

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL
REPORT NUMBER 187 OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD

October 3, 2013

To the Governing Council,
 University of Toronto

Your Board reports that it held a meeting on Thursday, October 3, 2013 at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall at which the following were present:

Professor Ellen Hodnett, Chair	Professor Charles Deber	Dr. Gary P. Mooney
Professor Andrea Sass-Kortsak, Vice-Chair	Professor Joseph Desloges	Professor Amy Mullin
Professor David Naylor, President	Ms Hanan Domloge	Ms Jessica Ng
Professor Cheryl Regehr, Vice- President and Provost	Professor David Dubins	Professor Emmanuel Nikiema
Professor Sioban Nelson, Vice- Provost, Academic Programs	Professor Wendy Duff	Dr. Graeme Norval
Professor Donald Ainslie	Professor Angela Esterhammer	Ms Jiwon Tina Park
Dr. Ramona Alaggia	Professor Zhong-Ping Feng	Professor Elizabeth Peter
Mr. Larry Alford	Professor Susanne Ferber	Professor Michele Peterson- Badali
Ms Laura Amodio	Mr. Peng Fu	Dr. Helen Polatajko-Howell
Dr. Dimitri Anastakis	Professor Robert Gibbs	Professor Russell Pysklywec
Mr. Christopher Balette	Professor Avrum Gotlieb	Ms Daisy Qin
Dr. Katherine Berg	Professor Daniel Haas	Ms Jennifer Raso
Professor John Bland	Professor Rick Halpern	Ms Aditi Ratho
Dr. Heather Boon	Ms Alexandra Harris	Professor Yves Roberge
Professor Markus Bussmann	Professor Richard Hegele	Professor Mohini Sain
Professor David Cameron	Mrs. Bonnie Horne	Professor Sonia Sedivy
Mr. Ken Chan	Professor Douglas Hyatt	Professor Salvatore Spadafora
Mr. Louis R. Charpentier	Dr. Avi Hyman	Professor Suzanne Stevenson
Dr. Caroline Chassels	Ms Jenna Jacobson	Professor Markus Stock
Professor Brian Corman	Professor Alison Keith	Professor Scott Thomas
Professor Elizabeth Cowper	Mr. David Kleinman	Ms Caitlin Tillman
Professor Maria Cristina Cuervo	Professor Linda Kohn	Professor Nhung Tuyet Tran
Mr. Rastko Cvekic	Professor Ron Levi	Professor Vincent Tropepe
Professor Luc De Nil	Mr. Ian Lin	Professor Cameron Walter
	Professor Douglas McDougall	Professor Sandy Welsh
	Ms Lorraine McLachlan	Ms Songyi Xu
	Dr. Don McLean	Professor Howard Yee
	Ms Michelle Mitrovich	
Regrets:	Ms Sara Dolcetti	Professor Julia O'Sullivan
Dr. Francis Ahia	Mr. John A. Fraser	Professor Janet Paterson
Professor Benjamin Alarie	Professor Robert Harrison	Professor Peter Pauly
Professor Cristina Amon	Professor Bart Harvey	Professor Lacro Pavel
Professor Maydianne Andrade	Professor Howard Hu	Professor Domenico Pietropaolo
Professor Jan Barnsley	Professor Ira Jacobs	Professor Michael Ratcliffe
Professor Dwayne Benjamin	Mr. Asad Jamal	Professor Neil Rector
Ms Marilyn Booth	Professor Paul Kingston	Ms Melinda Rogers
Professor Eric Bredo	Professor Jim Lai	Professor Seamus Ross
Professor Terry Carleton	Mr. Yingxiang Li	Professor Richard Somers
Professor Aziza Chaoui	Dr. Linda McGillis Hall	Professor Andrew Spence
Mr. Yuan Chung	Professor Faye Mishna	Professor Catharine Whiteside
Professor Gary Crawford	Professor Mayo Moran	Professor Joseph Wong

Non-voting Assessors:

Professor Deep Saini, Member of the Governing Council and Vice-President and Principal, University of Toronto Mississauga
 Professor Angela Hildyard, Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity

