

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL
REPORT NUMBER 101 OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD

September 28th, 2000

To the Governing Council,
University of Toronto.

Your Board reports that it held a meeting on Thursday, September 28th, 2000 at 4:15 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall. An attendance list is attached to this report. In this report, items 5 and 6 are recommended to Governing Council for approval, items 7 and 8 are 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 2000-2001. He introduced Professor Vivek Goel, the Vice-Chair of the Board, Professor Adel Sedra, Vice-President and Provost and the Board's senior administrative assessor, and the President, Dr. Robert Birgeneau.

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. Members could speak only once to an item and for no more than five minutes.

1. Report of the Previous Meeting

The report of the previous meeting, dated June 14th, 2000, was approved.

2. Business Arising

A member noted that several meetings ago he had requested that information he had submitted in support of a recommendation concerning funding for physical accessibility be distributed. This had not been done as far as he knew.

(Secretary's note: The Planning and Budget Committee dealt with this item at its meeting of May 24th. The motion had been defeated. Material is not circulated in such cases, but any member wishing to receive the documentation on the motion should contact the Secretariat.)

3. Report Number 87 of the Agenda Committee

The report was received for information.

The Chair noted that the Agenda Committee had received questions that a member wished to have addressed concerning the settlement with Dr. Chun. The questions and the response from Professor Gooch had been distributed as enclosures 6a and 6b of the agenda package. The Chair thanked the member for his courtesy in giving advance notice of his questions.

3. Report Number 87 of the Agenda Committee (cont'd)

The member noted that the Academic Board was unique in North America as a special forum for the raising of specifically academic issues that were complex and needed to be discussed dispassionately and with courtesy. He thanked Professor Gooch for responding to his questions and wished to indicate his concerns by elaborating on his questions and on the answers they received. As a member of the Academic Board, he had been notified by email on September 8th of the appointment of Dr. Chun as an “associate professor (non-tenure stream)” to the Department of Physics. He wished to raise some procedural questions relating to the University's *Policy and Procedures on Academic Appointments* (May 13th, 1999).

He reminded members that the nature of faculty positions that lead to lifetime appointments at good universities was usually termed “tenure-stream” as detailed in the University's *Policy and Procedures on Academic Appointments* and not the positions as outlined in the policy concerning research associates that Professor Gooch presented. There were three features of tenured positions: 1) entry positions were openly advertised and competed for by a large pool of qualified candidates; 2) tenure was granted only if a thorough appraisal by experts in the relevant discipline was positive; and 3) both the tenure-stream competition and the granting of tenure involved judgements of academic merit and it was the department involved that played the primary role in those judgements.

He believed that, to the extent that the administration had de-emphasized the department's role in making decisions about tenure-stream appointments or how the granting of tenure would be evaluated, the administration had engaged in an abuse of academic power.

The member suggested that the main relevance of his questions arose from the fact that, in the UofT press release of September 8th, President Birgeneau represented the terms of Dr. Chun's “non-tenure stream” appointment as being “consistent with our policies on academic appointments.” The member pointed out that the statement omitted to state that the appointment was potentially lifetime and that the conditions for attaining life-time status were easier than those in a normal tenure-stream appointment. The member then read his questions and commented on each.

1. Was there any precedent at UofT for a prospective life-time appointment of the sort that had been made to Dr. Chun?

The member said that he saw no clear answer to his question in Professor Gooch's response and this caused concern lest the situation be repeated.

2. Given that tenure-stream appointments were appointments that lead, after review, to an appointment until retirement, why did the administration assert that Dr. Chun's appointment was “non-tenure stream”?

The member said that again the answer was not clear and he believed that the terms of the agreement were such as to suggest a tenure-stream appointment.

3. The policies and procedures rules required open competition for permanent positions. How was this appointment reconciled with that requirement?

The member suggested that Professor Gooch's response to this question in which he referred to the appointment as that of a research associate was not adequate. He asked with whom would Dr. Chun be associated.

4. What input, if any, did the administration obtain from the promotion and hiring committee of the Department of Physics before making its decision on the terms of this appointment?

3. Report Number 87 of the Agenda Committee (cont'd)

The member said that the response - that the then-chair talked to a few departmental members - showed a gross administrative abuse of department academic power. In his opinion, departmental input fell far short of what he hoped would be the case for future academic appointments at this University.

5. How did the review agreed upon for Dr. Chun compare with the process of evaluation laid out for tenure-stream candidates by a tenure committee that employed experts in the discipline to render its judgment about quality of publications. Dr. Chun's review (which set a criterion of producing 4 papers within 3 or 4 years) would seem to rely merely on quantity of publications.

