THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

REPORT NUMBER 199 OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD

October 1, 2015

To the Governing Council, University of Toronto

Your Board reports that it held a meeting on Thursday, October 1, 2015 at 4:00 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall at which the following were present:

Professor Andrea Sass-Kortsak, Chair Professor John S. Bland, Vice-Chair Professor Meric Gertler Professor Donald C. Ainslie Mr. Faizan Sohail Akbani Dr. Ramona Alaggia Mr. Larry P. Alford Professor Cristina H. Amon Professor Maydianne C.B Andrade Dr. Glen Bandiera Ms. Marilynn Booth Mr. Harvey Botting Ms. Shakira Brathwaite Professor David Cameron Professor Carol C. Chin Professor Gary W. Crawford Mr. Dan G. D'Agostino Professor Charles M. Deber

Professor Vivek Goel Mr. Gary D. Goldberg Professor Tara Goldstein Professor William Gough Mr. Magno Miguel Guidote Professor Robert V. Harrison Professor Richard Hegele Mr. Alex Ivovic Professor Linda Johnston Professor Glen A. Jones Professor Stephen R. Julian Dr. Allan S. Kaplan Professor Gretchen Kerr Mr. Ray Khan Ms. Jeannie Kim Professor Ronald H. Kluger Professor Lorna E. MacDonald Professor Susan McCahan Ms. Martha McLean

Professor Faye Mishna Professor Amy Mullin Professor Sioban Nelson Dr. Graeme W. Norval Mr. David Palmer

Professor Michele Peterson-Badali Dr. Dana Joanne Philpott Mr. Tayyab Pirzada Professor Russell Pysklywec Professor Michael J.H. Ratcliffe Ms. Catherine Riddell Professor Locke Rowe Ms. Susmita Sarkar Ms. Melinda Scott Mr. Hugh D. Segal Professor Elizabeth M. Smyth Professor Salvatore M. Spadafora Professor James Stafford Ms. Lorraine Sugar Professor Scott Thomas Professor Steven J. Thorpe Professor Vincent Tropepe Professor Ning Yan

Dr. L. Trevor Young

Ms. Nana Mohan Zhou

Ms. Alena Zelinka Ms. Marissa Zhang

REGRETS:

Professor David Dubins

Ms. Rachael Ferenbok Ms. Linda Si Jie Gao

Professor Robert Gibbs

Dr. Francis Kwabena Ahia Professor Suzanne Conklin Akbari Professor Benjamin Alarie Ms. Ana Patricia Ayala Professor Joshua Barker Professor Dwayne Benjamin Dr. Heather S. Boon Ms. Christine E. Burke Professor Markus Bussmann Mr. Ken Chan Professor Aziza Chaouni

Mr. Louis Charpentier Professor Maria Cristina Cuervo Professor Luc F. De Nil

Professor Zhong-Ping Feng Ms. Sally Garner Ms. Judy G. Goldring Dr. Daniel A. Haas Ms. Mariam Hanna Dr. Bart J. Harvey Professor Angela Hildyard Ms. Shirley Hoy Professor Howard Hu Professor Douglas Hvatt Professor Edward M. Iacobucci Professor Susan Jaglal Professor Charlie Keil

Professor Bruce Kidd

Professor Angela Esterhammer

Professor Linda M. Kohn Professor Ulrich J. Krull Professor Jim Yuan Lai Professor Ernest W.N. Lam Ms. Jennifer J. Lau Mr. Malcolm Lawrie Professor Ron Levi Professor Reid B. Locklin Professor Scott Mabury Professor Tiff Macklem Professor Alice Maurice Dr. Don McLean Professor Emmanuel Nikiema Professor Lacra Pavel Ms. N. Jane Pepino

Professor David J. Phillips Professor Domenico Pietropaolo Dr. Helene Polatajko-Howell Professor Cheryl Regehr Professor Yves Roberge Ms. Melinda Rogers

Professor Seamus Ross Professor Mohini M. Sain Mr. Riaz Sayani-Mulji Professor Sonia Sedivy Dr. Anne Harriet Simmonds Professor Richard M. Sommer Professor Andrew M. Spence Professor Markus Stock Professor Nhung Tuyet Tran Ms. Emily Tsui Professor Njoki Wane Ms. Judith Wolfson

Non-Voting Assessors

Professor Bruce Kidd, Vice-President, University of Toronto and Principal, UTSC Mr. Malcolm Lawrie, Assistant Vice-President, University Planning and Design Professor Scott Mabury, Vice-President, University Operations Professor Susan McCahan, Vice-Provost, Innovations in Undergraduate Education