Mr. David Palmer, Vice-President, University Advancement
 Professor Franco Vaccarino, Vice-President and Principal, University of Toronto Scarborough

Professor Edith Hillan, Vice-Provost, Faculty and Academic Life
 Ms Gail Milgrom, Director, Campus and Facilities Planning

Secretariat:

Ms Mae-Yu Tan

In Attendance:

Mr. Andrew Arifuzzaman, Chief Administrative Officer, University of Toronto Scarborough (UTSC)
 Ms Judith Chadwick, Assistant Vice-President, Research Services and Portfolio Operations Research
 Professor Terry Donaldson, Wycliffe College
 Mr. Brent Duguid, Director, Partnerships and Legal Counsel, UTSC
 Ms Nora Gillespie, Legal Counsel, Offices of the Vice-President and Provost and the Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity

Dr. Jane Harrison, Director, Academic Programs and Policy, Office of the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs
 Professor Alan Hayes, Director, Toronto School of Theology (TST), and Professor, Wycliffe College
 Professor Gretchen Kerr, Vice-Dean, Academic Affairs, Faculty of Kinesiology and Physical Education
 Mr. Christopher Lang, Director, Appeals, Discipline and Faculty Grievances
 Ms Signe Leisk, Legal Counsel, Cassels Brock and Blackwell LLP

Professor Peter Lewis, Assistant Vice-President, Global Research Partnerships
 Professor Jaroslav Skira, Regis College, and Director of Advanced Degree Programs, TST
 Ms Archana Sridhar, Assistant Provost
 Ms Marny Scully, Assistant Vice-President, Government and Institutional Relations
 Professor Anthony Wensley, Director, Institute of Communication, Culture, Information and Technology
 Professor Donald Wiebe, Trinity College

1. Chair's Remarks

The Chair welcomed members to the first meeting of the Academic Board for 2013-2014. She noted that this was the final Board meeting of Professor David Naylor as the 15th President of the University and she thanked him for his exemplary leadership and unparalleled dedication. The Chair also complimented the President on his scholarly achievements and personal attributes. The Board gave the President a standing ovation.

The Chair introduced those assessors who were present and outlined some meeting procedures for members.

2. 2012 - 2013 Academic Board Evaluation Survey

The Chair provided a summary of the feedback gathered from the Board evaluation survey that had been conducted for the fourth consecutive year in June, 2013. The 45% response rate had exceeded that of previous years. Highlights included the following.

- The majority of respondents supported the continuation of educational components for Board members.
- In general, members expressed satisfaction with the amount of time allotted for the introduction and discussion of the Board's main areas of responsibility. However,

some were of the view that insufficient time had been spent on topics such as research, capital projects and other areas of the Board's responsibility.

2. 2012 - 2013 Academic Board Evaluation Survey (cont'd)

- A great majority thought the Board made decisions consistent with the University's mission and priorities and appropriately focused on governance, rather than management, issues.
- Members expressed appreciation of the work of the Board's assessors.
- There were very high ratings of the Chair's management of Board meetings.
- While the majority of respondents were happy with the conduct, efficiency and productivity of Board meetings, some commented on the minimal discussion of agenda items.
- A range of answers were provided in response to questions about the most and least valuable aspects of meetings.

In closing, the Chair said that the evaluations continued to be very positive overall and most respondents felt that the meetings were worthwhile.

3. Report of the Vice-President and Provost

In place of the Provost's Report, President Naylor advised the Board of a few matters. He referred to the Government of Ontario's consideration of greater differentiation within the post-secondary education sector. The President hoped that any such reforms would result in a positive outcome for the system as a whole, as well as for the University of Toronto, given that the University's position was sufficiently unique among its research-intensive peers. However, with the current Provincial deficit, the University would continue to experience fiscal pressures. The Vice-President and Provost, Professor Cheryl Regehr, and the President-Designate, Professor Meric Gertler, would have an opportunity to guide the evolution of the University's distinctive role during this challenging period which could be one of historic changes in the system.

