

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

REPORT NUMBER 103 OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD

January 11th, 2001

To the Governing Council,
University of Toronto.

Your Board reports that it held a meeting on Thursday, January 11th, 2001 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, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12 and 13 are recommended to Governing Council for approval, items 4 and 9 are presented for Executive Committee confirmation and the remaining items are reported for information.

1. Report of the Previous Meeting

The Chair noted two errors. On page 6, first paragraph, line 3, the member's comment should read "...UTS was a private high school...". On page 9, under the item from the Faculty of Law, the motion was on the floor when the debate was adjourned and should be added to the Report. A revised page 9 was circulated to members.

The report of the previous meeting, dated November 16th, 2000, as amended, was approved.

2. Business Arising Out of the Report

There was no business arising.

3. Report Number 89 of the Agenda Committee

The Chair noted that this report was presented for information.

A member referred to the discussion of the motion that had been placed on the Board's agenda. He noted that more than 10 percent of the members had signed the request and he wished to have the total percent recorded. (32.5 percent of the members signed the request.)

4. Degrees: Faculty of Law - "With Honours" Designation on Diplomas

The Chair recalled that debate on this issue was adjourned at the last meeting. The motion was still on the floor. Professor Mayo Moran, Associate Dean, from the Faculty of Law explained that the suggestion to add the honours designation to the diploma came from the students and that the motion had been passed unanimously at Law's Faculty Council on which there were a number of student members.

A member asked why the designation would not be "summa cum laude" in keeping with the change to the J.D. degree. Professor Moran responded that the Faculty wished to put honours standing on the diploma to reflect the wording on the transcript which would also show that the student had achieved honours standing. Those who received honours standing would be in the top 10 percent in two of the three years of the program. These students had performed with distinction throughout the program.

4. Degrees: Faculty of Law - “With Honours” Designation on Diplomas (cont’d)

A member said that this designation was for academic achievement only. There were other types of achievement that were not recognized and in the member’s view this was a concern. Professor Moran and a member confirmed that honours standing was for academic achievement.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

The use, where appropriate, of an honours standing designation on the diplomas of graduates of the Faculty of Law.

Documentation for this item is attached hereto as Appendix “A”.

**5. Enrolment Growth Fund: Allocations
(arising from Report Number 65 of the Planning and Budget Committee)**

Professor Mock explained that the Enrolment Growth Fund permitted the allocation of money to divisions that had increased their enrolment under approved agreements. In all cases, the enrolment increases would generate additional revenue - either from new Government funding for growth in a particular program, or from tuition fees. All allocations were subject to the division's meeting its enrolment target. There were three proposals:

- First, a three-year allocation for OISE/U.T., to cover the cost of 94 extra teacher-training students - the second tranche of OISE/U.T.'s enrolment increase.
- Second, a base budget allocation for the University of Toronto at Mississauga for its new Master's program in Biotechnology.
- Finally, the largest allocation - for an increase of over 800 undergraduate students and 100 graduate students in Computer Engineering, and related engineering programs, under the Ontario "Access to Opportunities" Program.

It was proposed to allocate base funding of:

- \$4.6-million to the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering,
- \$519,000 to the Faculty of Arts and Science, to cover its cost for training engineering students, and
- \$470,000 to Facilities and Services to cover the cost of operating part of the Bahen Building to accommodate the additional enrolment.

A member asked how much money was in the fund and how the allocations were made. He also asked for a clarification under the University of Toronto at Mississauga (U.T.M.) allocation which referred to “revenue generated by the tuition fees...”. Professor McCammond explained that the Enrolment Growth Fund received its funds from two sources - tuition fee revenue from the extra students and government operating grant funds for the students. The funds were then allocated to the divisions to mount the programs for the extra students. The Enrolment Growth Fund had a positive balance but mainly the funds flowed in and were immediately distributed to the appropriate divisions. An example of the programs it supported were those in the government’s Access to Opportunities Program (ATOP) for which the government asked for increased enrolment. The divisions produced plans for the enrolment increases and the allocations were made in support of those plans. With respect to the allocation for the U.T.M. program in Biotechnology, support would be provided from the

5. Enrolment Growth Fund: Allocations (cont'd)

Academic Priorities Fund (A.P.F.) and tuition fee revenue which would flow to the Enrolment Growth Fund and then to U.T.M.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

The following allocations from the Enrolment Growth Fund, subject to the divisions' meeting the increased enrolment targets, be approved:

1. To OISE/U.T. for expenses associated with the B.Ed. Program; One-Time-Only (OTO) funding of \$720,000 in each of 2000-01, 2001-02 and 2002-03.
2. To the University of Toronto at Mississauga for the Master of Biotechnology Program; \$213,196 in base funding.
3. To the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering for expenses associated with ATOP expansion in engineering programs; \$4,639,676 in base funding.
4. To the Faculty of Arts and Science for expenses associated with ATOP expansion in engineering programs; \$519,275 in base funding.
5. To Facilities and Services for operating costs associated with the Bahen Centre for Information Technology; \$469,980 in base funding.

