : The Provost's Address (cont'd)

- the Campaign had reached \$515 million toward the \$575 million minimum goal. The President intended that this goal be reached by June 30, 2000
- most colleges and faculties were extensively involved in the planning process
- enrolment had exceeded targets
- 127 new faculty have been hired during the past year; this year searches for 172 faculty would be undertaken
- there was a three-year salary and benefits agreement in place with the Faculty Association
- the teaching-stream faculty issue has been resolved
- negotiations with the United Steelworkers of America to arrive at a first collective bargaining agreement for staff were underway
- a new Memorandum of Agreement with the federated colleges has been approved, giving them a stronger role
- planning to increase the student residence capacity by 2500 beds was underway
- plans for a new health sciences facility were progressing
- the University was very successful in the recent Canada Foundation for Innovation (CFI) and Ontario Research and Development Challenge Fund (ORDCF) competitions and proposals were being developed for the next round.

In total, the University was entering the year 2000 with new plans to close the excellence gap with its peers.

The five key priorities for the Provost's office over the next year were:

1. to complete the 2004 planning process, including intensive interaction with the principals and deans to arrive at agreements on the resource allocations that would be recommended to support the academic plans
2. to plan for enrolment growth, excluding the ATOP and B.Ed. increases which have already been dealt with. Demographics indicated that by 2010, 90,000 new post-secondary education spaces would be required in the province. He read the following quote from today's provincial throne speech: "This year, a higher percentage of Ontario's young people are enrolled in post-secondary programs than ever before. As more people seek specialized skills and knowledge, your government will work with Ontario's post-secondary institutions to plan for increased demand. The commitment: Every willing and qualified Ontario student will continue to be able to attend college or university."

The administration was currently working on a discussion paper, laying out the pros and cons of taking part in the enrolment expansion, including under what conditions the University would participate, and where would the expansion occur – on which campuses, in which programs, at what levels. It was committed to protecting the quality of the programs and the student experience in the face of possible enrolment increases. The Board would have the opportunity to debate this issue and proffer its advice.

3. to update the capital plan which would be the most ambitious plan to date. Items on the current plan would be discussed later on today's agenda
4. to continue with faculty recruitment and retention. Without expansion, the University would require 100 faculty appointments each year for the next five years. The hiring

4. "The Year Ahead" : The Provost's Address (cont'd)

process was proactive and the University was taking the opportunity to be thorough and rigorous to ensure that only the best candidates were selected.

5. to focus on student recruitment and the admissions process. There were plans to review the deregulated admissions process to ensure that the opportunity to make early offers to applicants works well. The University's excellent and unique program of student aid would be reviewed to ensure that it worked efficiently and that the support was given to the students who needed it when they needed it.

The President said that he, too, was excited and optimistic about the next five to ten years. He indicated that he wished to report on two topics, the first was government relations and the second was follow up concerning a colleague, Dr. Nancy Olivieri.

(a) Government relations

At the federal government level, a remarkable and welcome new initiative has been the creation of the 21st Century Chairs for Research Excellence program. This was the most significant commitment of new funds to Canadian universities over the past decade. The program called for the initial creation of 1,200 chairs, eventually reaching 2000 chairs, of which the University of Toronto's share should be 10 to 15%. The chairs would be distributed based on relative performance in the peer-review competitions at the national granting councils. It would provide support for both junior and senior colleagues and there were no matching funds required. The chairs would cover all disciplines and would support the salary and both the direct and indirect cost of the chair holders' research. The President expressed his great pleasure at this initiative and said that it would make a powerful difference to the universities.

On another topic he said that there had been no decision on increasing federal transfer payments for post-secondary education. The universities had been working to get increased funding for post-secondary education that was earmarked and could not be diverted by the provincial government for other purposes. He said that they would be working between now and the next federal budget on this initiative and encouraged all constituencies to put pressure on the federal government.

At the provincial government level, he continued to press the case for substantial increases in operating grants to maintain the quality of the student experience in the light of the government's promise that there would be a place for every motivated and qualified student who wished to attend a post-secondary institution. A large increase in enrolment was expected over the next decade. The University was working closely with the Working Group on University Capacity. He noted that the university presidents had held a press conference to speak publicly about their concerns. He believed the people of Ontario should be informed of the universities' position, namely that more students could not be enrolled in the system without matching increases in operating grants. Increased enrolment without the appropriate level of funding would put the quality of education of current students at risk. The President stated that he was also working to ensure that the University received its fair share of the government's new SuperBuild Growth Fund for capital expansion.

4. "The Year Ahead" : The Provost's Address (cont'd)

The second initiative at the provincial level concerned increasing support for research and scholarship. He referred to the province's University Research Working Group that has been recently convened. The provincial government has recognized that it must make an increased investment in support of research in order that Ontario scholars could compete effectively for federal funding. In the past, Ontario researchers received 45% of federal funds but the percentage has now dropped to 36-37%. The President was pleased that the government was seized of this issue.

The President read from the throne speech the statements concerning increased enrolment, student aid, research initiatives and the appointment of Professor Heather Munroe-Blum to look into increasing opportunities for innovation.

(b) Dr. Nancy Olivieri

He recalled that he had reported to the Academic Board last year on the controversy surrounding Dr. Olivieri last year and that the University had played a role in arriving at a successful resolution to the problem between Dr. Olivieri and the Hospital for Sick Children. The agreement has been implemented but there were a number of unresolved issues.