President Naylor commented on major international university rankings that were released annually in the fall. Not only had the University continued to perform well in the most recent rankings, it had made gains in two of the three. This was the case with the 2013 QS World University Ranking (17th) and the Times Higher Education (THE) World University report (20th).

Turning to the Academic Board, President Naylor acknowledged the tremendous leadership and scholarship of its Chair, Professor Ellen Hodnett, and its Senior Assessor, Professor Regehr. Noting the incredible, round-the-clock commitment that was required to fulfill the role of Vice-President and Provost, the President expressed his pleasure at having someone of Professor Regehr's stature serve the University in this way. President Naylor then briefly outlined the historical development of the Academic Board. He cited President Bissell's reference to bicameral systems as promoting 'mutual innocence' with lay directors overseeing budgets and operations, while a senate deliberated on academic matters without accompanying budgetary oversight. He pointed in contrast to the Board's unique responsibility to integrate the University's core academic mission with budgetary priorities. President Naylor closed by thanking members for their service on the Board.

4. Presentation on University Score Cards

The Chair remarked on the timeliness of a presentation on University rankings, given the release the previous evening of the THE ranking report, and she invited Professor Regehr and Ms Marny Scully, Assistant Vice-President, Government and Institutional Relations, to address the Board. Included in the matters highlighted during their presentation¹ were the following.

- Factors relevant to the context in which the University was operating were: Provincial per-student funding that had been relatively flat for the past 17 years; a 2% decrease this year from various reductions in grant funding; a lower cap on the permitted increase in average domestic tuition fees; lack of Provincial government support for international students in Ontario; the introduction this year of a \$750 International Student Recovery deduction from the Provincial operating grant; and insufficient federal funding for institutional costs of research.
- The Government's recent consideration of a new process for university differentiation and funding using Strategic Mandate Agreements provided a potential opportunity.
- The Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario's report on differentiation metrics² clearly outlined the University of Toronto's differentiated role and outstanding achievements.
- The University was the only Canadian institution among the top 25 institutions in major international rankings for 2013.
- Resources available to institutions and variances in the methodology used to compile the rankings contributed to differences in results.
- Rankings results must be considered only one measure of the University's excellence and were particularly helpful for recruitment of international students.
- Key to the rankings results were the University's continued excellence in research and scholarly publications. Faculty participation in initiatives such as Massive Open Online Courses and advisory groups that shaped rankings, as well as completion of reputational surveys by members of the University, were other means of strengthening the University's reputation.

A member observed that, while the University's position on the THE ranking had increased over the past year, its absolute score had fallen. In response, Ms Scully explained that a number of measures contributed to an institution's total score. If an institution's score for one component remained unchanged while that of other institutions increased, the end result could be a decrease in the overall score. In the case of the THE ranking, the University's score on the research-volume, income and reputation indicator had dropped significantly, as had that of other Canadian universities. As well, it was evident that the federal and provincial governments had not kept pace with the financial investments made in universities of other jurisdictions around the world.

Members discussed the significance of the University's reputation and steps that might be taken to strengthen it, such as instituting a position similar to a Chief Reputation Officer in the corporate sector, or assembling a group of friends of the University to lobby the federal and provincial governments with respect to support for the University. A member commented that,

¹ A copy of the presentation slides is attached to the Report.

² http://www.heqco.ca/SiteCollectionDocuments/HEQCO%20Diversity_ENG.pdf

4. Presentation on University Score Cards (cont'd)

while the University's reputation attracted many international students, the resources to support international doctoral students within her department were very low. Professor Regehr observed that support for international students was one of the key advocacy issues for the University.

The Chair thanked Professor Regehr and Ms Scully for their informative presentation.

5. Report of the Review Committee of the Memorandum of Agreement between the Toronto School of Theology and its Member Institutions and the University of Toronto, 2013-14

The Chair said that the Report of the Review Committee of the Memorandum of Agreement between the Toronto School of Theology (TST) and its Member Institutions and the University of Toronto was being presented to the Board for information. It had also been presented for information at the September 17th meeting of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs (AP&P).