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

6. Academic Priorities Fund: Allocations

(arises from Report Number 65 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Mock said that on behalf of the Planning and Budget Committee, he was presenting the second and third batches of allocations from the Academic Priorities Fund. Following its normal practice, the Committee had reviewed summaries of the divisions' academic plans, which were the basis of the proposed allocations. In total, \$33-million had been, or would be, allocated over the four-year period, 2000-04, to support *Raising our Sights* plans. About two thirds of the money came from the 1.5% per year, across-the-board budget cuts from the academic and academic-service divisions. About one third came from tuition fee revenue.

This proposal included allocations to four health science faculties - Dentistry, Medicine, Nursing, and Pharmacy. The Faculty of Pharmacy would also receive an allocation from the Enrolment Growth Fund to support its enrolment increase - likely the first step to doubling its enrolment. Also proposed were allocations to the School of Graduate Studies, and the Student Recruitment Office. Finally, there was an interim, one-time-only allocation to support urgent infrastructure needs at the Mississauga campus. The Campus was unable to complete its academic plan until the Government decided whether it would fund enrolment growth. When the plan was completed, the Committee would consider a recommendation for allocations in support of the plan. The details of the proposal were documented in Professor Sedra's November 6th memorandum.

A member referred to the comments in the Report about the Bachelor of Science in Pharmaceutical Sciences. The Report seemed to indicate that the planning for this program was advanced but he was in a department which should be central to such a program and he had heard nothing about it. He also noted that it would be a second-entry program.

Professor Sedra said that the development of the program was in the early stages. The proposed allocation was seed money to help with its development. He hoped that

6. Academic Priorities Fund: Allocations (cont'd)

discussions would involve the member's department. It would be an Arts and Science degree in which the last two years of the program would largely involve the Faculty of Pharmacy and the Faculty of Medicine, particularly the Department of Pharmacology. The program would be facilitated through the proposed new Institute for Drug Research. Invited to speak, Professor MacGregor said that the program was not a second-entry one. Dean Amrhein noted that there had been a series of curriculum discussions and that this particular program was at the beginning of the planning period. The chair of the Department of Chemistry had not yet been involved in the discussions.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the following allocations from the Academic Priorities Fund be made in support of divisional plans, 2000-2004:

	Base	OTO
Dentistry	\$400,003	\$878,750
Medicine	3,285,250	2,320,720
Nursing	594,341	201,500
Pharmacy	284,726	110,000
SGS		
- Centres and Institutes	355,944	1,508,000
- Inst. For Women's & Gender Studies (New College)	50,000	
- Administration	209,930	365,122
Student Recruitment	600,000	
UofT at Mississauga		850,000
Total	\$5,780,284	\$6,234,092

THAT an allocation also be made to the Faculty of Pharmacy in support of its *Raising our Sights* Plan from the Enrolment Growth Fund to recognize the additional costs associated with the increase in enrolment from 120 students to 140 students in the B.Sc. Pharm.

	Base	OTO
Pharmacy	\$287,483	\$50,000

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

7. Academic Priorities Fund: Allocations
(arising from Report Number 66 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Mock reported that at its December meeting, the Planning and Budget Committee had considered another batch of A.P.F. allocations, this time for the St. George Arts and Science colleges, and for OISE/U.T. Proposed allocations for the Colleges focused on supporting efforts to improve the student educational experience, for example: scholarships, support for first-year students and students at risk, writing and statistics support, as well as registrar's services and recruitment. It was proposed that University College receive funding for the University Art Centre and that the summer and evening

7. Academic Priorities Fund: Allocations (cont'd)

program at Woodsworth College have its budget cut restored this year, pending a review of how that program was to be offered. The colleges of the three federated universities would receive funding to improve Library / Information Commons facilities. Trinity College would receive funding to match a student levy to construct its new Library. An Academic Transitional Fund allocation was recommended to help Innis College to add technical support to its Town Hall, which (among other things) generated revenue for the College.