The member said that this criterion, which would not need the time and experience of experts in the field to determine whether it had been met, set a bad precedent for academic appointments at this University.

In conclusion, the member suggested that the settlement had been entered into for social-engineering reasons of so-called diversity and the University had referred to the therapeutic function of so-called healing. The administration had forgotten that the prime function of the University was the epistemological search for truth rather than providing a place for social engineers and sociological therapists. He hoped that in future the administration would put the academic epistemological function first.

Professor Gooch referred to the report the President gave at Governing Council on this issue (September 14th), which had been posted on the University's homepage, and to the open letter the President had written to the University community that was published in the *Bulletin*. The Yip report and the finding that Dr. Chun had been exploited in his position were the only reasons on which the settlement was based. Dr. Chun was now employed by the University under the terms of the *Policy, Procedures and Terms and Conditions of Appointment for Research Associates (Limited Term) and Senior Research Associates* (policy on research associates). He agreed with everything the member had said about tenure-stream appointments, which were made under the *Policy and Procedures on Academic Appointments*. He emphasized that Dr. Chun's appointment did not fall under this policy but rather under the policy on research associates. Under that policy, senior research associates were offered continuing appointments.

A member noted his concern that the Vice-Provost's reply to the previous member's questions might leave the impression that the Department of Physics had been properly consulted and that the bypassing of its policies and procedures was merely a matter of administrative convenience. He reported that there was a strong feeling that this was not the case. He, therefore, wanted an assurance that the University's executive accepted full responsibility for this appointment.

He said that the relatively low performance requirements of the agreement had demeaned the many research associates and other scholars whose appointments, promotion and salaries were subject to the normal high standards. He had three questions:

1. Did the President fully support the actions taken by the administration relative to this appointment?
2. What actions were proposed to combat the very negative perceptions among those who continue to work and would work in the future within current University policies?
3. The exact status of Dr. Chun's position was somewhat unclear. Apparently he was appointed under the policy on research associates, but also seemed to have many of the

3. Report Number 87 of the Agenda Committee (cont'd)

privileges reserved for professorial staff. Was the appointment a well-defined academic one within the policies of the University and the Department?

In conclusion, the member had a question for the members of the Academic Board - should the Board be taking steps to mount an enquiry into the exact circumstances of the negotiation of this agreement with a view of ensuring that normal policies and procedures would not again be disregarded as they were in this case?

A member characterized the situation concerning Dr. Chun as one of miscommunication concerning the nature of the search process. He believed that Dr. Chun had not fully understood the reasons for his failure to achieve an academic appointment. In his opinion, both sides had suffered and neither had won. Some further thought about the consequences of actions and the need to better inform those who would be affected by the actions was needed. He referred to a recent example concerning the distribution of graduate support funding arising from recommendations of the Orchard task force. Some students received funding; others did not. The process was unclear. If the graduate coordinators had been consulted and asked for input, the outcome might have been better. In his opinion, communication in general needed to be better and the processes a little more open. This case has been a wake-up call that things needed to be done differently. He was unhappy to see what had occurred to his colleagues in physics and hoped that there would not be repeat occurrence.

A member noted that this issue had come many times in the past to the Academic Board but it had never been addressed as it was today. He found this disturbing. Why had the questions not been asked before? He said that reviews of the Department of Physics had raised problems and many had tried to bring these matters to the attention of the Board. Dr. Chun had been clearly exploited but no one had spoken about this at the Board. In his opinion, there had been serious irregularities in the hiring process. Diversity of opinion and culture were necessary to come to the truth. The resolution had not been speedy and he was concerned about the process of future appointments. It had been a troubling case, and he said that it had taken real courage for the administration to deal with it. He noted that the annual reports on employment equity were later items on the agenda. Lack of diversity was a continuing problem and must be addressed.

A member said that he did not see very much difference in this type of employment given to Dr. Chun and the contractually-limited term appointments. The University employed a number of people in non-tenure stream positions. These people did very good work, providing diversity in opinion, ideas, and research initiatives. These types of appointments provided the University with flexibility in employment. He had started this way at the University and he had competed for and been awarded a tenure-stream position. He hoped Dr. Chun would have the opportunity to demonstrate his abilities.