- Dr. Olivieri and four colleagues continued to have disagreements with the Hospital concerning space, salaries and related issues. The University was involved in efforts to mediate these problems and the President thanked Dr. David Naylor, Dean of Medicine, as well as Professors Sedra and Cook for their work. He was hopeful there would be an early resolution to the problems so that Dr. Olivieri and her colleagues could focus on their research and scientific work.
- The drug that was the source of the original problem has been approved for use in Europe. It was now being reviewed for use in Canada but there was still a significant substantive dispute about its efficacy. The matter has been placed before a regulatory agency. The University would not take a role in this process; there were colleagues on both sides of the issue, and it was an issue beyond the competence and jurisdiction of the University.
- There have been allegations of scientific misconduct associated with the dispute over the drug and these were being dealt with by Dean Naylor following established University policy and procedures.
- Dr. Olivieri and her colleagues have brought a complaint of harassment concerning anonymous e-mail messages and other unsigned communications. They asked the University to act on this. The person alleged to be the source of the messages was another faculty colleague. The process chosen to deal with this complaint must be fair to all concerned. The University has deferred to the Hospital to investigate this matter thoroughly, but, when the investigation is complete, the University has reserved the right to consider the findings and make different recommendations if warranted. The Hospital has initiated an outside forensic investigation which, while expensive and slow, would be

4. "The Year Ahead" : The Provost's Address (cont'd)

thorough. He hoped to see the end of the process in the next few weeks. The University was pressing to resolve the matter while preserving jurisdiction until it was satisfied with the outcome.

- The President recalled that a number of grievances had been filed by UTFA and Dr. Olivieri and her colleagues. His plan had been to resolve the immediate problem and get Dr. Olivieri and her colleagues back to their research and leave the grievances until later. He hoped the University would be able to resolve the grievances in collegial discussions with UTFA without resorting to a hearing before the Grievance Review Panel.
- With respect to policy issues, the President indicated that work continued on the harmonization of research policies between the University and the hospitals. He hoped there would be a common policy environment on such issues as disclosure and ethical approval. He had received a report on this issue over the summer and there were further meetings arranged for this fall. The second initiative in this area concerned a discussion of the nature of a clinical appointment. Policy in this area was limited and he has asked Professor Cook to review the matter in consultation with UTFA. A member suggested that Professor Cook review the proposed policy that had been drafted but not approved following the Yip committee's review of the Policy and Procedures on Academic Appointments.
- Finally, the President noted that CAUT has announced an independent inquiry of the Olivieri case. He read to the Board from a letter he had written to CAUT indicating that the University's position was that such an inquiry was neither appropriate nor useful and that the University would not participate. With the January 1999 resolution to the issue, there was a new beginning; a look backwards would undermine the progress made to date. He noted that CAUT was not an appropriate investigative body as it had not been impartial throughout the process, having taken up Dr. Olivieri's cause.

5. School of Graduate Studies: Proposal to Establish a Joint Master of Spatial Analysis (M.S.A.) Program

(arising from Report Number 73 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs)

Professor Rolph reported that this was a proposal for a joint master's program with Ryerson Polytechnic University and would be Ryerson's first graduate program. The Joint Master of Spatial Analysis Program would be an innovative new professional master's program, providing training in spatial statistical and inferential modeling and building on the complementary strengths of the participating units. The program would be governed by an Appointments Committee with equal representation from the University of Toronto and Ryerson Polytechnic University. Students would be admitted to, register in, and graduate from their respective institutions, but would have access to the faculty and other academic resources of both universities. During the preparation of this proposal, extensive consultations took place with other departments in the Faculty of Arts and Science and with the Faculties of Forestry and Architecture, Landscape, and Design.

5. **School of Graduate Studies: Proposal to Establish a Joint Master of Spatial Analysis (M.S.A.) Program** (cont'd)

Professor Mock reported that the proposal entailed only a modest redeployment of existing resources and no new long-term financial commitments.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the proposal for the establishment of a joint Master of Spatial Analysis (M.S.A.) program, Department of Geography at the University of Toronto and the School of Applied Geography and the Centre for the Study of Commercial Activity at Ryerson Polytechnic University, as described in the submission from the School of Graduate Studies dated March 16, 1999, and the draft Memorandum of Understanding on the administration of the joint Master of Spatial Analysis program dated April 20, 1999, be approved.

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

6. **School of Graduate Studies: Proposal for a Master of Biotechnology (M.Biotech.) Program**

(arising from Report Number 75 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs)

Professor Rolph indicated that this proposal was the product of a broad consultation among the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM), the School of Graduate Studies (SGS), the Faculty of Arts and Science, and the Rotman School of Management, as well as the Faculties of Medicine, and Applied Science and Engineering. The master's program would be based at the University of Toronto at Mississauga and will be administered by SGS through the graduate departments of Botany, Chemistry, and Zoology.

The Master of Biotechnology program was a professional master's program designed to equip talented science and applied science graduates for a career in the biotechnology or pharmaceutical industries. The program would provide individuals with a solid scientific exposure reflecting the diversity of modern biotechnology. Students would learn practical laboratory skills in areas selected by them with guidance from an advisory committee and they would also receive an introduction to business management and the management of biotechnology. The non-thesis program required 8 full courses, lasted 24 months and included 2 four-month placements. She said that the Committee had held a full debate on the merits of the proposal before voting to recommend approval.