Professor McDougall provided some historical background about the Toronto School of Theology and outlined the process that had been undertaken in the development of the Report. He noted that the Report would influence the revised Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) that would be brought through governance at a later date.

No questions were raised by members of the Board.

6. Toronto School of Theology – New Conjoint Ph.D. Program in Theological Studies

The Chair stated that the proposal for the conjoint doctoral program in Theological Studies had also been considered on September 17th by the AP&P. If approved by the Board, it would then be forwarded to the Executive Committee for confirmation on October 23rd.

Professor McDougall introduced the proposal. He noted that the TST had consulted with colleagues in a number of Faculty of Arts and Science units during development of the proposal, and it planned to close its existing, conjoint doctoral degree, the Doctor of Theology (Th.D.), once the proposed Ph.D. was operational. Professor McDougall then summarized the discussion of the proposal that had taken place at the AP&P meeting.³

Professor Regehr advised the Board that a Ph.D. program had been considered since 2004, during the MOA negotiations, and it had been endorsed in the recent University of Toronto Quality Assurance Process (UTQAP) external appraisal report. The review of the TST under the UTQAP had informed discussions of the review of the MOA with respect to academic appointments and the focus on excellence in theological education at the TST. As a new degree, the proposed Ph.D. was considered a new program under the provincial Quality Assurance Framework, and as such, it required approval by University governance bodies, the Ontario

³<http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/Assets/Governing+Council+Digital+Assets/Boards+and+Committees/Committee+on+Academic+Policy+and+Programs/2013-2014+Academic+Year/r0917.pdf>

6. Toronto School of Theology – New Conjoint Ph.D. Program in Theological Studies (cont'd)

Universities Council on Quality Assurance (Quality Council), and the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities (MTCU).

At the invitation of the Chair, Professor Alan Hayes, Director of the TST, addressed the Board. He expressed his gratitude to the many offices and staff that had supported and guided the TST in its development of the proposal.

A member said that he had enjoyed reading the proposal. He thanked the TST for recognizing the multicultural environment of contemporary Canadian society by acknowledging the religious traditions of recent immigrant communities, and he expressed the hope that in future communications the TST would similarly acknowledge the religious traditions of Aboriginal Canadians. Professor Hayes stated that the study of theology at TST had centered on Christian traditions. However, over the past few decades, its focus had expanded. The heads of the TST and its member colleges had had many discussions about the inclusivity of their programs and they would continue to consider the matter. A member said that she was pleased to see the proposal for a doctoral program being brought forward at this time. She had served as a representative of the Faculty of Arts and Science on numerous TST committees since 1980, and the question of a Th.D. versus a Ph.D. degree had been discussed on many occasions.

The Chair said that a speaking request for the Ph.D. proposal from Professor Donald Wiebe, a professor of Divinity at Trinity College, had been granted. At his request, Professor Wiebe's material had been made available to Board members on the Boardbooks governance portal.

During his address to the Board, Professor Wiebe outlined his objections to the proposal for a Ph.D. program in Theological Studies. In his view, the proposed program was not "brand-new", but rather a modification of the existing Th.D. program. Professor Wiebe referred to a comparative analysis he had done of the Th.D. and Ph.D. programs and pointed to similarities between the two. He also expressed concerns that students currently enrolled in the Th.D. program would be unable to choose to graduate with a Ph.D.

Professor Regehr responded to Professor Wiebe's comments, referring to the report of the external reviewers in which they had stated that the Th.D. program was below standard. In the TST's administrative response that had accompanied the report, issues that had been raised had been addressed. The process for academic appointments had been re-examined and the TST had undertaken to close the Th.D. and open a Ph.D. program. The Th.D. was considered a professional designation, whereas there was a strong focus on research in the proposed Ph.D. program.

Professor Regehr stated that there were significant differences between the Th.D. and the Ph.D. program that was being proposed. Further, a change in degree required MTCU approval. Professor Regehr closed by stating that the TST would explore ways in which students in the Th.D. program might meet the new program requirements and graduate with a Ph.D.