He noted that for OISE/U.T., the key proposal was a base-budget allocation to provide graduate student support - including a portion to be matched by the OISE/U.T. budget. Graduate student support at OISE/U.T. has been well below that of comparable units.

A member commented that in reading the summary plans of the colleges he had noted that two of them contained particular initiatives in support of commuter students. He wondered whether there were any concerted plans to address the needs of this increasing population. He suggested, for example, the introduction of web-based tutoring. Professor Tuohy said that services to commuter students were an important theme in self-studies of all the colleges and she regretted that it was not more apparent in the presentations. This was reflected in a number of initiatives such as new student carrels and 24-hour study space. Innis College was emphasizing its community activities and Woodsworth College was analyzing its space needs for commuter students. She said that the idea of web-based tutoring was an interesting one and she would refer it to the new task force on technology-assisted teaching.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

(a) THAT the following allocations from the Academic Priorities Fund be made in support of divisional plans, 2000-04:

	Base	OTO
Innis College	\$124,782	\$ 50,000
New College	\$161,500	
University College	\$ 59,400	\$ 10,000
University College for University-wide initiatives	\$185,000	\$200,000
Woodsworth College	\$ 77,500	\$ 25,000
Woodsworth College for Summer & Evening program	\$ 74,000	
St. Michael's College	\$ 35,625	\$325,000
Trinity College		\$215,000
Victoria College		\$164,000
OISE/U.T.	\$800,000	

Total Base: \$1,517,807 OTO: \$989,000 and

(b) THAT the following allocation from the Academic Transitional Fund be made:

	OTO
Innis College	\$50,000

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

8. Academic Transitional Fund: Allocations
(arising from Report Number 65 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Mock explained that the Academic Transitional Fund also supported the *Raising our Sights* plans. One-time only allocations were intended to help divisions to reduce costs or increase revenue. Buying micro-scale equipment would allow the Department of Chemistry to reduce the cost of purchasing, and disposing of, chemicals. A small allocation would provide the remaining money required for U.T.M. to complete a centre to house its new Master of Biotechnology program. That would enable the program to begin to generate tuition-fee revenue. A final allocation would fund the unmet cost of closing the Information Technology Design Centre in the Faculty of Architecture, Landscape, and Design. The Centre had not succeeded, in the face of competition, in generating sufficient revenue from its continuing education offerings.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the following allocations from the Academic Transitional Fund be approved:

- \$120,000 to the Faculty of Arts and Science for the purchase of Micro-Scale Equipment by the Department of Chemistry;
- \$125,000 to the University of Toronto at Mississauga to finance the construction of a centre to house the Masters in Biotechnology; and
- \$177,300 to the Faculty of Architecture, Landscape, and Design for the phase-out of the Information Technology Design Centre.

Documentation for this item is attached hereto as Appendix “E”.

9. Woodsworth College: Discontinuation of the Certificate in Case Management
(arising from Report Number 66 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Mock said that the Case Management Program, a cost-recovery program that was offered jointly with McMaster University, had been initiated in 1998 to train home-care workers. Unfortunately, staffing the program had been difficult, and enrolment had been less than needed for full cost recovery. It had also become clear that it would be important to be able to deliver the program through distance learning. Woodsworth had, therefore, decided to phase out the program and leave the field to McMaster, which has the necessary faculty support and distance-learning facilities.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

The admission of new students to the Certificate Program in Case Management at Woodsworth College be suspended indefinitely, effective with the 2001 summer session.

Documentation for this item is attached hereto as Appendix “F”.

10. Capital Plan 1997-2002: Update

(arising from Report Number 66 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Mock noted that the Capital Plan reflected the University's priorities for new buildings and major renovation projects. The current plan had been approved in 1997 and had been updated regularly since then. The plan was divided into two sections. The first contained the projects under construction, or fairly well along in the planning process. The estimated cost of those projects was \$488 million. Funding of \$358-million had been secured; \$130 million remained to be found. The second section showed projects at earlier stages of planning. Some had users' committees; others did not. None of those projects had been costed yet.