Professor Mock reported that the resource implications for this proposal had been dealt with by means of an one-time-only allocation of \$400,000 from the Academic Priorities Fund, which represented start-up costs plus three-years' operating funds. Contingent upon the success of the program, the Provost would recommend a base allocation of \$110,000 from the APF at the end of the three-year period.

6. **School of Graduate Studies: Proposal for a Master of Biotechnology (M.Biotech.) Program** (cont'd)

Principal McNutt indicated his pleasure in presenting this program to the Board for approval. He reported that the program had attracted an endowed chair and that the program had been able to leverage funding as a result of its success in the competition under the Canada Foundation for Innovation and the Ontario Research and Development Challenge Fund. He also acknowledged the leadership of Professor Ulli Krull in bringing this master's program to fruition.

A member expressed her concern about the growing number of courses in the University that were closed to students outside a given program. In her view, one of the advantages of the University was the wide array of courses available to students.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the proposal for a new Master of Biotechnology (M.Biotech.) program, based at the University of Toronto at Mississauga and administered through the graduate departments of Botany, Chemistry and Zoology by the School of Graduate Studies, effective May 1, 2000, as described in the submission from the School of Graduate Studies dated May 28, 1999, be approved.

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

7. **School of Graduate Studies: Proposal for an M.A. and Ph.D. Program in Counselling Psychology**
(arising from Report Number 75 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs)

Professor Rolph explained that the proposed M.A. and Ph.D. programs were designed to replace the existing M.Ed. and Ed.D. programs in the specialization of Counselling Psychology for Psychology Specialists. The latter were practice-oriented degrees. The new programs would provide an opportunity for more theoretical study and for developing and conducting advanced research, and would better prepare students for university research and teaching careers. Students enrolled in the M.Ed. and Ed.D. Psychology Specialist program, effective the start date of the new programs, would have the option of completing the programs they were in currently or transferring to the new programs, if they were eligible to do so.

Professor Mock reported that the proposal entailed only a modest redeployment of existing resources and no new long-term financial commitments.

A member asked about the qualifications necessary to attain certification as a psychologist. He hoped the changes proposed were not driven by the requirements of the licensing body. Professor Tuohy explained that it was the academic judgement of

7. **School of Graduate Studies: Proposal for an M.A. and Ph.D. Program in Counselling Psychology** (cont'd)

OISE/UT that a strong research-based degree was desirable regardless of the possibilities of certification. She said that there were three distinct clienteles for programs in counselling psychology. The first comprised students with an honours undergraduate degree in psychology. The proposed M.A./Ph.D. program was directed at these students. After completing the program and with some additional work, they could be registered in Ontario as clinical psychologists. A second clientele comprised students with a background in other areas of practice, such as nursing, who required counselling skills to enhance their own practice. Such students would continue to be attracted to the M.Ed./Ed.D. program in Counselling Psychology in Community Settings. Finally, students from a variety of backgrounds who wished to become guidance counsellors in the school system constituted the clientele for the M.Ed. in Guidance and Counselling.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

The proposal for new M.A. and Ph.D. programs in Counselling Psychology in the Department of Adult Education, Community Development and Counselling Psychology, OISE/UT, effective July 1, 2000, as described in the submission from the School of Graduate Studies dated May 28, 1999, and, the phasing out of the M.Ed. and Ed.D. degrees in the specialization of Counselling Psychology for Psychology Specialists.

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

8. **Capital Project: Centre for Information Technology - Report of the Users' Committee** (arising from the October 19th meeting of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Mock stated that the Centre for Information Technology (CIT) was planned to accommodate the University's teaching and research priorities in the field of information technology. The CIT would integrate the Advanced Technology Research Facility and the expansion of the teaching programs in computer science and information technology areas in engineering. The expansion of teaching programs arose from the Province of Ontario's Access to Opportunities Program or ATOP.

The total project cost of the CIT was estimated at \$88.1 million. This included costs related to the provision of classrooms and facilities for 1500 new undergraduate students, 150 new graduate students and 64 new faculty, as well as relocation of activities now accommodated in buildings on the site, relocation of services, and landscape improvements. It would be built between St. George and Huron Streets, north of College Street, behind the Fields Institute and the Koffler Student Services Centre.

Professor Mock noted that ATOP, which required matching funding, would provide over \$10 million to support this expansion. The University would seek a further

8. Capital Project: Centre for Information Technology - Report of the Users' Committee
(cont'd)

\$26.7 million in funding from the Government of Ontario's new SuperBuild Fund. The CIT was cited as an appropriate type of project for support through the SuperBuild Fund by the Government, and consequently the Provost was confident of securing funding. Any remaining amount would be borrowed, with the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering and the Faculty of Arts and Science agreeing to carry the loan repayment, without any further draw on University funds.

The CIT would accommodate the Advanced Technologies Research Facility, a group of four research initiatives with private-sector partners including Bell Canada and Nortel Networks. Three of the four initiatives have been firmly funded, providing \$11.8-million towards the building cost. An application was pending to provide a further \$600,000 from a fourth research initiative.