A member indicated that he was one of the members who had supported a motion to discuss the academic policies with respect to Dr. Chun's case last year. The request had been turned down. He believed that Dr. Chun had been treated unfairly. This was made clear in the Yip report. Since the Board was responsible for proper implementation of policy, the Board should have acted. He agreed with some of the remarks made by the first speaker. Negotiations should have included the Department of Physics since it had been responsible for the problem in the first instance. The democratic functions and rights of the Department had been bypassed. He believed that this had been happening increasingly. Decisions were being imposed by the administration from the top down. A further example of top down management was the distribution of chairs under the Canada Research Chairs Program.

A member re-inforced the point made previously about the normalcy of appointments. At his College, there were a number of different types of appointments where nobody fit the tenure-stream mould but all appointments were made within a well-ordered structure.

3. Report Number 87 of the Agenda Committee (cont'd)

Lecturers and senior lecturers had a kind of permanent appointment but were not in the tenure-stream. He suggested that this particular controversy was behind us and that the University should look forward. There were lessons to be learned in the implementation of the *Policy and Procedures on Academic Appointments*. With respect to the comment about truth, he suggested that the truth was found within a context, not a chosen one but an inherited context. The problem had been vexatious and difficult and it had been dealt with within a given context. It was time to move on. The context should be collegial, comfortable and free of discrimination. He realized that some of his colleagues were unhappy but, nonetheless, he hoped that they would help to create a collegial working environment for Dr. Chun or anyone else in similar circumstances.

A member agreed with the previous speaker about the complexity of the issue. He suggested that the matter had come full circle - every insult had been cast, every statement had been made and every inference had been drawn. At the end of the day there were signs that people were beginning to talk to each other across a divide. The case had been damaging to the University but there were positive signs that the University could proceed in a collegial way and move on.

The President expressed his appreciation of everyone's comments and he suggested that it was important to move on. He did not pretend that the matter had been handled perfectly. He had done his best to bring a very difficult situation to a close and he had responded to a number of difficult questions in his open letter. He regretted that he had not been more emphatic in stressing that the resolution removed any suggestion that Dr. Chun's colleagues in the Department of Physics were guilty of racism. This matter had been resolved conclusively by the decision of the Ontario Human Rights Commission not to proceed to a hearing. However, the innocence of those against whom the allegations were made needed to be underscored. He repeated his regret with respect to this point. Now it was time for Dr. Chun to return to the University community to resume his research career which would be very difficult after a six and one half years' absence. The University had provided him with the minimum conditions to resume research. He hoped that all members of the University community would support him as he started a new life.

4. "The Year Ahead" : The President's and the Provost's Address

The Chair invited the President to speak about the year ahead. The President said that he was pleased to attend his first meeting of the Academic Board and indicated that he would like to address three items. The first was enrolment growth. This would be a critical issue in the near future and had the potential to change the nature of the University. The University had been invited to submit plans to the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities for enrolment growth. The plan had been based on the document approved by Governing Council, *A Framework for Enrolment Growth*. It assumed the University would enrol the maximum number of students on the condition that it received the necessary capital and operating funding to support the growth. The University would not compromise the quality of undergraduate and graduate education by taking more students without proper financial support. The total increase would be about 14,000 students, with 3,800 on the St. George campus and the remainder split between the suburban campuses. In response to the submission, the University had then been asked to re-submit its plan, assuming no capital funding whatsoever. In a meeting with the Deputy Minister, the University had made it plain that if there were no funds, the University would not absorb more than the 3,800 students it was already committed to take. The University was asked to submit another plan for 50 percent growth. Again this was dependent on receiving full funding. The University would take more than 3,800 students only if full operating funding was provided. He thanked Professor Sedra, Professor McCammond and Mr. England for their efforts in preparing the responses.

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

The President said that enrolment growth provided not only a phenomenal challenge but also a remarkable opportunity. Because of retirements, the University would be hiring 100 new teaching staff members each year for the next five years. If the University grew by the maximum number of students, 200 new teaching staff each year would be needed to maintain the current student:staff ratio, let alone improve on it. Hiring new teaching staff was becoming increasingly competitive provincially, nationally and internationally. Competition was becoming more globalized. This brought many positive benefits but the University would have to be aggressive to maintain and improve its overall teaching staff quality and numbers over the next five years.

One of the positive developments in terms of teaching staff retention and hiring was the Canada Research Chairs program. It would provide remarkable new resources for teaching staff and research initiatives. He was very proud of the Strategic Research Plan -- it was well designed and arose from extensive consultation within the divisions. There were many exciting proposals to strengthen areas of academic excellence. In addition to the plan, the University had also submitted the first list of chair nominees. These were primarily internal candidates because of the short timeframe. There had been a number of complaints about the process but he believed these could be sorted out given time. He was very pleased with the calibre of the people proposed. He congratulated the deans, Professor Munroe-Blum and Professor Adel Sedra. The group had functioned well in producing the first response to the Chairs program. He suggested that there would be an opportunity for further input in future rounds from those who did not think that consultation had been broad enough.

