

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO  
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

REPORT NUMBER 102 OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD

November 16th, 2000

To the Governing Council,  
University of Toronto.

Your Board reports that it held a meeting on Thursday, November 16th, 2000 at 4:15 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall. An attendance list is attached to this report. In this report, items 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9 are recommended to Governing Council for approval, items 11 and 12 are presented for Executive Committee confirmation and the remaining items are reported for information.

1. **Report of the Previous Meeting**

The report of the previous meeting, dated September 28th, 2000, was approved.

2. **Business Arising**

A member expressed his disagreement with the Secretary's note concerning the distribution of material to the Academic Board for a matter that was defeated in a committee. He noted that the Planning and Budget Committee, at its meeting on November 14th, 2000, had received a status report on physical accessibility to buildings and asked if it could be made available to Board members. On a second point, the member indicated that levels of non-OSAP support were not insignificant as reported; the average Scotia loan according to his information was \$9,000. (Secretary's Note - There is no comment in the report of the previous meeting referring to non-OSAP loans as insignificant. The number given by the member, \$9,000, refers only to students in the Faculty of Dentistry. For full details concerning student support, members should consult the annual report from the Vice-Provost, Students on student financial support.)

3. **Report Number 88 of the Agenda Committee**

The Chair noted that the Committee had dealt with two notices of motion made during the September meeting and an additional motion two members had submitted after the Board meeting. After consideration, the Committee had decided to put none of the motions on the agenda of the Academic Board. The reasons were laid out in the report.

The mover of one notice of motion said that he had not been notified that he could submit supporting documentation to the Agenda Committee. The Chair apologized for that oversight and said that the Committee would revisit his notice of motion if he wished to make a submission. The mover of the second notice of motion said that he had "tabled" his motion and wished at this time to "reactivate" it. He was concerned that the decision to not bring the motion forward had been made at the Agenda Committee. He said that the merit of the motion should be discussed in this forum. The Chair noted that the by-law stipulated that the Agenda Committee dealt with notices of motion. This the Committee had done. He said that the member could challenge the disposition of his motion or he could gather the signatures of ten percent of the members of the Board and present this request at a meeting of the Board. The motion would automatically appear on the agenda of the next regular Board meeting.

3. **Report Number 88 of the Agenda Committee** (cont'd)

The movers of the third motion submitted a request, signed by ten percent of the Board members, at the meeting and the following motion would appear on the agenda of the next regular meeting of the Board:

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 report was received for information.

4. **Capital Project: Bahen Centre for Information Technology: Change in Scope**  
(arising from Report Number 64 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Mock said that an expanded scope was proposed for the new Bahen Centre for Information Technology project, originally approved one year ago. There were two aspects to the recommendation. First, it was proposed to add 1,900 net assignable square metres to the project in the form of a shelled-in sixth floor. The University would be taking full advantage of the space permitted by City of Toronto zoning and would ameliorate a growing shortage of research space. The \$5.2-million cost was expected to be paid by future grants for research infrastructure from the Canada Foundation for Innovation and the Ontario Research and Development Challenge Fund. Until then, it was recommended that an allocation from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund be approved.

Second, it was proposed to expand the project to provide chiller facilities not only for the Bahen Building but also for a number of surrounding buildings including Chemistry and Physics, and a possible new building on the site of the present Faculty of Nursing. The existing chillers were now thirty years old. Their recommended service life was twenty-seven years. By combining the replacements, and building in room for additional capacity in the future, the University would achieve real savings in both construction and operating costs. The additional cost of the chiller plant was \$2.27-million, to be funded from the Government of Ontario's Facilities Renewal Program.

There were also two other factors that had increased the cost of the project. First, the University had decided to complete the project using sequential tenders (rather than a general contract) in order to get the building up quickly. Using sequential tenders meant that the University bore the inflation in construction costs, between one-half and three-quarters of a percent per month at present. The eventual cost of the inflation escalation was estimated to be \$4-million.

Finally, in the course of detailed design, it had become apparent that there would be need for more gross space to accommodate the building program. The site was a complex one, including the historically designated house at 44 St. George Street, and the net to gross space ratio had declined from the usual one for most other campus buildings. That would cost an additional \$5.02-million.