Mr. David Balman Vice Provident University Advancement

Mr. David Palmer, Vice-President, University Advancement

Professor Locke Rowe, Dean, School of Graduate Studies and Vice-Provost, Graduate Research & Education

Secretariat:

Mr. Anwar Kazimi, Secretary, Academic Board

Mr. Patrick McNeill, Assistant Secretary of the Governing Council

In Attendance:

Ms. Althea Blackburn-Evans, Director, Media Relations

Ms. Catherine Gagne, Chief Administrative Officer, Office of the Provost

Mr. Michael Kurts, Executive Director, Communications

Ms. Helen Lasthiotakis, Executive Director, Strategic Partnerships and Director, Office of the Vice-President Research and Innovation

Mr. Steve Miszuk, Director, Planning and Infrastructure, Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering Ms Archana Sridhar, Assistant Provost

Ms Mae-Yu Tan, Senior Projects Officer, Office of the Vice-President and Provost

1. Chair's Remarks

The Chair welcomed members and guests to the first meeting of the Academic Board for 2015-16. She introduced Professor John Bland, the Vice-Chair of the Board; Professor Cheryl Regehr, Vice-President and Provost and the Board's senior assessor; and other assessors who were in attendance.

The Chair said that members had been asked to complete an evaluation survey at the final Board meeting of the 2014-15 year. Noting that the response rate for the survey had been very low, the Chair expressed hope that a higher response rate for the evaluation survey for 2015-16 would allow for a better analysis of the Board in discharging its responsibilities.

2. Orientation

The Chair, Professor Bland, Professor Regehr, and the Secretary presented a high-level overview of the Board with slides, which are <u>appended to this Report</u>. The following matters were highlighted:

Membership of the Board

• The Secretary provided a brief history of the Governing Council, including its membership and its Boards, Councils, and Committees. Members were encouraged to refer to the respective websites for the Governing Council and the Academic Board.

Expectations and Attributes of Board members

• Professor Bland referred to the three governance documents provided to the members – *Principles of Good Governance, Mandate of Governance, and Expectations and Attributes of Governors and Key Principles of Ethical Conduct* – and outlined the fiduciary responsibilities of the members in discharging their duties.

Responsibility – Mandates and Terms of Reference

• The Chair highlighted the mandate of the Board as it related to the teaching, learning and research mission of the University; and the responsibilities delegated to its four standing Committees. She provided examples of some items that could be brought forward by the administration for the Board's consideration.

Process and the role of the Office of the Vice-President and Provost

 Professor Regehr provided an overview of the broad consultative process with internal and external stakeholders in developing proposals that were brought before the Academic Board. She provided as an example of the cyclical process of academic reviews and planning.

Reference Guide to the Use of Cover Sheets

• The Secretary explained that cover sheets were designed to enable members to focus on the major elements of the proposals, and that they were a valuable tool in clarifying the responsibilities of the relevant governance bodies for each item of business.

3. Senior Assessor's Report

In her comments, the Provost highlighted the following:

- The start of the new academic year had provided the University the opportunity to welcome new and returning members of the community. Approximately 16,000 undergraduate students, 1,200 new second-entry professional students and 6,800 graduate students would be starting programs in the Fall term. In addition, over 120 new faculty members from more than 20 countries would be joining the University community in 2015.
- The proposals, or items that the administration would bring forward to the Board for its consideration, would focus on academic planning, policies, and resources. Prior to being presented to the Board, the proposals would have been vetted through a series of administrative processes, and prepared following formal and informal consultations with relevant stakeholders and advisory bodies.

3. Senior Assessor's Report (cont'd)

- The four capital projects for the Board's consideration at the meeting provided stellar examples of the alignment with the University's priority to enhance the undergraduate and graduate student experience and continue its leading-edge research:
 - o The University College renovation project promised to be remarkable space for enhancing the undergraduate student experience;
 - O The renovation and expansion of the Recreation Wing (R-wing) at the University of Toronto Scarborough Highland Hall would result in a renovated facility with lecture theatres, student event space, study space, and student services and faculty offices to support the undergraduate expansion at that campus;
 - o The renovation project for the MacDonald-Mowat House on St. George Street reflected the University's strong priority in enhancing the graduate student experience. The plans for the site included embedded mental health counselors and enhanced professional development skills training; and
 - O At the meeting of the Planning and Budget Committee, Mr.Qiang An, a PhD candidate, had stated that the High Pressure Research Facility at the University of Toronto Institute for Aerospace Studies (UTIAS) would have direct and significant impact on his research. Mr. An had explained that the new facilities at UTIAS would be unique in Canada and would allow him, and his fellow graduate students, to link computer simulations to experimental research.
- The *Times Higher Education* magazine had named the University of Toronto as the top university in Canada and 19th globally in its 2015-16 World Universities Rankings.