He said that the current iteration of the plan had removed projects that had been completed: Graduate House, the Munk Centre for International Studies, and the Davenport Building within the Lash Miller Chemical Laboratories. It added new projects including student residences on all three campuses and facilities to accommodate enrolment expansion at Mississauga and Scarborough.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the updated Capital Plan, 1997-2002, which is Schedule "A" to Appendix "G", be approved

11. Capital Project: Users' Committee Report for the Centre for Cellular and Biomolecular Research

(arising from Report Number 66 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Mock said that the University of Toronto, along with its teaching hospitals, had emerged as one of the world's leading centres for scientific research in what was likely to be the world's most exciting area of scientific research - biomolecular research. Proceeding with the Centre for Cellular and Biomolecular Research was an essential step to keeping the U of T at the forefront. The Centre would enable researchers from the medical and biological sciences and other disciplines - mathematics, computer science, engineering - to work closely together, studying biology in the entirely new way it must now be studied - making use of genome sequencing to characterize the proteins expressed by the genome, and learning how they affect disease.

The proposed Centre was to be located on Taddle Creek Road, fronting on College Street. It would link the Medical Sciences Building, the FitzGerald Building and the Rosebrugh Building, and would draw on existing support facilities and services. It would accommodate about sixty principal researchers and their research groups, along with ancillary space.

Professor Mock reported that the cost would be just over \$105-million. The secured external funding consisted of just under \$50-million from the Canada Foundation for Innovation and the Ontario Innovation Trust. The I'Anson Fund would provide a further \$2-million, and the Planning and Budget Committee recommended approval of a proposed allocation of \$2.8-million from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund. \$50.7-million of the projected cost was still to be found. The University proposed to go back to the Canada Foundation for Innovation and the Ontario Innovation Trust and ask for additional support to reflect the reality that, since the original application, construction costs

11. Capital Project: Users' Committee Report for the Centre for Cellular and Biomolecular Research (cont'd)

in Toronto had been sky-rocketing. The project cost now before the Board assumed a 33% cost escalation from the date of the funding application to the projected tender date in 2002.

Second, the Centre was a top priority for the fundraising Campaign. This was an incredibly exciting and important area of research, and the Centre should be very attractive to benefactors. There would be naming opportunities, both for the building as a whole and for its individual components. This had attracted benefactors for the Bahen Centre for Information Technology. It should attract benefactors for the Centre for Cellular and Biomolecular Research.

Professor Mock explained that the Board's approval, along with that of the Governing Council, would mean that the University had designated this project as one it should build, one that should be a top priority in its efforts to secure government funding, and one that should be a top priority in private fundraising. It would not mean that construction would begin, and that the University would be at financial risk if funds were not found. Apart from \$50,000 for design work, which could be spent under administrative authority, not a penny would be committed until the Business Board was satisfied that enough funding was secure that it was safe to proceed.

Finally, Professor Mock noted that at the Planning and Budget Committee, there had been concern that King's College Road would have to handle too much traffic. Traffic would be generated by this project and by the closure of Taddle Creek Road and this would conflict with open space plans for Convocation Plaza and King's College Road. The traffic circulation study had been circulated for information.

A member commented that cellular and biomolecular research was taking place in the Faculty of Arts and Science, in a number of departments, and these departments did not appear to be involved in this new project. They seemed to be isolated and he suggested their exclusion would have a negative effect on the Faculty. He believed the research in these areas should be a university-wide initiative and not just restricted to the Faculty of Medicine, the Faculty of Pharmacy and the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering. In response, Dean Naylor said that there were two components to the Centre for Cellular and Biomolecular Research (C.C.B.R.). One component was the Centre as a building and the other was the Centre as a program. Three faculties were collaborating in the first while the second was envisaged as a university-wide program in biomolecular research. The building would be the headquarters for the network of research. He was confident that researchers from the Faculty of Arts and Science would be involved in the research programs.

A member agreed that the project was more than a building. He said that there was social conflict between academic units and in interdisciplinary projects. He hoped that the concerns expressed by the previous speaker would be seriously addressed. Dean Amrhein said that he had been party to the early discussions which had also included the former chair of the Department of Chemistry. He expected to continue his involvement as the discussions moved to detailed planning.