Professor Mock explained that these additional costs - the added gross space and the inflationary increase - were being assigned to the occupants of the building, the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering, and the Faculty of Arts and Science. Those Faculties were seeking to raise \$21.75-million in private funding for their share of the cost. As a back-up, that amount would be financed, with the two Faculties being responsible for the costs of debt service. Every effort was being made to secure donations to cover the cost. The President had announced the extension of the Campaign, and funding for this project would be given appropriate priority. In addition, the Association of College and Universities of Canada and the University of Toronto had been working with the Government of Canada to secure funding for the indirect costs of its funded

4. **Capital Project: Bahen Centre for Information Technology: Change in Scope**  
(cont'd)

research. The Ontario Government was already providing for the overhead costs for the research it funded. If the additional federal funding materialized, part of it could, with the agreement of this Board, be used to cover any funding shortfall for the Bahen Centre.

A member noted that the Board had seen a number of similar motions in recent months regarding new buildings while physical accessibility in older buildings was not being addressed. The member gave notice of motion that \$5.2 million be allocated to the physical accessibility initiative.

Professor Sedra pointed out that an item that appeared later on the agenda, the Ontario SuperBuild Renewal Program/Ontario Facility Renewal Fund/Accommodation and Facilities Directorate Infrastructure Plan for 2000-2001, contained projects that addressed this issue.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

- (i) THAT the revised scope of the Centre for Information Technology of 19,300 net assignable square meters (nasm) be approved;
- (ii) THAT the revised project cost of \$104.63-million and the revised funding sources, outlined in Professor McCammond's memorandum of October 10, 2000, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "A", be approved; and
- (iii) THAT an allocation of a \$5.197-million from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund to construct 1,900 nasm of shelled space, be approved.

5. **Capital Project: New College Residence Expansion - Users' Committee Report**  
(arising from Report Number 64 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Mock said that the Committee had considered the Users' Committee Report for New College Residence Expansion. It was proposed that the new residence, to be situated on the south-east corner of Willcocks and Spadina, would house 280 students and seven dons. The expected cost of the residence was just over \$22 million. The funding would include \$750,000 provided by New College from the reserve built up from the existing residence operation, a 25-year mortgage and an allocation from the Academic Priorities Fund (A.P.F.) of up to \$352,000 a year for a period of eight years. The allocation from the A.P.F. was designed to keep the residence fees at a reasonable level while carrying the mortgage.

He noted that the members had asked a number of questions concerning the determination of fees, the funding and the use of ancillary revenue and he referred members to the report of the meeting.

A member said that he accepted the notion that increased residence capacity was needed to improve the academic experience. However, he had three concerns with the residence projects on the agenda, not just with the New College proposal. First, he was opposed to using A.P.F. money on capital projects. He believed the A.P.F. should be used to support all facets of academic programs and support services such as the library. At Erindale, the funds flowed in the reverse direction and the surplus funds from the ancillaries were used to support the library. His second concern centred on the location of residence expansion. He believed that the St. George campus was slated to grow minimally and the suburban campuses were expected to grow by 50 percent. However, two new residences were proposed for St. George and a third project was still with the

5. **Capital Project: New College Residence Expansion - Users' Committee Report**  
(cont'd)

Users' Committee and was expected shortly. Finally, he noted the difference in resources being proposed for the St. George campus as compared to the funding available for the suburban campuses. He could not comprehend the sense of this plan. His last comment was that U.T.M. students would pay more in fees.

Professor Sedra said that he was not aware of the background concerning the member's last comment but he undertook to investigate any inequity in fees. Professor Browne explained that the fees that had been proposed to support the business plan and the proposed financing of the construction were proposals. Once the tenders were in and again when construction was underway, a better idea of an appropriate fee would be available. In the end, the University Affairs Board would approve the fee once the mortgage had been arranged and all costs were known. He also noted that there was a range in residences fees charged on the St. George campus.

Professor Sedra responded to the member's earlier point about the appropriateness of using A.P.F. money for residences. He personally believed that living in residence added to a rich academic experience. The funding from the A.P.F. was a relatively modest sum. He noted that New College, too, had used funding from its summer business to support its library. Of course, New College would no longer be able to continue this practice since, in the first instance, all surplus funding would have to be put toward retiring the mortgage. As a last point, he said that it cost less to build in Mississauga.

Principal McNutt noted that Erindale put its summer conference earnings toward supporting the library. He said that residence expansion was moving more quickly than in the past when the College had had five or six years between residence phases to build a surplus to help fund the next phase. Because of the accelerated residence expansion program it was no longer possible to build a surplus. Principal Clandfield noted that New College transferred only surplus summer income to the operating budget.