The Planning and Budget Committee strongly supported this proposal. The question of moving the University's academic focus towards the applied sciences and away from the humanities and social sciences; moving that focus in a direction prescribed by the private-sector partners; and also steering the University's fundraising efforts, was raised in discussion. Dr. Dellandrea assured the Committee that this proposal had not steered fundraising efforts, that their efforts had been based on approved academic plans. He pointed out that 51 of the 95 endowed chairs established through the Campaign were in fact in the Humanities and Social Sciences. He also noted that every agreement entered into by the University began with a statement of the overriding principle of academic freedom. Further it was assured that the proposal had no steering effect, and that the faculty would be engaged in research according to approved academic plans.

Professor McCammond had assured the Committee that the student-activity space accommodated in the two houses on the building site would be relocated to equal or better space. Miss Oliver had assured the Committee that the elimination of the chemical waste facility on the site would have no negative environmental consequences. Until other arrangements were established, chemical waste would be removed directly from the site of origin.

A member asked about the recent meeting of the Heritage Board where this project was discussed. The President reported that there were three parts to the proposal before the Board with respect to this project. The first was the demolition of the old Boys and Girls Library building at 40 St. George Street. The second was the demolition of 42 St. George Street and the third was the plan for the preservation of the facade and south wall of 44 St. George Street and their integration in the CIT project. The Board approved the first. The second part was also approved but with an undertaking that the architects consider the possibility of incorporating a reflection of the historical significance of the building in the new project in an appropriate way. With respect to the plans for 44 St. George, the members of the Board were split although the staff of the Board support the University's proposal. The Board requested more work be done. He believed that the University would receive a decision on this part in a month's time. The delay of a month with respect to this part of the project would not delay the project. Miss Oliver confirmed that the issue of incorporation of

8. **Capital Project: Centre for Information Technology - Report of the Users' Committee**
(cont'd)

44 St. George was not on the critical path and the project could begin with the demolition of the other two buildings. She would be pleased to work to achieve a compromise position with the Historical Board on the outstanding issue and expressed confidence a good resolution would be achieved.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the Users' Committee Report for the Centre for Information Technology, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "D", be approved in principle; and

THAT the project cost of \$88,136,578, funded as described on page 3 of Professor McCammond's memorandum dated October 6, 1999, be approved; and

THAT an allocation of \$12,673,000 from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund, \$10 million to provide quality improvement space and \$2,673,000 as the University's contribution to the infrastructure costs of the Advanced Technology Research Facility, be approved.

9. **Capital Project: Centre for Information Technology - Garage**
(arising from the October 19th meeting of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Mock stated that significant development planned for the St. George campus would displace some of the parking that was currently available. In order to meet the University's parking commitment required by the City of Toronto, and to provide service to the high density medical and engineering complexes, it was being proposed that a 308 parking space garage be constructed beneath the CIT. The estimated cost was approximately \$10.3 million. The Parking ancillary would use its capital reserve to fund the project and secure long-term borrowing for the balance of the capital cost.

Miss Oliver had informed the Committee that proposed capital plans over the next five years would displace parking space on the south campus that was currently in heavy use. The CIT site offered the largest space available for a parking garage. The number of proposed parking spaces was arrived at by evaluating space needs for a large loading dock for both the CIT and the Koffler Student Services Centre and the cost-effectiveness of constructing below a particular level. Due to water-table problems, the optimum depth for construction would allow 308 spaces.

A member noted that the proposed cost was based on \$33,000 per space. He asked how this compared to other garages. Miss Oliver said that the price was higher. The garage was being built in an area surrounded by buildings and must, therefore, have reinforced

9. Capital Project: Centre for Information Technology – Garage (cont'd)

walls to prevent slipping of nearby buildings. Secondly there were problems associated with the watertable. The cost per space was more than that for the garage under the Rotman building which, at the time of construction, was on a clear site. She suggested the current comparable cost per space of a clear site would be \$26,000.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT a parking garage be constructed beneath the Centre for Information Technology, for a cost of \$10,280,000 plus bridge financing, funded from the Parking ancillary's capital reserve and long-term borrowing.

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

**10. Capital Project: Lash Miller Chemical Labs - Addition and Renovation
(arising from the October 19th meeting of the Planning and Budget Committee)**

Professor Mock reported that the Planning and Budget Committee had recommended approval of the Users' Committee Report and the first phase of the staged construction of the addition and renovations to the Lash Miller Chemical Labs in May 1998. In April 1999, a revised phase I was recommended by the Committee. The subsequent success of the CFI application, matched to the Davenport gift, has enabled the Department to recommend completion of the plan. The current priority was to renovate the lobby, construct the Davenport seminar room, fit out the library, renovate the stair tower and complete some renovations to the fourth floor, at a cost of approximately \$3.6 million. The total cost to date was within the \$19.2 million cost for the project approved in 1998.

In response to a member's question, the President explained that the building would retain the Lash Miller name and the new laboratories would be named in honour of the Davenports.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the Department of Chemistry proceed to complete the renovations identified in the Users' Committee Report in the revised priority sequence, at a cost of \$3.6 million, as described in Professor McCammond's memorandum dated October 7, 1999, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "F".

11. Enrollment Growth Fund: Allocations

(arising from the October 19th meeting of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Mock recalled that revenue generated by the enrolment increases in the B.Ed. program, Computer Science, and high demand areas in Engineering, under the Access to Opportunities Program initiative, was directed into the Enrollment Growth Fund in the *Revisions to the Approved Budget for 1999-2000*. The proposed allocations would be used to provide additional faculty, administrative, and technical staff, increased teaching assistant assignments, laboratory equipment, faculty recruitment expenses and start-up funding, and general operating expenses. Approximately \$2.3 million in base funding, and \$1.7 million in one-time-only funding was being allocated.