The third item he raised was the new provincial task force called Investing in Students. Chaired by Ms Jalynn Bennett, the task force would identify best practices to help the universities become more efficient. The Deputy Minister had indicated that there would be one-time-only funding for worthwhile initiatives. The President suggested that the administration seek ways to contribute to the task force's deliberations and to benefit from the outcome.

The Chair invited Professor Sedra to outline the year ahead. Professor Sedra began by welcoming the new chair, vice-chair and president. This was the thirteenth year of operation for the Academic Board and, as he had said on previous occasions, he believed the Board served governance well.

It had been a very busy summer. He echoed the President's remarks about the quality of the nominees for the Canada Research Chairs and regretted that a number of people had found fault with the level of consultation. He and his colleagues had tried to involve as many as possible in the drafting of the first Strategic Research Plan. He expected that the process would improve given a longer timeframe in which to accomplish the tasks for next year.

In addition to the issues mentioned by the President, the following matters would come before the Academic Board this year:

- As a result of the *Raising Our Sights* planning process, a number of academic plans and the recommendations for budget allocations to support them would come to the Board this fall through the Planning and Budget Committee. That Committee had dealt with seven divisional plans in July, including two large divisions, Arts and Science and Applied Science and Engineering, and the recommended allocations were part of the agenda for this meeting. The remaining plans would come forward through the Planning and Budget Committee this fall and he said that the process of budget allocations for the 2000-2004 period would be completed before the end of this calendar year.

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

- Early in 2001, the Provost's Office would publish a brief paper which would assess the current planning process and inform the next one.
- The University's capital plan would be updated this year. The University was undertaking a very ambitious capital expansion program to accommodate the recent success in research activities and the projected increase in enrolment. The University was committed to taking an increase of 3,800 new students. The residence expansion plan was also being implemented.
- In the area of graduate student support, this year's budget contained \$5.2 million more for this item than last year's budget. He was very pleased and proud to be associated with the new support program that had resulted from the Orchard Task Force Report on Graduate Student Financial Support.
- An announcement about the next phase of the Campaign would be made in the next few weeks.
- The Academic Board would receive recommendations concerning the use of academic computing and new media arising from the report produced by the Thompson Task Force on Academic Computing and New Media.
- A response and recommendations concerning faculty teaching development, resulting from a report produced by colleagues at OISE/UT, would be presented to the Board.
- There were a number of accountability issues, one of which was the Report on Performance Indicators for Governance. This item appeared later on the agenda at which time he or Professor Tuohy would be pleased to answer questions. A companion report to performance indicators was the summary of academic reviews. These were being considered by the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs.

In summary, Professor Sedra said that this year would be busy and an exciting time of opportunities and renewal.

Referring to the provincial task force, a member asked whether it was at all connected to the provincial auditor, a prospect the member would find alarming. His second question concerned the new capital projects and the possibility that appropriate operating funding would not be available, thus drawing support from existing academic programs. Professor Sedra responded that with respect to the task force, it was hard to tell from the preliminary information what its exact mandate was. He personally did not believe that there was a great deal more efficiency to be found. However, the University hoped to be able to use the process to its advantage and use any resources available to improve the administration of the University. On the capital side, the decision has been made to double enrolment in Pharmacy. Funding for the capital project has been received from the SuperBuild Fund and the University was confident that proper operating funding would follow. The second commitment concerned the Centre for Communication, Culture and Information Technology at the University of Toronto at Mississauga. The increase in enrolment would be about 750 students and again the University was expecting full rather than marginal operating support for these students.

A member suggested that the administration should be cautious if the membership of the task force was composed of people from corporate settings. These individuals would have a very different perception of how to run an efficient organization that would not translate well to a university setting. Another member cautioned that beyond the membership issue, the University should be aware of how the universities were going to be rated as efficient and that an auditor's formula might not be best suited to a university enterprise.

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

Dean Amrhein spoke to the comment that the process of consultation leading up to the Strategic Research Plan for the Canada Research Chairs program was not very extensive. He disagreed. Most departments had engaged in very broad consultation. The proposals that had arisen from the Faculty of Arts and Science included multi-campus as well as multi-faculty ones. There was a great deal of discussion as the number of proposals were reduced. Although the process was time compressed, consultation was a major part of the process. Indeed, many departmental chairs had lost their holiday time. The next round of preparation for the chairs program would be not be as constrained. He was proud that broad based consultation was a tradition of the Faculty of Arts and Science.