A member suggested that if a subsidy was provided from a central fund, all students should be eligible to benefit from the increased residence spaces.

At the end of the meeting, Professor Sedra reported that the matter of the Erindale fee had been looked into and it was found that the proposed fee at Erindale was \$9 more per month. He took the matter under advisement.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

**YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS**

- (i) THAT the Users' Committee Report of the New College Student Residence Expansion, proposing a 11,355 gross square meter building on site 5 of the St. George Campus, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "B", be approved in principle;
- (ii) THAT the project cost of \$22,400,880 be approved;
- (iii) THAT the sources of funding, \$750,000 from New College, and a 25-year mortgage for the remainder to be repaid from residence fees and an allocation from the Academic Priorities Fund, be approved; and
- (iv) THAT the base funding of up to \$352,000 be allocated from the Academic Priorities Fund to New College for a period of eight years, the allocation to be reviewed at that time.

6. **Capital Project: University of Toronto at Mississauga Residence Phase 7 - Users' Committee Report**  
(arising from Report Number 63 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Mock said that this was the seventh residential project for the UofT at Mississauga. It provided an additional 192 spaces for undergraduate students. Unlike the New College Residence, which incorporated dormitory-style residences, Phase 7 would continue the suite-style accommodation implemented in Phase 6. For this project, the increased costs of construction and the absence of a reserve in the ancillary for a down-payment would produce unacceptably high room rates. The University had, therefore, proposed to subsidize the ancillary until the planned break-even point in eight years. He said that continuing members would recall that an allocation from the A.P.F. for this purpose had been incorporated into the *Budget Report* for 2000-01.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

- (i) THAT the Users' Committee Report of the University of Toronto at Mississauga (U.T.M.) Student Residence proposing a 7278 gross square meter building on the U.T.M. Campus, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "C", be approved in principle;
- (ii) THAT the project cost of \$14,059,095 be approved;
- (iii) THAT the sources of funding, \$40,000 from the Parking Ancillary, and a 25-year mortgage for the remainder to be repaid from residence fees and an allocation from the Academic Priorities Fund, be approved; and
- (iv) THAT the base funding of up to \$100,000 be allocated from the Academic Priorities Fund to U.T.M. for a period of 8 years, the allocation to be reviewed at that time.

7. **Capital Project: OISE/UT and University of Toronto Schools at 371 Bloor Street West - Users' Committee Report**  
(arising from Report Number 64 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Mock explained that this was a proposal for renovations to 371 Bloor Street West, the home to OISE/UT and the University of Toronto Schools (U.T.S.). Also housed at 371 Bloor Street West was the University's Department of Sociology. The Users' Committee has recommended a plan that would accommodate the planned enrolment increase for U.T.S. (from 450 to 624 students by September, 2001) and the current needs of the OISE/UT programs. The project was designed to improve and modernize the building in addition to providing the appropriate quantity of space needed to accommodate the increased enrolment. The project cost has been estimated at \$23.24 million, with some \$2.5 million required for the chiller plant, electrical substation and related costs. It was proposed that the University provide \$3.5 million from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund (U.I.I.F.). U.T.S. proposed to raise \$16 million for the project. OISE/UT would provide the remaining \$3.74 million.

Professor Mock noted that the discussion at the Planning and Budget Committee focused on the University's relationship with U.T.S. and in particular the level of academic integration between U.T.S. and OISE/UT.

Professor Sedra said that U.T.S. was a division of OISE/UT and he asked Dean Fullan to elaborate on the relationship. Dean Fullan said that U.T.S. was part and parcel of OISE/UT. It was a laboratory school and there were three ways in which its mandate was carried out. In the first instance, there were a series of relationships having to do with the placement of student

7. **Capital Project: OISE/UT and University of Toronto Schools at 371 Bloor Street West - Users' Committee Report** (cont'd)

teachers, cross-appointed faculty and curriculum innovation projects. Secondly and more broadly, U.T.S. provided a source of excellent applicants to the University and was a basis for outreach to the public. Lastly, there was a connection with the public school system through which public school teachers, on a half-time basis, worked with U.T.S. and OISE/UT teaching staff on curriculum renewal. The new principal, Ms Newnham, came from the public school system.