A member asked about security issues surrounding animal care facilities and about temporary arrangements for waste storage and animal management. Professor Yip said that the planning group had paid particular attention to the animal care facility and its security. In the past, there had been a non-confrontational atmosphere with the animal rights groups because of the open dialogue. The member noted that there was nothing in the Users' Committee Report about this matter. Professor Yip explained that the Report was a

11. Capital Project: Users' Committee Report for the Centre for Cellular and Biomolecular Research (cont'd)

conceptual document. The particulars about the animal care facility and its security would be dealt with when the project reached the architectural design stage. With respect to the temporary arrangements for waste storage and animal management, Ms Sisam noted that these arrangements were for an interim period while the project was under construction. The details were in the room specifications, a voluminous section of the Report which had not been duplicated for Board members. She said that there would be secure access points for delivery of animals during construction and that once the building was complete, delivery would be below ground. The member was also concerned about fumes from idling vehicles and she said that "temporary" had a way of becoming long term. She said that these issues needed more attention and Professor Sedra undertook to look into these matters.

A member wanted to clarify a point made by Professor Mock in his introduction. He believed that this project should not be the top capital priority. If enrolment expansion was to take place, the capital projects required to house that expansion should be first. He hoped the capital priorities were not changing and that this project would not compete for funding with those required for enrolment expansion. Professor Mock confirmed that the C.C.B.R. was *a* top priority and not *the* top priority.

A member indicated that he had some comments arising from the traffic circulation study that had been circulated to the members. Professor Sedra invited the member to contact him outside the meeting.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

- (i) THAT the Users' Committee Report for the Centre for Cellular and Biomolecular Research, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "H", be approved in principle;
- (ii) THAT the Centre for Cellular and Biomolecular Research project scope of 10,370 net assignable square metres, site on Taddle Creek Road, project cost of \$105,143,000, and funding as follows be approved:

Canada Foundation for Innovation	\$24.0-million
Ontario Innovation Trust	25.6-million
University Infrastructure Investment Fund	2.8-million
I'Anson Fund	2.0-million
Additional funding to be sought from the Canada Foundation for Innovation, the Ontario Innovation Trust and future donations to be sought through the Campaign	50.7-million

and

- (iii) THAT an allocation of \$2,800,000 from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund for the Centre for Cellular and Biomolecular Research be approved.

12. Capital Project: Users' Committee for the Academic Resource Centre at the University of Toronto at Scarborough

(arising from Report Number 66 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Mock commented that this was another exciting project that would provide a wonderful electronic teaching and learning commons at the Scarborough Campus, including networked study spaces, language and writing labs, multi-media labs, a Centre for Instructional Technology, all in combination with traditional library services. The project would also remedy serious deficiencies in library, study and classroom space at Scarborough. The proposal included a 500-seat lecture theatre, four small classrooms, and two case rooms for the Management Program. The cost of the project was \$18.4-million.

Sources of funding consisted of about \$9-million in the form of an indirect grant from the Ontario SuperBuild Growth Fund and \$1.1-million from the Scarborough version of the University Infrastructure Investment Fund. Just over \$8.3-million was yet to be found and this was expected to come from the Campaign.

Once again, Professor Mock stressed that this recommendation did not include approval to begin construction, and it did not entail accepting financial risk. The Business Board would eventually make a judgement about when it was prudent to proceed. In this case, the project consisted both of about \$14-million of new construction and \$4.5-million of renovation. If there was a shortfall in fundraising, the project could proceed in phases.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

- (i) THAT the Users' Committee Report for the Academic Resource Centre at the University of Toronto at Scarborough, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "I", be approved in principle; and
- (ii) THAT the project scope of 2,935 net assignable square metres (n.a.s.m.) of new space and 2,638 n.a.s.m. of renovated space, project cost of \$18,408,000, and sources of funding as follows be approved:
- | | |
|--|-----------------|
| Net proceeds of lease of land by Centennial | |
| College of Applied Arts and Technology | \$ 8.97-million |
| University of Toronto at Scarborough funds | 1.10-million |
| Future donations to be sought through the Campaign | 8.33-million |

13. University of Toronto at Mississauga: Campus Master Plan 2000

(arising from Report Number 66 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Mock explained that a Campus Master Plan was a land-use or zoning plan, setting out zones for academic buildings, student residences, mixed-use space, greenbelt, and parking. The plan had a number of very interesting features:

- "No build" greenbelt areas, including the Credit River Watershed, the woodlot and the pond;
- landscaping to knit the campus together, not unlike the St. George Campus Open Space Plan;
- the phasing of development so that, at each stage, the Campus appeared complete rather than a continuous work in progress; and
- a second entrance and entrance plaza on Mississauga Road to relieve traffic congestion on a street not intended to service a major institution.