6. Toronto School of Theology – New Conjoint Ph.D. Program in Theological Studies (cont'd)

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

It Was Resolved

THAT, subject to confirmation by the Executive Committee

THAT the proposed new Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) in Theological Studies degree program, as described in the proposal from the Toronto School of Theology dated August 22, 2013, be approved, effective the academic year 2015-16.

7. *Inventions Policy*

The Chair said that the proposed revisions to both the *Inventions Policy* and the *Research Administration Policy* had been considered previously by the AP&P on April 16th. If recommended by the Board, they would be considered by the Governing Council for approval on October 30th.

Professor McDougall outlined the history of previous revisions of the *Inventions Policy* and the consultation that had taken place during the development of the current proposed revisions. He recalled that the proposed revised *Policy* had been presented for information to the Board on May 2, 2013. A subsequent timeline for the *Policy* to be considered by the Board for recommendation for approval in June had been altered so that additional consultation with the University of Toronto Faculty Association could take place before consideration by the Board in the Fall, 2013.

There were no questions from members.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the proposed revised *Inventions Policy* be approved, replacing the *Policy* approved by the Governing Council on June 25, 2007.

8. *Research Administration Policy*

Professor McDougall advised the Board that a similar consultation process had taken place with respect to the proposed *Research Administration Policy* as had been followed for the *Inventions Policy* and the AP&P had also recommended its approval on April 16th.

There were no questions from members.

8. Research Administration Policy (cont'd)

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the proposed *Research Administration Policy* be approved, replacing the *Policy on Research Agreements and the Recovery of Indirect Costs of Research*, the most recent revision of which was approved by Governing Council on April 26, 2007.

9. Policy on Capital Planning and Capital Projects - Proposed Revisions

The Chair noted that the Board was responsible for individual capital projects and capital planning policy. The proposed revisions to the *Policy on Capital Planning and Capital Projects* had been considered by the Planning and Budget Committee (P&B) on September 16th. If recommended by the Board, it would be considered by the Governing Council for approval on October 30th.

Professor Cowper said that, with the establishment of the University of Toronto Mississauga (UTM) and University of Toronto Scarborough (UTSC) Campus Councils on July 1, 2013, revisions to the *Policy* were needed to reflect consideration of UTM or UTSC capital projects with budgets over \$3-million by the respective Campus Affairs Committee and Campus Council. The proposed revisions would preserve accountability and help focus governance oversight at the appropriate levels.

Professor Amy Mullin, Vice-Principal Academic and Dean, UTM, expressed her appreciation for the proposed *Policy* revisions and for the opportunity for campus governance bodies to consider such capital projects.

There were no questions from members.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the proposed revised *Policy on Capital Planning and Capital Projects* be approved, effective October 31, 2013.

10. UTSC – Pan-Am Aquatics and Athletics Centre: Shareholder and Co-Ownership Agreement

The Chair said that the Board was responsible for planning matters and agreements with external bodies. On September 16th, the P&B had reviewed the special Co-Ownership Agreement. If recommended by the Board, the Agreement would be considered for approval on October 30th by the Governing Council.

Professor Cowper outlined the key aspects of the Co-Ownership Agreement, which set out the fundamental principles, rights and obligations of the City of Toronto and the University as Co-

10. UTSC – Pan-Am Aquatics and Athletics Centre: Shareholder and Co-Ownership Agreement (cont'd)

Owners of the Toronto Pan Am Sports Centre (TPASC). She also summarized the in-depth discussion that had occurred at the P&B meeting.⁴

Professor Franco Vaccarino, Vice-President and Principal, UTSC, elaborated on the principles of the Agreement and emphasized the enormous benefits of the project for the University and the City. With the land remediation, the full potential for development had been made apparent.

During the Board's discussion, a member asked whether there had been a change in the UTSC portion of the project cost from the initial amount of \$37.51-million in 2008 dollars, and what the estimated operating cost of the Centre would be. Mr. Andrew Arifuzzaman, Chief Administrative Officer, UTSC, replied that, with inflation, the University's share would be \$48-million. The total project cost of \$249-million was approximately \$40-million below budget. The University's portion of the operating costs (17%) would be about \$2.3-million. In response to questions from the member about arrangements with Third Party Users, Mr. Arifuzzaman explained that the University was confident that there would be demand for use of the Centre and that its risk exposure would be low.