A member said that he would not speak against the project itself but he was concerned with a subsidy being given to a unit, in this case U.T.S., that was not part of the academic mission of the University. In his opinion, U.T.S. was a private high school and any allocation given to it diverted funding from the academic enterprise. It was misguided. He noted that the School did not receive funding from the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities. With respect to the athletics facilities mentioned in the Users' Committee Report, he noted that the renovation included a second pool. He said that there was no pool at all at the University of Toronto at Mississauga (U.T.M.) for its 6,000 students. U.T.M.'s gym was comparable to a high school facility. He was concerned about the divergence of priorities across the campuses as highlighted by this project. A second member echoed the final remark, noting that facilities at the Scarborough campus were not air conditioned and it too lacked a pool. She agreed that the relationship between a public university and a private school needed to be re-evaluated.

A member from OISE/UT said that the building was in bad repair and had had no work done on it for a number of years. With respect to the relationship between the School and OISE/UT, she said that there was an innovative teacher education program where student teachers spend two days a week at U.T.S. as their practicum placement. She believed that it did address and meet the academic mission of the University. Another member said that the project should be considered on its merits, namely that U.T.S. was a necessary part of the academic mission of OISE/UT. An argument about the relative condition of various buildings on campus would not be fruitful.

A member said that the appropriateness of the allocation turned on the relationship between U.T.S. and OISE/UT. If U.T.S. in fact provided a research facility for OISE/UT, then the proposal was reasonable and should be supported. If U.T.S. was a primarily a high school, then he had the same difficulty in supporting the motions as the earlier speaker.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

- (i) THAT the Users' Committee Report of the University of Toronto Schools and OISE/UT at 371 Bloor Street West, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "D", be approved in principle;
- (ii) THAT the project cost of \$23,240,000 be approved and that implementation begin when the private funding has been raised;
- (iii) THAT \$3.5-million be allocated from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund when the private funding has been raised.

8. **Budget: University Infrastructure Investment Fund - Allocation to Faculty of Architecture, Landscape, and Design Building , Phase 3 Renovations**  
(arising from Report Number 64 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Mock recalled that in 1998, the Governing Council approved the Users' Committee Report for the then School of Architecture and Landscape Architecture. That

8. **Budget: University Infrastructure Investment Fund - Allocation to Faculty of Architecture, Landscape, and Design Building , Phase 3 Renovations** (cont'd)

Report recommended renovations, estimated at just under \$10 million, to be implemented using a phased approach as funding became available. Implementation of the first 2 phases, renovations to the library and faculty offices, had also been approved. He noted that the Provost had placed a high priority on completing the project and had agreed, in the response to the Faculty's academic plan, to match private donations towards the cost of the renovations. The Faculty has acquired additional private funding and wished to proceed with the third phase of the project -- renovation of the exhibition hall and the installation of bay windows -- at a cost of \$690,000.

A member asked for a description of the first two phases of the renovation. He also understood that the building was not accessible and asked if this would be addressed in the planned renovation.

Professor Sampson, a teaching staff member from the Faculty, explained that the first phase had included renovations to administrative offices and the relocation of the library. The second phase had seen the creation of a new computing facility to support design studies. The third phase proposed the renovation of the exhibition hall and installation of bay windows. This renovation would largely complete the changes to the ground floor. Professor Sedra noted once again that the infrastructure plan for 2000-001, the next item on the agenda, contained an allocation of \$260,000 to make the building accessible. Professor Sampson explained that there was an elevator in the building but it was not accessible from the ground floor. This would be corrected and all four floors and parts of the fifth would be accessible. Changes to make the fifth floor completely accessible would be done at a later date.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT \$345,000 be allocated from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund for Phase 3 renovations to the Faculty of Architecture, Landscape, and Design building.

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

9. **Ontario SuperBuild Renewal Program/Ontario Facilities Renewal Fund /Accommodation and Facilities Directorate Infrastructure Plan for 2000-2001** (arising from an oral report of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Mock said that unlike the previous items, this proposal had been considered by the Planning and Budget Committee only two days ago. Normally, it would have been brought to the January meeting of the Board, along with the written report of the Committee's meeting. However, there was some urgency to implementing some of the projects contained in the infrastructure plan and it was, therefore, being fast-tracked.

This integrated facilities renewal program addressed the University's priorities for deferred maintenance, classroom upgrades, disabled access and space alterations and modernizations. There were four sources of funding totaling just over \$12 million:

- the SuperBuild Renewal Program;
- the Ontario Facilities Renewal Fund;
- the Accommodation and Facilities Directorate Operating Budget for this year plus prior year project savings; and
- additional funding contributed by divisions for specific projects.