**5. Budget: Administrative Priorities Fund and Administrative Transitional Fund - Allocations
(arising from Report Number 63 of the Planning and Budget Committee)**

Professor Mock explained that one of the roles of the Planning and Budget Committee was to consider allocations from a number of designated funds created in the Budget Report, in this case the Administrative Priorities Fund and the Administrative Transitional Fund. The allocations proposed were for three Vice-Presidential offices, Internal Audit, the Governing Council Secretariat and the Archives and Record Management Systems. The funding would cover such items as costs for the new vice-presidential office, Administrative Management Systems hardware and software, a new document management system for the Governing Council Office, and base support for the GRIP office which provided help in preparing applications to granting agencies for research infrastructure grants.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the following allocations from the Administrative Priorities Fund (AdPF) and the Administrative Transition Fund (AdTF) be approved:

(i) Office of the Vice-President, Government and Institutional Relations: \$295,000 in base from the AdPF and \$100,000 OTO from the AdTF;

(ii) Internal Audit: \$8,809 in base from the AdPF and \$35,000 OTO from the AdTF;

(iii) Office of the Vice-President, Administration and Human Resources: \$858,000 in base from the AdPF and \$705,000 OTO from the AdTF;

(iv) Office of the Vice-President, Research and International Relations: \$553,057 in base from the AdPF and \$460,000 OTO from the AdTF;

(v) Office of the Governing Council: \$108,650 in base from the AdPF and \$217,100 OTO from the AdTF; and

(vi) University of Toronto Archives and Record Management System (UTARMS): \$110,000 OTO from the AdTF.

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

6. Budget: Academic Priorities Fund - Allocations
(arising from Report Number 63 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Mock said that one of the main purposes of meeting in the summer had been to spend a dedicated block of time reviewing academic plans which had been drafted in response to the *Raising Our Sights* planning document. The second part of the process had been to consider the Provost's recommendations for allocations from the Academic Priorities Fund (A.P.F.) to support the implementation of the plans. The Committee had received documentation summarizing the individual academic plans as well as tables outlining the funding requests from the divisions and the Provost's recommendations. The Dean of each of the academic divisions had been present to comment on the plans and to respond to questions.

The recommendations for A.P.F. allocations concerned two major faculties - Arts and Science, and Applied Science and Engineering - and a number of smaller faculties - Social Work, Music, Forestry and Architecture, Landscape and Design - plus several small units or programs. Although this group represented 50% of the relevant base budget of the academic divisions, only 40% of the A.P.F. was being recommended for allocation at this time to leave flexibility for future allocations. The Provost would bring forward other recommendations this fall for allocations to the health science faculties, the colleges, OISE/UT and Management.

A member noted that there had been no graduate student input on this matter at the Committee's meeting and that material had arrived too close to the meeting to allow enough time to review the allocations. He pointed to the absence of any allocations in support of improving physical accessibility, which he characterized as essential. He would, therefore, vote against the motion.

On a 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
Arts & Science	\$8,000,000	\$4,100,000
Comparative Literature	98,000	10,000
Medieval Studies	159,640	157,680
Engineering	3,332,712	1,650,000
Social Work	181,250	60,000
Music	416,825	600,000
Architecture	396,894	836,363
Forestry	172,188	25,000
TYP	171,250	
Ethnocultural Academic Initiatives Fund		600,000
International Student Exchange Office	145,000	
Total	Base: \$13,073,759	OTO: \$8,039,043

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

7. **Woodsworth College: Discontinuation of Diploma and Certificate Programs**
(arising from Report Number 63 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Another role of the Planning and Budget Committee was to consider the disestablishment of programs, particularly the resource implications. In this case, Woodsworth College proposed the discontinuation of three certificate programs and one diploma program. Student demand in all of these programs had been declining. Degree programs in criminology had been introduced and student demand for these programs was increasing. The College was continuing to explore with the Rotman School of Management ways of better meeting the needs of students currently in the certificate program in business. Lastly, discussions about the possibility of upgrading the diploma program in gerontology to a master's level program had not been successful. It was with regret that the College proposed closing the diploma program. In total, there would be a loss of tuition fee revenue amounting to \$187,000 relative to 1999-2000 level.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the following Woodsworth College programs be discontinued:

Certificate Program in Business
Certificate Program in Criminology
Certificate Program in Law Enforcement and Administration, and
Diploma Program in Gerontology.