Professor Mock noted that the Committee had some concerns regarding the different level of funding allotted to teaching assistantships in the Faculties of Arts and Science as compared to that in Applied Science and Engineering. The Provost explained that as a multi-phase project, the divisions submitted their funding requests at different times and distributed funding as they deemed appropriate.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the following allocations from the Enrollment Growth Fund, be approved:

\$719,000 in each of 1999-2000, 2000-2001, 2001-2002, and 2002-03, to OISE/UT for expenses associated with the B.Ed. program;

\$998,323 in base and \$505,000 in One-Time-Only to the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering for expenses associated with ATOP;

\$88,688 in base and \$120,000 in One-Time-Only to the University of Toronto at Mississauga for expenses associated with ATOP; and

\$1,153,177 in base and \$337,500 in One-Time-Only to the Faculty of Arts and Science for expenses associated with ATOP.

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

12. University Infrastructure Investment Fund: Allocation

(arising from the October 19th meeting of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Mock indicated that the proposed allocations were requested to refurbish and update a 40-year-old student laboratory in the Faculty of Dentistry and to renovate St. Michael's College to accommodate the relocation of the Departments of Italian and Slavic Languages and Literatures. The Committee had supported the proposal unanimously.

12. University Infrastructure Investment Fund: Allocation (cont'd)

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the following allocations from the UIIF be approved:

\$99,000 from the UIIF for the refurbishment of a student laboratory in the Faculty of Dentistry; and

\$875,000 from the UIIF for the renovations at St. Michael's College to accommodate the relocation of the Departments of Italian and Slavic Languages and Literatures.

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

13. Administrative Transitional Fund: Allocation
(arising from the October 19th meeting of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Mock noted that the Vice-President, Administration and Human Resources was requesting one-time-only funding to support a SAP systems upgrade, the demand for AMS and other staff development courses, temporary funds to support union negotiations, and production costs for the updated *Orientation Guide for New Academic and Administrative Staff Members*. The Committee also supported this proposal unanimously.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT an allocation of \$125,000 from the Administrative Transitional Fund to the Human Resources Department in the portfolio of the Vice-President, Administration and Human Resources, be approved.

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

14. Funds for Matching Programs
(arising from the October 19th meeting of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Mock stated that among the most attractive features of the current fundraising campaign were the matching programs. A \$270 million endowment had been created for student support and 95 endowed chairs using \$110.5 million of matching funds had been established. However, new sources of matching funds needed to be approved in order to continue the matching programs. In order to meet the firm commitments already made, an additional \$18.9 million in central matching funds was required. If it were decided to honour all outstanding chair proposals, applying a discount factor, that figure rose to \$43 million. If the additional projects shown in Table 2 of

14. Funds for Matching Programs (cont'd)

Professor Sedra's memorandum for which no funding had yet been raised were added, the total amount required would rise to \$99.7 million.

He explained that three sources of additional funds have been identified to meet the firm commitments. The Connaught Committee has agreed to the use of the capital of the I'Anson Fund to provide \$18 million of the matching funds for chairs in the Health Sciences including Social Work. The second proposed source was the University's General Endowment which currently stood at \$27.6 million. The \$1.4 million of yearly revenue generated from the Endowment for use in the operating budget would be replaced by an allocation from the Academic Priorities Fund thus holding harmless the University's bottom line. The third proposed source of funds was the savings from the employer pension contributions in 2002-03, amounting to \$18 million. It was noted that Scarborough would receive a contribution under the RCB/RCM protocol.

In discussion, the members of the Committee had been very supportive of the proposal that would facilitate the continuance of the matching programs. Several members, however, questioned the use of the funds arising from the employer pension contribution holiday. They suggested that these funds should more properly be used to support items that would directly benefit faculty and staff or students. A motion to split the motion and consider the sources of funds separately was defeated. In his response to the members' concerns, Professor Sedra noted that using these monies to double the available funds was, in his opinion, the best use of the funds. The funds were OTO and if they were used to permit a tuition freeze or salary increases, for example, they could only be used for one year. Finally, if the pension fund was in surplus, the University was prevented by law from making a contribution to the fund.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the transfer of the I'Anson Fund capital to support matched chairs in the Health Sciences, including Social Work, with the transfers to occur as the full external matching funding for each Chair is received, be approved; and,

THAT the following sources of funds to be used to provide matching support for chairs and other matching programs, for approved:

- The I'Anson Fund (\$18 million) to be used to provide matching for Chairs in the Health Sciences, including Social Work;
- The University's General Endowment (\$27.6 million). As previously approved, the Academic Priorities Fund (APF) will continue to bear the cost to hold harmless the University's bottom line for any matches made under the New Matching Chairs program; and
- Savings from the employer pension contributions in 2002-03 (\$18 million).

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

15. Expanding Residence Capacity at the University of Toronto
(arising from the October 19th meeting of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Mock noted that the initiatives set out in *Raising Our Sights* placed additional residences high in the University's priorities. The companion document to *Raising Our Sights, Student Housing: A plan for the Next Phase*, quantified those requirements. The Provost has appointed Professor John Browne Director of Residence Development. He drafted the report now before the Board. He drew together the known proposals for increasing residence capacity and examined the issues that expansion would entail. The report also identifies potential and available sites for development to meet the residence needs.