4. Capital Project: Report of the Project Planning Committee for the University College Revitalization (Revised Phase 1) and Croft Chapter House (Phase 2)

Professor Steven Thorpe highlighted the details of the Report of the Project Planning Committee for the University College Revitalization (Revised Phase 1) and Croft Chapter House (Phase 2). Professor Donald Ainslie said that the University College building provided the iconic image for the University. He added that the project embodied a goal of the University as a leading research institution.

On motion duly moved, seconded and carried,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDED

- 1. THAT the Report of the Project Planning Committee for the University College Revitalization (Revised Phase 1) and Croft Chapter House (Phase 2), dated August 24, 2015 be approved in principal: and
- 2. THAT the additional project scope for Phase One and for Croft Chapter House (Phase 2), totalling 273 net assignable square meters (nasm) (316 gross square meters (gsm)) for a total of 985 nasm (1266 gsm) be approved in principle, be funded by Capital Campaign Funds, Provost's Central Funds, University College (Operating Funds); and Faculty of Arts and Science (Capital Funds) and

- 4. Capital Project: Report of the Project Planning Committee for the University College Revitalization (Revised Phase 1) and Croft Chapter House (Phase 2) (cont'd)
 - 3. THAT subsequent phase s of the project be brought forward for approvals through the appropriate vehicle as funding becomes available to move forward with the implementation of the overall plan as presented in the Project Planning Committee Report.
- 5. Capital Project: Revised Report of the Project Planning Committee for the Renovation and Expansion of the Recreation (R-Wing) at the University of Toronto Scarborough the new *Highland Hall*

Professor Bruce Kidd presented the highlights of the Revised Report of the Project Planning Committee for the Renovation and Expansion of the Recreation (R-Wing) at the University of Toronto Scarborough – the new Highland Hall. Professor Kidd noted that project had been approved in principle by the Governing Council on April 1, 2015 but that part of the anticipated funding for the project an award of the Ontario Major Capacity Expansion Program, had not been received. There had been no changes in the total project cost, the major change was in the sources of funding.

On motion duly moved, seconded and carried

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDED

THAT, the capital project as described in the Project Planning Committee Report for the Renovation and Expansion of the Recreation Wing (R-Wing) at the University of Toronto Scarborough dated, November 20, 2014; with a project scope of 4,237 net assignable square (nasm) (8,178 gross square metres (gsm)) of new construction and 2,223 nasm (4,291 gsm) of renovation; approved in principle by the Governing Council on April 1, 2015, be amended to reflect the following revised sources of funding: the UTSC Operating Funds; the Capital Campaign; the Provost Central Funds; and Financing (with any shortfall of funds from the Capital Campaign and the accompanying match from the Provost Central Funds to be met by additional UTSC Operating Funds and not drawn upon from further financing); and that this be approved.

6. Capital Project: Report of the Project Planning Committee for the High Pressure Combustion Research Facility, University of Toronto Institute for Aerospace Studies, Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering

Professor Steven Thorpe highlighted the details of the Report of the Project Planning Committee for the High Pressure Combustion Research Facility, University of Toronto Institute for Aerospace Studies, Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering.

A member referred to the Report of the Project Planning Committee for the capital project and asserted the following:

- A Piping and Instrumentation diagram had been provided. It showed that the cooling water pump would provide 564 metres of total dynamic head; this is 55 atmospheres of pressure. There was no pressure relief and no liquid expansion protection. The diagram indicated that the University would provide the high pressure combustion chamber. Pressure vessels were required to be designed by licensed engineers, be fabricated by certified shops, be registered with the Technical Standards and Safety Authority (TSSA), and undergo hydrostatic testing every six years. The report had not addressed this matter.
- The proposed facility would have a combustion reaction under pressure. As such, there was possibility that the effects of a blast needed to be considered, and that the building could require blast panels (through the roof, as it as an internal room).
- Finally, the exhaust gas would be sent to a stack, an as this gas was not caused by domestic
 heating, the new source was required to be registered and the Environmental Compliance
 Approval needed to be updated.

In response, Mr. Steve Miszuk said that the drawing provided in the Report of the Project Planning Committee was not a detailed design, and had been included to explain the high cost of the project in comparison to the relatively small lab area (intensive equipment infrastructure). It did not include the level of detail that the member had anticipated, however, all of the safety issues that had been raised by the member would be addressed in the detailed design, which was 75 per cent complete. The TSSA compliance for pressure vessels would be part of the project scope and the combustion chamber final design would be the responsibility of the manufacturer (in accordance with the experiment parameters provided by the University). Mr. Miszuk noted that the exhaust from the experiment would be the subject of an amendment to the existing Certificate of Approval that was in place with the Ministry of the Environment for the Aerospace building.