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

8. **School of Graduate Studies: Discontinuation of M.H.Sc. Program in Clinical Biochemistry**
(arising from Report Number 63 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Mock reported that the decision to recommend discontinuation of this program was based on academic reasons, following an internal review. The reasons were laid out in Professor McCammond's memorandum. The Department intended to increase doctoral enrolment and focus on the M.Sc. and Ph.D. programs. Total loss of tuition fee revenue would be about \$65,000.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the M.H.Sc. program in Clinical Biochemistry in the Department of Laboratory Medicine and Pathobiology be discontinued.

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

9. Items for Information**(a) Report of the Vice-President and Provost****(i) Performance Indicators**

Professor Sedra said that this report had been presented to Governing Council at its meeting on September 14th and a copy had been included in the agenda package. There would be no presentation but he was happy to answer questions.

A member recalled that there had been some concern that the provincial government had used student retention data and degree completion statistics to determine the eligibility of a university for funding. Professor Sedra said that last year, the government had distributed a portion of its operating funding to the universities on the basis of key performance indicators such as graduation rates. The amount of funding involved was about one percent of the University's base budget or \$3 million. He believed the government would continue this practice of using indicators but the government had admitted that the process it had used had been less than satisfactory. To its credit, it had established a committee to review the matter and Mr. England was a member of that committee. Mr. England said that government representatives were fully engaged in discussions with representatives of the Council of Ontario Universities. He hoped there would be a better mechanism next year to distribute this small envelope of funding. He also hoped that the total amount of funding in the envelope would not be expanded at the expense of other envelopes and that it would remain comparatively small.

A member noted that there were performance indicators to measure how many students entered first year, how many graduate and how many get jobs. What he did not see was any indication of the value added to the students' education. Were there any such indicators or plans to create such measures? Could the University conduct exit polls of its graduates to ask to what extent the teaching and faculty contributed to their learning experience? Professor Tuohy responded that this question had been raised a number of times. It was an excellent suggestion to include such questions in student surveys and she was working with the Vice-Provost, Students, to develop instruments to do that. Value-added information was, however, very difficult to obtain. Data on the level of satisfaction with the educational experience was a great deal easier to collect. The suggestion would continue to be discussed.

Professor Marrus reported that the School of Graduate Studies would be launching an exit survey of all doctoral graduates to gather their views on the educational process. While the survey would be a useful planning tool, the results would not lend themselves to tabular reporting of performance indicators.

A member referred to the data on acceptance rates on page 3 and noted that the offer rate for the University of Toronto at Mississauga (U.T.M.) was 82 percent while the offer rate for St. George was 64 percent. He asked Professor Tuohy to comment on the difference. Professor Tuohy said that a difference in the offer rate - the number of offers made as a percentage of applications received - was of somewhat less importance than the yield rate - the number of students who registered as a percentage of the number of offers made. U.T.M.'s yield rate was slightly lower but she suggested that as the campus built critical mass and developed distinctive programs, this number would rise. She believed the establishment of the new bachelor of business administration at Scarborough, for example, had had a positive effect.

A member noted that the offer rate in 1997-98 at U.T.M. was over 100 percent. Professor Tuohy explained that some students had applied to the St. George campus but had been referred to and accepted by U.T.M.

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

A member suggested that a discussion of performance indicators was peculiar in the context of a liberal education. How did one measure a liberal education? He said that during discussion of the performance indicators at the Governing Council, issues of the percentage of visible minorities, diversity and accessibility were raised. In terms of who could attend the University, increasing non-OSAP debt rates were an important factor that affected accessibility. This information was not part of the report on performance indicators.

(ii) Enrolment Growth

Professor Sedra noted that this item had been reported on by the President in his remarks.

(iii) Calendar of Business

Professor Sedra noted that he had touched on a number of matters coming to the Board under his remarks earlier.

- (iv) Appointments and Status Changes
- (v) Appointment of Professors Emeriti
- (vi) Post-65 Appointments

These items were presented for information. There were no questions.