Professor Mock reported that during discussion, comments were made about several of the proposed sites. With respect to site 4, beside the Robarts Library, a member wished to know whether that site would be needed by the Library for future expansion and asked that the Chief Librarian be consulted on this matter. The unnumbered University College site, on the back campus along Hoskin Avenue, drew comments about disappearing green spaces on campus. Several members were anxious that any residence construction be done in conjunction with the implementation of the Open Space Plan. It was noted that a residence on Hoskin could have open walk ways on the ground floor that would allow glimpses of the green space behind the building. It was also not definite that the residence would be placed at the north end of the back campus; all possible placements on the site would be considered. Professor Sedra stressed that the report supplied a direction for planning; detailed capital projects would return to the Planning and Budget Committee for consideration and approval.

A member noted that site 21, Varsity stadium, would not, as the recommendation implied, be used primarily for residence development. There would, of course, be a new Varsity Stadium on that site, as well as a renovated Arena in addition to the residence. He asked that the motion be amended to reflect this and this was accepted by the administration and the mover and seconder.

Professor Browne gave a presentation on residence expansion. A paper copy of the presentation is attached hereto as Appendix "K".

A member noted that from the statistics on the family housing on Charles Street it would appear that there were a large number of single person units. Professor Browne agreed that there were a number of bachelor units included in the mix of suites in the current building. (Secretary's note: The presentation had indicated that there were 710 apartments housing approximately 1000 persons. Professor Browne subsequently amended the number of occupants to approximately 2000 persons.)

A member asked about the current policy on how residence spaces were assigned. Professor Browne said that any first-year student who requested a residence place was accommodated. First-year students occupied 60% of the spaces in the constituent college residences and 40% in those of the federated colleges. The plans for New and Innis Colleges would give them more capacity to accommodate upper year students. Professor Sedra

15. Expanding Residence Capacity at the University of Toronto (cont'd)

confirmed that the University wanted to be able to change the mix and house more upper-year students while still honouring the guarantee of places to first-year students.

A member referred to the expected demographic and double cohort increases in enrolment. He asked if the government might supply funding for residence construction and whether this might be a condition of accepting more students. He also asked whether the University would complete the construction before the students arrived. The President did not expect the government's support of increased University capacity to include subsidies for residence building. The University would continue to use capital market loans which could be assumed for reasonable long-term rates. The University would, of course, welcome subsidies but the last government subsidies were provided by the Liberal government in the late 1980s. Professor Sedra said that the University was anxious not to lose ground, as enrolments rise, in the percentage of students accommodated in residences. This plan covered current enrolment levels including those increases resulting from ATOP and the expanded B.Ed. program. Further plans would be required to deal with increased enrolments resulting from possible demographic and double cohort increases. The President noted that the suburban campuses, where most of the increased enrolment might reasonably be concentrated, had more land to accommodate residence expansion. The St. George campus was more challenged in terms of land and this was one reason the plans for the Varsity Stadium site was changed to include residences.

A member asked if there was a plan to use the new residence expansion to bring the second-entry professional faculties students together to enhance the non-academic portion of their University experience. Professor Browne indicated that he was holding discussions on this point with the Dean of Law and that ways of integrating OISE/UT students in the campus life were under consideration. The President added that Dean Naylor was engaged in this problem on behalf of students in the Faculty of Medicine, which included a number of second-entry professional programs. If the Varsity Stadium site was built in a modular form, a section could be set aside for these students.

In response to a question, the President indicated that the unnumbered sites had not appeared on an earlier plan. The member expressed his concern that buildings on these sites would encroach on green spaces and he asked whether consideration had been given to increasing the capacity on other sites. Professor Browne responded that the sites have given density specifications as agreed with the City. The possibility of building on top of the current UC residences was explored but it was discovered that the foundations could not support more floors. The President explained that the green space on the back campus would be expanded eastward: the road and the parking spaces on the east side would disappear. He believed it was possible to make the area more attractive and still meet the athletic and residence needs of the University.

A member had three questions. The costing of the projects appeared to be based on use for 8.5 months a year. Should there be a policy on conference facilities that would increase use over a whole year? Secondly, he asked if the federal government might not be approached to subsidize student housing; more student housing could free up low cost rentals and possibly help address the homeless problem. Lastly, he asked if the City could

15. Expanding Residence Capacity at the University of Toronto (cont'd)

be approached to change the density envelopes on certain sites. Professor Browne indicated that the costs were based on the gross square meters, not on use. Miss Oliver had established a group to look at the issue of conference facilities. Summer income did assist the residences but it was variable and could not be relied on to bring relief to winter residence fees. It was used to finance such things as building improvements or to provide residential scholarships. He noted that the University was meeting with the City about the New College and University College sites and the question of increasing the density could be raised.

A member noted that there was a demand for family housing. He agreed that providing family housing was a complex issue; for example, families affect the way services were delivered.

A member asked that the question of food services, its delivery and quality, not be lost in this period of expansion. This was a big issue for students.

A member spoke in support of expanding residence spaces at his College. He believed that residence spaces were needed to attract excellent students and that excellent students in turn attracted excellent faculty. He said that the number of beds available at his College had not changed since the 1950s although the College had more than doubled the number of students.