13. University of Toronto at Mississauga: Campus Master Plan 2000 (cont'd)

A member asked a number of questions about the rationale for reduced parking, the research and learning technology centre and the internal allocation of space of the proposed buildings. He noted that the plan addressed the problem of physical facilities but he suggested that there were serious academic issues at U.T.M. that needed attention such as low academic standards and an insufficient number of faculty. Principal McNutt said that while the campus had slightly lower admission averages than the St. George campus he firmly disagreed that the College had low standards. With respect to the number of faculty, he hoped that the Provost would help correct that through the planning process. On the parking issue, he said that this matter was still under active consideration. The campus currently had more parking spaces than required by the City of Mississauga. There was, however, more to be done on this issue. Finally, he commented that the research and learning technology centre was a college-wide initiative that was part of the academic plan. The campus plan was a footprint of where the buildings could be situated. Still to come was the academic plan that would show what would be housed in the buildings.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the University of Toronto at Mississauga Master Plan 2000, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "J", be approved in principle, replacing the Master Plan approved in 1994

14. Motion: Academic Appointments

The Chair noted that at the last meeting of the Board, two members submitted a request, signed by 10 percent of the members of the Board as required in *By-law Number 2*, that a motion appear on the agenda. In fact, the request had been signed by 32.5 percent of the members. The Agenda Committee's discussion had determined that this motion was deemed to be a "sense of the meeting" motion and, if passed, would not proceed farther in the governance process.

The member, who later moved the motion, explained why it was important for the Board to consider his motion. He believed that past administrations' practice of not interfering in an academic unit's decision concerning the appointment of individuals had been abandoned by the current administration in the settlement of the Chun case. In the member's view, without adequate consultation with the Department of Physics, Dr. Chun was given a position for which no competitive advertising was done. He believed that interference in decision-making of academic units constituted an administrative abuse of academic power. The power should lie with the expertise in the discipline. He had distributed a page from an article *Seven Principles of Higher Education: A Primer* in which principle seven was that "not even the most powerful administrator should, *qua* administrator, make academic decisions."

He said that this motion was important because of its relevance as the University entered a period of intense hiring competitions. He noted that it referred to primary rather than sole responsibility as he recognized that the administration had the ultimate power on appointments. In light of the previous statement, he wondered why the Agenda Committee had circulated the rules of appointment to the Board as though arguing against the motion. He believed there was nothing in the policies that contradicted his motion. His point was that in deciding the academic merits of individual appointments, the primary responsibility should rest with the academic unit. He hoped that faculty and students would support the motion.

14. Motion: Academic Appointments (cont'd)

It was duly moved and seconded,

The Board affirms the principle that in appointing and reappointing academic staff the primary responsibility lies with the academic unit(s) directly involved, since they alone possess the requisite disciplinary expertise to make a judgement.

The seconder referred to the policy excerpts that had been distributed with the agenda package. With respect to tenure-stream appointments, he agreed that the President was responsible for such appointments but he said that the President could not make the appointment responsibly without taking advice of the relevant departments. He said that there might be times when the President did not take the advice of the departments, for example, in the case of a dispute within a department on a particular appointment. The President should consult the department and sometimes those outside the department or the University and rely upon those with the relevant expertise. The President agreed with the member's comments.

A member asked about any opposition to the motion. Professor Sedra said that the motion added nothing to the current practice but he expressed concern that it could be construed as an amendment to carefully drafted policies. It was, of course, a "parenthood" motion but it represented an undisciplined insertion into these policies.

A member suggested that this was an issue of balance between academic departments and administration and that those who proposed the motion believed the balance should tilt to the academic departments. He said that the motion should not be made unless members were unhappy with the current rules. He had reviewed the procedures at other institutions and he had found that this University gave more authority and more autonomy to departments in matters of appointment. Appointment recommendations were initiated in the departments, were recommended by the deans to the Provost and then to the President. Support of the motion would mean that the policies did not serve the University well. Finally, he noted that a representative of the School of Graduate Studies sat on committees to ensure comparable standards were applied across the University.

Professor Gooch said that the motion was a statement of the strength of feeling about the spirit of academic appointments. There were excellent policies and procedures that emphasized the role of the departmental chairs in representing the authority of the discipline. He was pleased to hear that the mover believed the motion did not affect current policies. Although he agreed with the spirit of the motion, he had concerns about the wording. For example, he noted that the role of the chair was not mentioned. The word "primary" was ambiguous; it could mean initial or ultimate. Disciplinary interests could also be represented by other academic units and by scholars from outside the University. The words did not capture the spirit of the motion and he believed the motion was redundant.