(b) Employment Equity Reports 1997-98 and 1998-99

A member said that he had several questions which he had given to the Provost before the meeting. The first concerned the declining rate of response to the surveys. He asked for a comment on the reason for this decline and why the University believed that it led to an under estimation of minorities. The next question focused on the visible minority classification. He asked whom it included and who had made the decision about its composition. Professor Tuohy responded that in the matter of the definition of visible minorities, the University followed the practice of federal contractors legislation not to define the term but to leave the definition to the respondents themselves. There had been an opportunity to check the reliability of the responses by comparing the original survey results of 1995 against data about those people now in the senior ranks obtained from the chairs' surveys. The results were close. The discrepancy was in the junior ranks and among new appointments where the response rate had dropped. This meant there was a less comprehensive data base. The sense that the number of self-identified visible minorities was lower than actual came from a brief review of the names on the files of the new hires and was confirmed by the chairs' survey. In response to the member's question, Professor Tuohy had no grounds for speculating why the faculty did not respond to the survey.

A member referred to the single page containing two tables and a graph which he had distributed to members just prior to the meeting. He believed that the numbers spoke for themselves. Over the last ten years, the University had not made any progress in increasing the percentage of visible minorities in the faculty. If 15 percent of new hires were visible minorities, it would take 39 years to make visible minorities 15 percent of the total number of faculty. The University had, however, had considerable success in improving gender equity. Governing Council's role was to implement policy. Part of the Employment Equity Policy stated that the University would set goals consistent with the Policy and timetables and plans for achieving them. The member urged the Academic Board to take responsibility to ensure that the Policy was implemented. Unless some action was taken he suggested that in ten

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

(b) Employment Equity Reports 1997-98 and 1998-99 (cont'd)

years' time another person would stand up and say exactly the same thing - no progress has been made.

Professor Sedra believed that the University was making some progress, albeit slowly. Last year's data showed that 19 percent of new tenure/tenure-stream faculty appointments were visible minorities. Of the last 100 hires, 29 percent were visible minorities. It would take a while to make a sizable change in the faculty at large. With renewal and the large number of new hires expected each year for the next five years, he was confident there would be an appreciable difference.

A member suggested that if visible minorities were not defined, there was no way to tell if individuals had been misidentified. He suggested that placing emphasis on visible minorities was a different way to discriminate against another group of people. He used the National Basketball Association as an example and wondered what would happen if there was a program to remove discrimination against white and oriental people. He suggested that the University was working to eliminate a problem that was not a real problem.

The President said that excellence was the only criterion to be used in hiring new people. He believed that by focusing on excellence and finding the best possible candidates the employment equity problem would resolve itself. If excellence was the criterion, the University would achieve a diverse faculty.

A member remembered that he had spoken to Archbishop Tutu after he had received his honorary degree in Hart House's Great Hall. Archbishop Tutu had remarked that there were no pictures of visible minorities. The member noted that there were none in the Council Chamber either. He suggested that this matter could not be properly discussed at this time. It should be the central item on a future agenda. He noted that 37 percent of the faculty were women when they made up 50 percent of the population. Why was this good news? He would like to see data on salaries by groups. There were problems with the reports in terms of methodology. He said there were decreasing numbers of visible minorities, especially at the full professor level. The number of faculty members with disabilities was also decreasing. He raised the issue of what he perceived to be inadequate funding for physical accessibility projects. He knew graduate students who had left the University because of accessibility issues. He urged the Board to have a discussion of these matters.

A member gave notice of motion that the Academic Board recommend to the Governing Council that the Employment Equity Policy, dated March 28, 1991, be rescinded.

Pierre Elliott Trudeau

Professor Sedra announced that he had just received word that the Right Honourable Pierre Elliott Trudeau had just passed away. The members stood for a minute of silence in his memory.

(c) Items for Information in Reports Number 81 and 82 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs

Professor Gallop drew attention to the Strategic Research Plan for the Canada Research Chairs Program which had been discussed at the August meeting and was attached to Report Number 81.

9. Items for Information (cont'd)

- (c) Items for Information in Reports Number 81 and 82 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs (cont'd)

She also noted that Report Number 82 contained a number of recommendations that would come forward to the Board. However, the Planning and Budget Committee must review the resource implications of the programs before they could be considered by the Board. She asked members to keep this report and bring it forward for the next meeting.

- (d) Items for Information in Reports Number 62 and 63 of the Planning and Budget Committee

Professor Mock referred members to the lengthy discussion of the residence capital projects for Woodsworth College and the University of Toronto at Scarborough in Report Number 63. These items had been approved under Governing Council's Summer Executive Authority.

- (e) Reports Number 247 to 250 of the Academic Appeals Committee

There were no questions on these reports.