Another member understood the need for more residence spaces but was concerned about the encroachment on green spaces. He remarked on the pleasure provided by the small park between the OISE and the Faculty of Social Work buildings. He believed it was important to be able to see green space from Hoskin Avenue. With respect to the site on the west side of the Robarts Library, he was concerned that it might be needed to house Library expansion. He noted that no discussion or public debate of this issue had taken place prior to the site's being proposed for residences. The matter had been raised at the meeting of the Planning and Budget Committee and comments from the Chief Librarian would be sought. It was inappropriate, in his view, to rush ahead without proper consultation. Professor Sedra commented that there were currently a number of academic units housed in the Library and these were gradually being accommodated elsewhere to provide more room to the Library. He also suggested that the site was too valuable to be used to store books that were not often used and that off site storage was a reasonable option.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the directions and priorities outlined in *Expanding Residence Capacity at the University of Toronto*, dated October 8, 1999, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "L", be endorsed; and

15. Expanding Residence Capacity at the University of Toronto (cont'd)

THAT sites 4, 5, 12, 21, and 26, subject to discussion with the City of Toronto, New College and University College, be approved, as primary sites for residence development. In the use of site 21, the development of a student residence will not take place without the simultaneous development of a new Varsity Stadium and a renovated Varsity Arena.

16. Items for Information**(a) Report of the Vice-President and Provost**

- (i) Calendar of Business
- (ii) Appointments and Status Changes
- (iii) Appointment of Professors Emeriti
- (iv) Post-65 Appointments

Professor Sedra drew the above reports to the attention of the Board. He also reported that with respect to the 127 new appointments this year, he had waived five searches to take advantage of windows of opportunity. Three were at the full professor level in Chemistry, Economics and Medieval Studies, one at the associate professor level in Public Health Sciences, and one at the Assistant Professor level in Chemistry.

(b) Report of the COU Colleague

The Chair thanked Professor Chamberlin for attending the meeting and invited him to comment on his report. Professor Chamberlin said that the Council of Ontario Universities (COU) was occupied with the same issues as the University including increasing enrolment, faculty renewal, level of public funding both capital and operating, research funding and secondary school liaison.

The President recorded his gratitude to Professor Chamberlin for acting as this University's academic colleague on COU for the past 10 years. He was the most respected colleague at COU and his experience made him an ideal representative of the University. The Board joined the President in expressing their appreciation.

A member noted that AUCC and CAUT had joined with student groups to lobby the provincial government. COU did not seem to be involved in these efforts. Professor Chamberlin said that the government relations committee of COU used a wide range of alliances, including those with student organizations, in its lobbying efforts and would continue to do so.

A member asked about the Ministerial Consents, applications to the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities by institutions who do not have degree granting authority, to award degrees for particular programs. Professor Chamberlin used the example of the Eastern Pentecostal Bible College. It was required to print on all documents relative to this

16. Items for Information (cont'd)

program a “buyer beware” clause alerting students to the conditions under which the consent was granted.

- (c) Items for Information in Reports Number 74 and 75 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs

Professor Rolph noted that it had been suggested at the Agenda Committee meeting that she report on the review process the Committee had undertaken in July. She suggested that this report be postponed until the next meeting and the Chair agreed.

- (d) Items for Information in Reports Number 52 and 53 of the Planning and Budget Committee

Professor Mock had no comments to make and there were no questions.

- (e) Reports Number 237 to 240 of the Academic Appeals Committee

There were no questions on these reports.

- (f) Report on Approvals under Summer Executive Authority

- (i) Appointments:

The Board received notice of the following academic administrative appointments approved under summer executive authority:

Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering

Institute of Biomaterials and Biomedical Engineering (IBBME)

Professor Michael Sefton

Director from August 1, 1999 to June 30, 2004

Faculty of Architecture, Landscape, and Design

Professor Robert Wright

Associate Dean from July 1, 1999 to June 30, 2001

Faculty of Arts and Science

Innis College

Professor Brian Merrilees

Acting Principal from July 1, 1999 to June 30, 2000

16. Items for Information (cont'd)*Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures*

Professor Christopher Barnes Acting Chair from July 1, 1999 to
June 30, 2000

Department of Spanish and Portuguese

Professor James Burke Acting Chair from July 1, 1999 to June 30,
2000

Faculty of Dentistry

Professor Robert M. Pilliar Acting Associate Dean, Graduate/Postgraduate
Studies from July 1, 1999 to June 30, 2000

School of Graduate Studies

Professor Umberto De Boni Associate Dean, Life Sciences from July 1,
1999 to June 30, 2002

Institute for Environmental Studies

Professor Roger Hansell Acting Director from July 1, 1999 to June 30, 2000

Faculty of Information Studies

Professor Barbara L. Craig Acting Dean from August 1, 1999 to July 31, 2000.

Faculty of Medicine

Professor David Naylor Dean from August 3, 1999 to June 30, 2006

Professor Murray Urowitz Acting Dean from June 18, 1999 to August 2,
1999.

Department of Rehabilitation Science

Professor Molly Verrier Chair from October 1, 1999 to June 30, 2002
(reappointment)

Faculty of Nursing

Professor Gail Donner Dean from July 1, 1999 to June 30, 2001.