9. **Ontario SuperBuild Renewal Program/Ontario Facilities Renewal Fund**  
**/Accommodation and Facilities Directorate Infrastructure Plan for 2000-2001**  
(cont'd)

The recommended slate of projects was a combination of the Accommodation and Facilities Directorate's own initial review and divisional priorities.

- Funding for the federated and affiliated institutions was being provided based on the same criteria used to allocate government funding between Ontario's universities. These institutions would select their own projects within Ministry eligibility requirements.
- At the UofT at Scarborough, projects included various repairs, upgrades to classrooms and research labs, as well as an improved campus communications network.
- At the UofT at Mississauga, projects included facility improvements at its main academic building and repair of its utility plant, including the upgrade of the cooling tower and air conditioning chiller.
- St. George Campus projects included plant renewal and deferred maintenance, space alterations and modernizations, upgrades to classrooms and libraries and various wheelchair access initiatives. With respect to the latter initiative, funding was also provided from the Students' Administrative Council.

In response to a member's question, Professor McCammond pointed out that page 2 of his memorandum, in the table at the top, showed that \$438,000 would be spent on disabled access projects on the St. George Campus. On the last page of Schedule A, there was a further \$60,000 (\$30,000 each from A.F.D. and SAC) for disabled access projects across the campuses; the projects would be chosen in consultation with SAC. The member noted that the Banting and Best Institutes were not accessible and that several years ago a lecturer had been unable to give his lecture because he could not enter the building. Professor McCammond said that any building was eligible to be chosen for funding for accessibility projects. On the basis of the recent status report on physical accessibility to buildings which was prepared by Miss Oliver and presented to the Planning and Budget Committee earlier this week, those projects in the infrastructure plan were considered to be the highest priorities.

A member indicated that he had not seen the report referred to but he asked if it contained a list of buildings. The Chair said that the Board was making a decision on those projects currently before it and he undertook to send the member a copy of the report. The member said that the list was important to provide context for making the decisions concerning priority. Another member noted that this report provided a snapshot of projects for this year. He emphasized that the work was ongoing. This year, for example, his College would continue to work on bringing doors up to accessibility standards. In response to a question, the member said that there was not a timetable but that completion of all necessary projects would take a number of years.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

**YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS**

THAT Schedule A to Professor McCammond's memorandum of October 26, 2000, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "F", for allocations totaling \$12,062,110 be recommended for approval as the University's SRP/OFRF/AFD Infrastructure Plan for 2000-01.



**10. Degrees: Faculty of Law - Honours Designation on Diplomas**

In the Dean's absence, Professor Tuohy introduced the proposal to have honours standing added to the parchments of graduating law students, where appropriate. She noted that similar requests had been approved for other faculties in the past.

A number of questions were raised which could not be resolved in the absence of a representative from the Faculty of Law. These included the following:

- why was honours standing being added to the diploma instead of "summa cum laude" which might be considered more appropriate with the change to a J.D. degree?
- do the students support the change and the idea of a "label" on the diploma?
- what does honours standing mean?

It was duly moved and seconded,

THAT debate on this item be adjourned.

The motion was carried.

**11. Degrees: Faculty of Dentistry - Specialty Designation on M.Sc. Diplomas**

Professor Tuohy introduced this item from the Faculty, noting that normally the master of science parchment at the University did not indicate the area of specialization. In this case, the Faculty has asked that the areas of post-graduate specialty training for purposes of certification be added to the parchment. She was pleased to support this request.

A member asked if this provision applied only to Dentistry or could it apply to other programs and faculties. Professor Mock, a member from the Faculty of Dentistry, noted that this program was unique in that it combined a master's of science degree with specialty training. The number of years required to complete the degree was increased accordingly. Certifying bodies expected to see the specialization on the graduate diploma.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

The proposal to add specialty notations to M.Sc. degree parchments, as described in the submission from the Faculty of Dentistry dated January 10, 2000, effective immediately.

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

**12. Faculty of Pharmacy: Constitution - Revisions**

On behalf of the Dean of the Faculty, the Vice-Chair introduced the motion, noting that the Board was concerned with the constitution only. It was not being asked to approve the by-laws.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

The constitution of the Faculty of Pharmacy, last amended June 3, 1999.