On motion duly moved, seconded and carried

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT, subject to confirmation by the Executive Committee

- 1. THAT the Report of the Project Planning Committee for the High Pressure Combustion Research Facility, University of Toronto Institute for Aerospace Studies, Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering, dated August 26, 2015, be approved in principle, and;
- 2. THAT the project scope to accommodate the High Pressure Combustion Research Facility Renovation of 188 net assignable square metres (nasm), be approved in principle,

to be funded by Canadian Foundation for Innovation (CFI) funds, Ontario Research Fund (ORF) funds and Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering (UTIAS) Operating Funds.

CONSENT AGENDA

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the revised consent agenda be adopted.

7. Capital Project: Report of the Project Planning Committee for the School of Graduate Studies, MacDonald-Mowat House, 63 St. George Street Renovation and Restoration On motion duly moved, seconded and carried

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT, subject to confirmation by the Executive Committee

- 1. THAT the Project Planning Committee Report for the School of Graduate Studies, MacDonald-Mowat House, 63 St. George Renovation and Restoration, dated September 1, 2015, be approved in principle; and
- 2. THAT the project scope of 63 St. George Street Renovation and Restoration totalling 715 net assignable square metres (nasm) (1070 gross square metres (gsm)) be approved in principle, to be funded by the School of Graduate Studies Operating Funds.

8. Approval of the Report of the Previous Meeting

Report Number 198, from the meeting of June 1, 2015, was approved.

9. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting

There was no business arising from Report Number 198.

10. Items for Information

The following items were received by the Board for information:

- (a) Calendar of Business for 2015-2016
- (b) Reports of the Agenda Committee Meetings
 - i. Report Number 215 June 9, 2015
 - ii. Report Number 216 September 23, 2015
- (c) Report Number 175 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs September 16, 2015
- (d) Report Number 168 of the Planning and Budget Committee September 17, 2015
- (e) Approvals Under Summer Executive Authority

11. Date of the Next Meeting – Thursday, November 19, 2015, 4:10 p.m. – 6:00 p.m.

The Chair advised members that the next Board meeting for 2015-2016 was scheduled for Thursday, November 19, 2015 from 4:10 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. in the Council chamber.

12. Other Business

There was no other business

THE BOARD MOVED IN CAMERA.

13. Quarterly Report on Donations – May 1 to July 31, 2015

The Board received information on the Quarterly Reports on Donations for May 1 to July 31, 2015.

14. Capital Project: Report of the Project Planning Committee for the University College Revitalization (Revised Phase 1) and Croft Chapter House (Phase 2) – Total Project Cost and Sources of Funding

On a motion duly moved, seconded and carried

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDED

THAT the recommendation regarding the University College Revitalization(revised Phase 1) and Croft Chapter House (Phase 2), contained in the memorandum from Professor Scott Mabury, Vice-President, University Operations, dated September 24, 2015 be approved.

15. Capital Project: The Renovation and Expansion of the Recreation Wing (R-Wing) at the University of Toronto Scarborough – the new Highland Hall – Total Project Cost and Sources of Funding

On motion duly moved, seconded and carried

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDED

THAT recommendation regarding the renovation and expansion of the Rereation Wing (R-Wing) at the University of Toronto Scarborough, contained in the memorandum from Professor Scott Mabury, Vice-President, University Operations, dated September 24, 2015 be approved.

16. Capital Project: Report of the Project Planning Committee for the High Pressure Combustion Research Facility, University of Toronto Institute for Aerospace Studies, Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering – Total Project Cost and Sources of Funding.

On motion duly moved, seconded and carried

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the recommendation regarding the High Pressure Combustion Research Facility, contained in the memorandum from Professor Scott Mabury, Vice-President University Operations, dated September 24, 2015 be approved.

IN CAMERA CONSENT AGENDA

17. Capital Project: Report of the Project Planning Committee for the School of Graduate Studies, MacDonald-Mowat House, 63 St. George Street Renovation & Restoration – Total Project Cost and Sources of Funding

On motion duly moved, seconded and carried

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the recommendation regarding the School of Graduate Studies, MacDonald-Mowat House, 63 St. George Street Renovation and Restoration, contained in the memo by Professor Scott Mabury, Vice-President University Operations dated September 24, 2015 be approved.

The Board returned to open session.	
The	e meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.
Secretary	Chair
October 8, 2015	