- (f) Report on Approvals under Summer Executive Authority

I. Academic Administrative Appointments

The following academic administrative appointments were approved under the Board's summer executive authority:

Faculty of Arts and Science

Professor Pekka Sinervo

Vice-Dean from September 1, 2000 to June 30, 2003

School of Graduate Studies

Institute for Environmental Studies

Professor Rodney White

Director from July 1, 2000 to June 30, 2005

Institute of Medical Science

Professor Ori D. Rotstein

Acting Director from July 1, 2000 to December 31, 2000

Faculty of Medicine

Department of Anatomy and Cell Biology

Professor Jane Aubin

Chair from July 1, 2000 to June 30, 2001 or until approval of the merger of the Department of Anatomy (Cell Biology) with another cognate department, whichever comes first (extension of appointment)

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

(f) Report on Approvals under Summer Executive Authority (cont'd)

New College

Professor Michael Dixon

Vice-Principal from July 1, 2000 to June 30, 2002

OISE/UT

Institute of Child Study

Professor Richard Volpe and
Professor Angela Hildyard

Acting Co-directors from July 1, 2000 until
the appointment of a new director is made.

II. Other Matters

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

(a) Academic Board and its Committees

Effective Date for Appointment of Planning and Budget Committee Members, 2000-01

THAT the effective date for the appointment of members of the Planning and Budget Committee for 2000-2001 be amended from September 1, 2000 to July 1, 2000.

(b) Items from Planning and Budget Committee July 25th meeting

Capital Project: Woodsworth College Student Residence - Users' Committee Report

(i) THAT the Users' Committee Report for the Woodsworth College Student Residence (dated 18 July, 2000), a copy of which is attached to Report Number 63 of the Planning and Budget Committee as Appendix "B", proposing a 14,000 gross square meter building on site 26 on the St. George Campus, be approved in principle;

(ii) THAT the project cost of \$27 million be approved;

(iii) THAT the sources of funding, a 25-year mortgage to be repaid from residence fees and an allocation from the Academic Priorities Fund, be approved; and

(iv) THAT base funding of up to \$1,024,000 per year be allocated from the Academic Priorities Fund to Woodsworth College for a period of 8 years, the allocation to be reviewed at that time.

Capital Project: University of Toronto at Scarborough Student Residence (Phase 4) - Users' Committee Report

(i) THAT the Users' Committee Report for the Scarborough College Student Residence (dated 11 July, 2000), a copy of which is attached to Report Number 63 of the Planning and Budget Committee as Appendix "C", proposing a 7,558 gross square meter building on the Scarborough Campus be approved in principle;

9. Items for Information (cont'd)

- (f) Report on Approvals under Summer Executive Authority (cont'd)
- (ii) THAT the project cost of \$13.7 million be approved;
 - (iii) THAT the sources of funding, a 25-year mortgage to be repaid from residence fees and an allocation from the Academic Priorities Fund, be approved; and
 - (iv) THAT base funding of up to \$204,000 per year be allocated from the Academic Priorities Fund to Scarborough College for a period of 8 years, the allocation to be reviewed at that time.

(c) Item from Committee on Academic Policy and Programs August 29th meeting

Canada Research Chairs: Strategic Research Plan

THAT the Canada Research Chairs Strategic Research Plan, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 81 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs as Appendix "A", be approved.

(g) Quarterly Report on Donations May 1st - July 31st, 2000

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

10. Date of Next Meeting

The Chair noted that the next regular meeting of the Board would be held on November 16th, 2000.

11. Other Business

A member gave notice of motion that the Academic Board establish a task force to review its current policies, to solicit the input of the university community and to forward recommendation that would ensure that the mandate for diversity and equity at the University of Toronto was realized.

(Secretary's Note: This motion was given to the Secretary several days after the meeting. The Chair had given the member additional time to formulate it. The member had also submitted details of the proposed terms of reference and membership of the task force, which information was given to the Agenda Committee for their consideration of the item.)

The Board moved into closed session.

12. Academic Administrative Appointments

The following academic administrative appointments were approved:

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

Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering

Division of Environmental Engineering

Professor Bryan W. Karney Acting Chair from July 1, 2000 to
December 31, 2000

Faculty of Arts and Science

Department of Physics

Professor Henry M. van Driel Acting Chair from September 1, 2000 to
June 30, 2001

University College

Professor David Rayside Acting Principal from January 1, 2001 to
June 30, 2001

For Information:

Professor Sedra drew attention to the appointment of Professor Douglas Bradley as Director of the Centre for Sleep and Chronobiology. His term would begin July 1, 2000 and continue to June 30, 2005.

13. **Report of the Striking Committee**

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT Mr. Robert Foote be appointed a member of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs for 2000-2001, effective immediately.

The meeting adjourned at 6:20 p.m.

Secretary
October 2nd, 2000

Chair