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

### 13. Items for Information

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

Professor Sedra noted that there were several items on which he wished to report.

i) Maclean's ranking - He was pleased to report once again that the Maclean's survey had ranked U of T number one among the medical/doctoral universities in Canada for the seventh year in a row.

A member noted that a report of the Maclean's survey in the New York Times had reported the results incorrectly. Professor Sedra said he would ask Ms Bloch-Nevitte to follow-up.

ii) Enrolment expansion - Professor Sedra recalled that at the September meeting he had reported on a number of items, including enrolment expansion, under the item on the year ahead. He wished to bring members up-to-date on this matter and referred them to the article on the front page of the November 13th issue of *The Bulletin*. While continuing to pursue clarification from the provincial government on its intentions regarding enrolment expansion, the University had revised its planned expansion downward and was now proposing to expand by 9,000, the low end of the range given in the document Framework for Enrolment Expansion. Capital funding for an increase of 4,000 students had already been provided through the SuperBuild Fund. The remaining 5,000, to be split between the University of Toronto at Mississauga (U.T.M.) and the University of Toronto at Scarborough (U.T.Sc.), would increase their current level of enrolment by 50 percent. Capital funding had to be found for these students and satisfactory operating funding for all 9,000 students was still unresolved. He said that the language had been modified to indicate that the University was willing to expand while continuing to work toward finding a satisfactory resolution to the funding question. This stance was more reassuring to students and parents who might be part of the double cohort and concerned about accessibility. At the end of the process, however, the University would need capital funding to build the resources necessary to cope with the increased number of students. The University was committed to expanding enrolment only on condition that appropriate funding was forthcoming.

A member noted that in the decade starting about 1963 and ending about 1972, the University of Toronto had expanded 300 percent and across the country, the university system had expanded about 200 percent in response to the demographic bulge of the baby boom. The University's current plan for enrolment expansion of 9,000 student was an expansion of only about 20 percent in response to the current demographic bulge of the baby boom echo and increased participation. What Professor Sedra had reported about the process was not comforting and he wondered what the effects on access to the University would result from an inadequate planning process. He suggested that the University might end up in a catch-up planning process without the appropriate capital facilities in place to deal with the expansion. Professor Sedra agreed that in an ideal world, he would have liked the government to have made its intentions clear by now concerning the number of places to be made available and the funding mechanisms. The member's apprehension was justified and he shared it. The University would continue to work with the government to expedite the process and he hoped that there would be progress by January or February. If not, he feared that a number of the participants would lose heart and abandon their plans. However, to solve the problems, the universities must continue to work with the government. This University would accept 9,000 students of the expected 58,000 additional spaces required, less than its normal share which would be about 20 percent.

iii) Raising Our Sights - Professor Sedra reported that the summary of the academic plans and the recommended A.P.F. allocations for 2000-2004 for twelve divisions had now been reviewed by the Planning and Budget Committee. The Board would be reviewing five of

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

those allocations at its January meeting. He hoped to be able to complete much of the process by the end of the calendar year.

iv) Residence expansion - Professor Sedra recalled that the University's goal was to increase residence places to accommodate 25 percent of the students. He noted that St. Michael's College was building a residence to be ready for this coming fall to accommodate 200 students.

v) The Campaign - Professor Sedra said that the Campaign goal had recently been increased to \$1 billion and the term extended to 2004. All academic divisions would be revisiting their campaign priorities. Three major priorities in the next phase of the Campaign would be the graduate student support endowment, capital for new facilities and renovations, and endowed chair support. For the latter, it was proposed to use the Canada Research Chairs (C.R.C.) program to bring in additional funding for endowed chairs. It was proposed to use the \$4 million notional equivalent (the amount of an endowment required to produce approximately \$200,000 per year in interest) for each chair as the University's 2:1 match for a donor's \$2 million to enable the University to endow each Tier 1 (senior) C.R.C. The increased support arising from an endowed chair would support the work of the chairholder. With respect to the graduate student support endowment, the new program would take advantage of changes in the Ontario Graduate Fellowships program with focus on increasing support to the humanities and social sciences. The Ontario Graduate Scholarships in Science and Technology program had raised considerable support for students in the sciences and engineering in the earlier phase of the Campaign.