A member said that the motion was innocuous since it appeared to fall within the policies. For him, the problem was the connotation of the motion and the wording. He suggested that the motion was a rebuke not of the policy but of a particular action.

A member commented that although he supported having the motion come forward, he was opposed to the motion on the grounds that departments were not alone in possessing expertise in a particular discipline. It was important that change could be introduced from outside. It was the appointment itself that had precipitated the discussion because other

14. Motion: Academic Appointments (cont'd)

appointments had been made in the same manner and not questioned. He believed there must be a mechanism for bringing other opinions into the process.

Dean Amrhein, referring to the appointment in question, said that the appointment was made in accordance with the policies and procedures. The recommendation had been made with the advice of the chair of the unit and he had forwarded it to the Provost, and then the recommendation had been considered by the President. He did not understand the basis of the rebuke since procedures were followed. He too was concerned about the ambiguity of "primary". He worked closely with the departments on appointments from advertising to submitting the recommendation to the Provost. It was a shared process among the chair, colleagues and the dean. He also referred to the process for spousal appointments where the dean could take the initiative and discuss an appointment with the chairs of departments. He believed the motion was vague and it neither challenged or criticized current policy. The present procedures were flexible and worked well.

A member noted his confusion with the use of the words "academic staff". There were many types of academic appointments and therefore various methods of appointment. If the motion referred only to tenure-stream appointments, then he suggested there was no purpose to the motion.

A member expressed his concern that although the policies might be good, the members in the department concerned felt betrayed. Although there might have been consultation with the chair, other members of the department were not consulted. Perhaps the policies did not include the necessity of consulting colleagues. The problem was that this was an academic appointment and there has been concern expressed about the method of making the appointment. Was this process satisfactory? It had upset members of the department who felt that the decision implied negative criticism of them. He said that the intent of the motion before the Board was to ask whether the members believed the current policies were working well.

A member said that the University had good procedures for appointments where those with disciplinary expertise could generate a recommendation and non-disciplinary members could ensure university-wide standards. In some cases, if there was dissension in the department, obtaining external expertise would be important. The current basis of operation was a good one and although he had been in favour of discussing the motion, he would vote against it.

A member suggested that the motion was a rebuke disguised as an affirmation. At best it was redundant and at worst it was confusing. If it changed the status quo it would be a mistake since there were no problems with current procedures. He was, however, concerned that members of the Department of Physics felt that they were being criticized. He expressed his confidence in the Department.

Another member echoed a previous speaker's comment that he did not regard this matter as a rebuke of the colleagues in the Department. He believed the case in question had divided the University community and that it had been full of ambiguity and misunderstanding. It had complicated life for staff, students and alumni. It had taken an extraordinary effort to settle the matter and he applauded the new President and the administration. He was sorry that members of the Department felt the resolution was a denigration.

The Chair invited the mover to make final comments. The member asked the Board to read the motion carefully. The use of the words "academic staff" was deliberate and did refer to a number of different types of appointment. As to the motion being a rebuke, he had meant it to be a rebuke against future problems that might arise. Was there adequate consultation in

14. Motion: Academic Appointments (cont'd)

the department before the decision to make the appointment was taken? The point was appropriate consultation and whether there had been consultation with the colleagues. In that respect, he felt the administration had done something new and the purpose of the motion was to discourage such action in future.

The vote on the motion was taken.

The motion was defeated.

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

Professor Sedra reported on a number of items.

Budget Report 2001-2002: Professor Sedra explained that there were a number of factors that affect the formation of the Budget Report and the University's ability to begin the process. The provincial government announcement of operating grant funding for 2001-2002 which was a major source of University funding was not expected until well into Spring. Another item which would have an effect on the budget was the federal government's decision about whether it would support the indirect costs of research. The provision of such funding would have a significant impact on the University's budget. An announcement on this matter could be expected in the next federal budget which might not be presented until the Fall. The administration would proceed in March at the Planning and Budget Committee with consideration of the budget, based on the best assumptions.

Long-Range Budget Guidelines, 2002-2008: Professor Sedra reported that next fall, the administration would begin planning the framework for the next six-year period with extensive consultation. The University was currently in the fourth year of the current six-year period. New Guidelines would cover the remaining two years in the current period and continue for a further four years.

Graduate Student Support: Professor Sedra said that a group had been appointed to oversee the implementation of recommendations in the Orchard Task Force on Graduate Student Financial Support.