Professor Vaccarino replied to a member's question of the University's plans to leverage educational opportunities for students with the development of the Centre. He agreed that the project would provide for significant opportunities for experiential learning and stated that it was UTSC's intent to take advantage of them. For example, the Health Studies Program planning activities included exploration of appropriate platforms for students tied to activities of the Centre. Mr. Arifuzzaman added that the TPASC Advisory Councils, which were referenced in the Unanimous Shareholders' Agreement, would also help to guide such discussions.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT whereby a corporation known as the Toronto Pan Am Sports Centre Inc. (TPASC) will be jointly established by the City of Toronto and the University of Toronto:

1. THAT a Co-Ownership Agreement (draft dated September 12, 2013) between the City of Toronto and the University of Toronto be approved, effective immediately, to which the TPASC Inc. will be a party and to which the corporation will be bound, substantially on terms and conditions as set out in the term sheets attached hereto and that the University execute this agreement and all related agreements with the City of Toronto and TPASC;
2. THAT the President, or designate, be authorized to sign the Co-Ownership Agreement on behalf of the Governing Council, provided the agreement conforms to the terms and conditions outlined in section 1; and
3. THAT the agreement signed under the provision of this resolution be filed with the Secretary of the Governing Council.

⁴<http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/Assets/Governing+Council+Digital+Assets/Boards+and+Committees/Planning+and+Budget+Committee/2013-2014+Academic+Year/r0916.pdf>

CONSENT AGENDA

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the consent agenda be adopted.

11. Academic Board Terms of Reference – Minor Revisions

The Board received this item for information.

12. Name Change: “Institute of Communication, Culture and Information Technology” to “Institute of Communication, Culture, Information and Technology”

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT, subject to confirmation by the Executive Committee,

THAT the name of the “Institute of Communication, Culture and Information Technology” be changed to the “Institute of Communication, Culture, Information and Technology”, effective immediately.

13. Approval of the Report of the Previous Meeting: Report Number 186 – June 3, 2013

Report Number 186 of the meeting held on June 3, 2013 was approved.

14. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting

There was no business arising from Report Number 186.

15. Items for Information

The following items for information were received by the Board.

- (a) Report on Approvals Under Summer Executive Authority
- (b) Calendar of Business for 2013-2014
- (c) Reports of the Agenda Committee Meetings
 - i) Report Number 193 - June 25, 2013
 - ii) Report Number 194 – September 24, 2013
- (d) Report Number 163 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs – September 17, 2013
- (e) Report Number 156 of the Planning and Budget Committee – September 16, 2013

16. Date of the Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Board was scheduled for Thursday, November 21, 2013, 4:10 – 6:00 p.m., in the Council Chamber.

17. Other Business

Professor Regehr spoke of the co-curricular record that would accompany student transcripts, capturing the activities in which they had been involved while at the University. The University was a leader in the development and implementation of such an initiative. Professor Regehr invited members to attend a reception that evening at Hart House to celebrate the launch of the co-curricular record.

The Board moved *in camera*.

18. Appointment: University Tribunal Co-Chair

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT Ms Sana Halwani be appointed as a Co-Chair of the University Tribunal for the period July 1, 2013 to June 30, 2016.

19. Appointment: Assistant Secretary of the University Tribunal

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT Ms Sinéad Cutt be appointed Assistant Secretary of the University Tribunal, effective October 3, 2013.

***IN CAMERA* CONSENT AGENDA**

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the *in camera* consent agenda be adopted.

20. Quarterly Report on Donations

The Board received for information the following Quarterly Reports on Donations:

- a) February 1 to April 30, 2013
- b) May 1 to July 31, 2013

The Board returned to open session.

The Chair thanked members for their attendance and participation in the Board meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

Secretary
October 10, 2013

Chair