A member asked whether there was still a difference in fees between foreign and domestic graduate students. Professor Sedra replied that the difference had been declining and was now about \$4,000. A program had been established several years ago whereby each department which recruited additional foreign students was provided with the amount of the difference in the fee. He also noted that once the recommendations of the Orchard Task Force on Graduate Student Financial Support were in place, doctoral stream international students would receive fees plus \$12,000 each year for four years. The member said that the differential fee was a problem that would need to be resolved for the University to maintain its top Maclean's ranking.

vi) Canada Research Chairs program - Professor Sedra recalled that the University had submitted 40 nominations for chairholders last September. He said that divisions would soon receive detailed feedback on the cluster proposals including such things as the breakdown between Tier 1 and Tier 2 chairs. There would be an interactive process with each dean to finalize the number of chairs and to begin the process for next year.

vii) Task Force on Technology Assisted Learning - This new task force was being established with Vice-President Sheldon Levy as chair. Terms of reference would be announced and he was accepting nominations for membership on the task force.

A member suggested that representatives of the three student governments should be members of the Task Force. Professor Sedra took the comment under advisement.

viii) Search process for foreign faculty applicants - Professor Sedra noted that the process for dealing with applicants for faculty positions through a two-tier search had been somewhat relaxed. He believed that this was welcomed by all universities in Ontario and should serve this University well in future recruitment. There was no change to the policy but rather a change in implementation. Canadians were still required to be dealt with first, but there was a more streamlined process for extending the search to foreign applicants. Professor Gooch

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

would be sending a memorandum to members of principals, deans, academic directors and chairs to outline the new process.

ix) Council on Undergraduate Education - Professor Sedra repeated the announcement the President made during his installation speech in which he stated he would establish a Council on Undergraduate Education composed of mainly deans and senior academic administrators. The terms of reference would be announced shortly. He said that he would be pleased to receive comments and questions.

A member asked about the new government Task Force on Investing in Students. Professor Sedra noted that it would be focused on achieving efficiencies in administrative matters. Professor McCammond believed there were a number of proposals that the University would be submitting shortly. The President understood that the proposals to save money generated a need for \$350 million to put the ideas into practice. To become more efficient it was necessary to spend a great deal of money, especially with the impact of enrolment expansion. The government has indicated that the universities must prioritize these proposals and set them against the capital funds for expansion. All the proposals involved doing more with more, but were spend to save ideas.

x) Appointments and Status Changes - These were presented for information.

xi) Advisory Committee on the University of Toronto Library System: Membership for 2000-01 This item was distributed to the members as they arrived at the meeting and was presented to the Board for information.

(b) Items for Information in Report Number 83 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs

A member raised a question about comments made in the discussion of reviews in the Faculty of Arts and Science. In particular, he was interested in the Dean's comments about the Faculty's being wide-open in terms of choosing courses while at the same time protecting disciplinary prerequisites. A student might have all the prerequisites and still be prevented from taking particular courses.

Dean Amrhein ascertained that the student was referring to a course in the Commerce program and he directed the student to the director of the program since a number of its courses were offered by another faculty, the Rotman School of Management. In general, courses in the Faculty of Arts and Science were open to all students, subject only to capacity and necessary prerequisites which spoke to the potential success of the student if enrolled in the course. He believed the departments should serve their own major and specialist students first.

(c) Items for Information in Report Number 64 of the Planning and Budget

There were no questions concerning the items for information.

**14. Date of Next Meeting**

The Chair noted that the next regular meeting of the Board would be held on January 11th, 2001.

The Board moved into closed session.

**15. Academic Administrative Appointments**

The following academic administrative appointments were approved:

Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering

Professor Michael Charles                      Dean from January 1, 2001 to June 30, 2001 (extension)

Faculty of Arts and Science

*Department of Botany*

Professor Rowan Sage                              Acting Chair from January 1, 2001 to June 30, 2001 (leave replacement)

Joseph L. Rotman School of Management

Professor Glen Whyte                              Associate Dean, Curriculum from January 1, 2001 to June 30, 2004

Faculty of Medicine

*Department of Immunology*

Professor John (Jack) Bruce Hay                      Acting Chair from October 1, 2000 to March 1, 2001

*Department of Medical Imaging*

Professor Walter Kucharczyk                      Chair from July 1, 2002 to June 30, 2007 (second re-appointment)

Professor Patrice Bret                              Acting Chair from July 1, 2001 to June 30, 2002

The meeting adjourned at 6:20 p.m.

Secretary  
November 22nd, 2000

Chair