Canada Research Chairs Program: Professor Sedra reported that all but one of the 41 nominations submitted by the University for the Chairs Program had been approved. In addition, the University had submitted five more nominations in December. The vast majority of the current nominees had been internal candidates and the process had been relatively simple. The next stage of the nomination process would be more difficult and would involve the recruitment of new faculty and the submission of names of the external nominees for the chairs. Professor Sedra was currently involved in interactive discussions with the deans on the various clusters and their dimensions including the numbers of Tier I and Tier II chairs and the number of chairs held by internal candidates versus the number of chairs held by new appointees. He was about to write to the deans, bringing the discussions to a successful conclusion.

He noted that the federal government, on the basis of more recent data, had recalculated the distribution of the chairs and the University had been awarded 20 more chairs. These chairs would be assigned later in the five-year program, perhaps to new emerging areas of interest.

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

Task Force on Intellectual Property relating to Instructional Media: Professor Sedra reported that a task force, chaired by Professor Daniels, had been established to review the existing policies on such matters as inventions, copyright and intellectual property.

Questions:

A member asked at what stage in the process was the proposal for the planned expansion in enrolment in the Faculty of Pharmacy. Professor Sedra indicated that the preparatory work had been completed and both the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities and the Ministry of Health had encouraged the University in its plans. The proposal would be submitted to the government soon and he expected to receive a response in a few weeks.

In response to a question about the progress of enrolment expansion discussions with the provincial government, Dr. Levy noted that the enrolment expansion plans of the universities in aggregate met the expected increase in students seeking university places. The universities now wanted to meet with the government on the questions of full average funding for the new students and the necessary capital funding to support the expanded enrolment.

A member asked what percentage of the 40 Canada Research Chairs were held by women. She noted that the percentage across Canada was 16 percent. Professor Sedra said that he would provide the member with the information.

(b) Items for Information in Report Number 84 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs

Professor Gallop drew members' attention to the appendix to the Report which was a copy of the presentation Professor Orchard had made to the Committee on student financial support. In response to a member's question, Professor Tuohy noted that there was a mechanism to review the needs of students who did not meet the OSAP needs assessment.

(c) Items for Information in Reports Number 65 and 66 of the Planning and Budget Committee

Professor Mock had no comments to make on these reports.

(d) Reports Number 251, 252, and 253 of the Academic Appeals Committee

There were no questions on these reports.

(e) Quarterly Report on Donations

This report was presented for information. There were no questions.

16. Date of Next Meeting - February 15, 2001

17. Other Business

A member said that he would pursue his motion on employment equity that had been dealt with by the Agenda Committee in November. The second matter he wished to raise concerned the LSAT, the admissions test used by faculties of law. He said that the criteria used for admission should be continually questioned. He noted that a complaint has been filed with the Ontario Human Rights Commission concerning the discriminatory nature of LSAT. He wished to flag this issue and asked whether the Faculty of Law could provide a report on the validity of LSAT as an admission tool and if the Faculty had reviewed its admissions practices, particularly with respect to minorities.

The meeting moved into closed session.

18. Academic Administrative Appointments

The following academic administrative appointments were approved:

Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering*Institute for Aerospace Studies*

Professor Tony Haasz

Director from July 1, 2001 to June 30, 2006
(reappointment)

Professor Lloyd Reid

Acting Director from January 1, 2001 to
June 30, 2001

Faculty of Law

Professor Ron Daniels

Dean from July 1, 2001 to June 30, 2007
(reappointment)

Faculty of Medicine*Department of Immunology*

Professor Michael Ratcliffe

Chair from March 1, 2001 to June 30, 2006

Department of Ophthalmology

Professor Wai-Ching Lam

Acting Chair from January 1, 2001 to June 30,
2001

Department of Paediatrics

Professor Hugh O'Brodovich

Chair from July 1, 2001 to June 30, 2006
(reappointment)

18. Academic Administrative Appointments (cont'd)

School of Graduate Studies

Institute of Medical Science

Professor Ori Rotstein

Acting Director from January 1, 2001 to June 30, 2001 or until a new director is appointed, whichever comes first

Faculty of Social Work

Professor Usha George

Associate Dean from July 1, 2002 to June 30, 2003 (reappointment)

Professor Sedra reported for information that Professor Derek Allen had been reappointed Vice-Provost and Dean of Arts of Trinity College for a term, July 1, 2002 to June 30, 2007.

The meeting adjourned at 6:25 p.m.

Secretary
January 17, 2001

Chair