16. Items for Information (cont'd)OISE/UT

Department of Adult Education, Community Development and Counselling Psychology

Professor Jack Quarter

Acting Chair from July 1, 1999 to
December 31, 1999

University of Toronto at Scarborough

Professor David Cook

Chair, Division of Social Sciences from July 1,
2000 to June 30, 2006 (this is a 5-year term
with a leave to be taken in 2002-03)

Division of Social Sciences

Professor Ronald Manzer

Acting Chair from September 1, 1999 to
June 30, 2000

(ii) Other Matters:

The following recommendations were approved under the Governing Council's resolution on summer executive authority:

(a) Appointments to the Board and its Committees

Academic Appeals Committee

Approval was given for the appointment of the following Acting Chairs for 1999-2000:

Ms Bonnie Croll
Professor Emeritus Alan Mewett
Professor Kent Roach
Professor Emeritus Ralph Scane

Academic Appeals Committee: Professor Lori Dolloff

Committee on Academic Policy and Programs: Ms Debbie Chachra

Discipline Appeals Board: Professor Marvin Gold.

16. Items for Information (cont'd)

(b) Items from Planning and Budget Committee July 20th, 1999 meeting

**Ontario Facilities Renewal Fund/University Infrastructure Investment Fund/
Accommodation and Facilities Directorate: Infrastructure Plan for 1999-2000**

Approval of Ontario Facilities Renewal Fund/UIIF/AFD Infrastructure Plan for 1999/2000, as set out in the attached memorandum from Professor Derek McCammond, dated July 14, 1999. The memorandum was reviewed and recommended for approval by the Planning and Budget Committee at its meeting on July 20, 1999.

University Infrastructure Investment Fund: Allocation re Department of Psychology

Approval of University Infrastructure Investment Fund allocation for increase in scope of Department of Psychology renovations, as set out in the attached memorandum from Professor Derek McCammond, dated July 14, 1999. The memorandum was reviewed and recommended for approval by the Planning and Budget Committee at its meeting on July 20, 1999.

Academic Priorities Fund and Academic Transitional Fund: Allocations

Approval of allocations from the Academic Priorities Fund and Academic Transitional Fund, as set out in the attached memorandum from Professor Derek McCammond, dated July 15, 1999. The memorandum was reviewed and recommended for approval by the Planning and Budget Committee at its meeting on July 20, 1999.

**Administrative Transitional Fund: Allocation re Compliance with the Tri-Council
Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans**

Approval of Administrative Transitional Fund allocation re compliance with Tri-Council Policy Statement on Ethical Conduct for Research involving Humans, as set out in the attached memorandum from Professor Derek McCammond, dated July 14, 1999. The memorandum was reviewed and recommended for approval by the Planning and Budget Committee at its meeting on July 20, 1999.

(c) Other

Capital Project: Munk Centre for International Studies

Approval of increase in project cost of the Munk Centre for International Studies from \$10,000,000 to \$11,980,000, as described in the attached memorandum from Janice Oliver dated August 9, 1999. The funding of the increase is: donations (\$1,230,000), settlement of legal claim (\$450,000), favourable exchange on donation (\$100,000), and \$200,000 financed through the Capital Reserve Fund. The Chief Financial Officer is authorized to arrange bridge funding, if required, from internal or external sources.

16. Items for Information (cont'd)**(g) Report on Award of Degrees**

This report on the number of degrees, diplomas and certificates conferred at the June convocation was presented for information.

(h) Quarterly Report on Donations May 1 - August 31, 1999

This report was presented for information in accordance with the Provost's Guidelines on Donations.

17. Date of Next Meeting

The Chair noted that the next regular meeting of the Board would be held on November 18th, 1999.

18. Other Business

A member took the opportunity to thank all those involved in the renovation to the Gerstein Science Information Centre. There has been a tremendous improvement in the facility and he congratulated the administration on a great job.

The Board moved into closed session.

19. Academic Administrative Appointments

The following academic administrative appointments were approved:

Faculty of Arts and Science

Professor John Baird

Acting Associate Dean, Humanities
from January 1, 2000 to June 30, 2000

School of Graduate Studies***Centre for Comparative Literature***

Professor John Fleming

Acting Director from January 1, 2000 to
June 30, 2000

19. Academic Administrative Appointments (cont'd)Faculty of Medicine*Department of Occupation Therapy*

Professor Judy Friedland	Acting Chair from October 1, 1999 to December 31, 1999 (extension)
Professor Helene Polatajko	Chair from January 1, 2000 to December 31, 2004

Faculty of Nursing

Professor Donna Wells	Associate Dean, Education from July 1, 1999 to June 30, 2004
-----------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------

OISE/UT

Department of Human Development and Applied Psychology

Professor Keith Oatley	Acting Chair from September 9, 1999, renewable on a monthly basis, pending the appointment of a new Chair
------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

20. University Professors: Appointment

Professor Sedra introduced the recommendation for the appointment of four new University Professors, the highest honour that could be given to a member of the teaching staff. With these new appointments, there would be 30 University Professors.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT Professor J. Richard Bond, Canadian Institute for Theoretical Astrophysics; Professor Michael P. Collins, Department of Civil Engineering, Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering; Professor Richard B. Lee, Department of Anthropology, Faculty of Arts and Science; and Professor Ernest J. Weinrib, Faculty of Law, be appointed University Professors as of July 1st, 1999.

The meeting adjourned at 6:40 p.m.

Secretary
October 28th, 1999

Chair