

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

REPORT NUMBER 98 OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD

January 13th, 2000

To the Governing Council,
University of Toronto.

Your Board reports that it held a meeting on Thursday, January 13th, 2000 at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall. An attendance list is attached to this report. In this report, items 4 - 10 are for Governing Council approval and the remaining items are reported for information.

1. Report of the Previous Meeting

The report of the previous meeting, dated December 2nd, 1999, was approved.

2. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting

Item 5c – Reviews: Academic Programs and Units

Professor Rolph recalled that a revised procedure for the consideration of reviews of academic units by governance had been inaugurated in the summer of 1999. At a three-hour meeting in July, the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs considered 29 reviews conducted during the period 1995-96 to 1997-98: 4 departments in the Faculty of Arts and Science, plus a review of the Faculty itself, 5 units in the School of Graduate Studies, 10 department in the Faculty of Medicine, 1 division each at Mississauga and Scarborough, plus 7 other Provostial reviews in addition to the Arts and Science Faculty review to which she had already alluded.

The summer of 1999 package included summaries of all of the individual reviews as well as an overall summary prepared by Professor Tuohy, Deputy Provost, and her staff. In future, the summaries of individual reviews would be prepared in the divisions to which the units belonged, but this year, in order to address a considerable backlog of reviews, all of the summaries were prepared in the Office of the Provost. It was the Committee's role to look at the thoroughness of the academic review process in all of its phases, including the administrative responses, and thus perform the primary task on behalf of governance and within the context of the Broadhurst Report of ensuring university accountability.

2. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting (cont'd)

Item 5c – Reviews: Academic Programs and Units (cont'd)

The dedicated meeting facilitated identification and discussion of common themes raised in individual reviews across several divisions. Some of those common themes:

- the importance of the three Faculty R's: replacement, recruitment and retention of faculty
- a positive assessment of the quality of teaching in undergraduate courses, together with specific suggestions for improvement of the total educational experience of our students: issues related to class size and use of instructional technology
- scheduling of material in the medical curriculum, in light of the severe pressures to be as comprehensive as possible
- comments on the centrality of the colleges in achieving the goal of enhancing the student experience
- the importance of cultivating interdisciplinarity, and the success of graduate centres and institutes as vehicles of interdisciplinary collaboration in both teaching and research. (The importance of the cultivation of relationships between units was a point noted particularly in the Computer Science and Statistics reviews.)
- the variability in the relationships across the three campuses in different departments
- concerns regarding time to completion and level of funding in regard to graduate education
- ensuring adequate levels of administrative support
- need for increased space in all units

Academic Board members will recall from reading the report of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs July meeting that some of the issues raised by the Committee around which there was considerable discussion included:

- the need for more input from undergraduate students in the review process
- increasing and improving cross-divisional linkages
- revision of the summary template to include useful background facts and statistics about the unit and about the academic and institutional credentials of both international and domestic reviewers.

She stressed that the new *Guidelines for Reviews of Academic Programs and Units* had been issued subsequent to the completion of all 29 of the reviews examined, but prior to their discussion by the Committee in July. Thus the Committee had an opportunity to appreciate the potential usefulness of the Guidelines document. The Guidelines offered a process for the standardization of criteria and practice, including a series of useful provisions which should facilitate the implementation of best practice in reviews across the institution. She added that it would make next summer's dedicated meeting an event worth waiting for, as the Committee devoted its attention to the first round of reviews conducted in the context of the *Raising Our Sights* planning process.

Item 7 – Other Business

The President said that Dr. Cook had the lead responsibility for the University in the matter concerning Dr. Chun. He noted that Dr. Chun was proceeding in three fora. In the first,

2. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting (cont'd)

Item 7 – Other Business (cont'd)

Dr. Chun had a case before the Ontario Human Rights Commission. The Commission continued to investigate the matter and had requested some further information in December, which the University had provided. The President undertook, when the decision was rendered, to report to the Board. Dr. Chun had also initiated a civil suit against the University. This action was continuing through the discovery process and, at present, Dr. Cook was being questioned by Dr. Chun's counsel. In the third forum, the University continued to make strong efforts to reach a settlement with Dr. Chun. This effort has been ongoing for several years. The University was seeking a settlement consistent with the Policy and Procedures on Academic Appointments. The mediation process was ongoing and the University's group consisted of Professor Sinervo, chair of the Department of Physics, Dr. Cook and counsel. Under mediation, the parties were exploring issues without prejudice to events in the civil suit or the proceeding before the Ontario Human Rights Commission. The mediation process was also confidential. To date, there was no common ground. The President believed the University's position was fair and principled and responsive to the findings of the Yip report. The University would continue to work for a solution that was compatible with University policies.

The member who raised the matter said that he had spoken with Dr. Cook and was encouraged by the progress. But, notwithstanding earlier encouraging reports, the situation remained unresolved. Last year, a number of members had signed a request that the matter be discussed by the Board in terms of the relevant policies. He would, at this meeting, circulate such a request for discussion of relevant policy issues at the Board's next meeting.

3. Report Number 83 of the Agenda Committee

The report was presented for information.

4. Growing Ontario's Innovation System: The Strategic Role of University Research: University's Response

The President said that Professor Munroe-Blum's report concerned an important matter for Ontario which would have a positive effect on the University. The report was an excellent and a timely one. It had been submitted to the Ministers of Training, Colleges and Universities and Energy, Science and Technology before the holiday break. They had embraced the report and distributed it with a letter encouraging debate and reaction. The President had since met with the deputy ministers. It was expected that all universities would discuss the report and provide their responses to it to the Council of Ontario Universities (COU). The COU would then develop a position on behalf of the universities of Ontario by the end of February. The Council of Ontario Universities had already applauded the commission of the report and the concerns expressed about research and adequate funding for it. Under governance, this University's response would be recommended by the Planning and Budget Committee, with the concurrence

4. ***Growing Ontario's Innovation System: The Strategic Role of University Research: University's Response*** (cont'd)

of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs, to the Academic Board and thence to Governing Council for approval. The recommended response, which had been distributed to members, had been drafted following consultation with the principals and deans; it had been unanimously endorsed by both Committees of the Board.

The President took the opportunity to thank Professor Munroe-Blum. He was pleased that she had been able to take leave to do the work and create a report that would be to the very great benefit of Ontario.

Professor Munroe-Blum gave a presentation of the highlights of her report, a paper copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "A".

Professor Mock said that at the Planning and Budget Committee's meeting there had been a good discussion of the report. All members had congratulated Professor Munroe-Blum on her report and given unanimous support to the motion. During the discussion, the following topics were raised:

- the importance of not undermining current research funding arrangements
- concerns about matching funds and developing partnerships for matching
- increasing opportunities for students to work one on one with professors on their research
- the public distribution of the report
- the government's political will to carry out the recommendations
- emphasis on basic research, not just applied research
- the response of industry to the report
- concerns over the ownership of intellectual property.

Professor Rolph reported that at the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs meeting there was also a good discussion of the report. All members who spoke prefaced their remarks with congratulations to Professor Munroe-Blum on her report. The Committee had also given unanimous support to the motion. During the discussion, the following topics were raised:

- strategies for keeping the issues in front of the government
- the importance of protecting academic freedom and university autonomy
- concerns about the government "cherry-picking" items that suit its agenda and ignoring matters that are important to the universities
- ways of showing the external community the value of research in terms of benefits to society beyond economic benefits
- ways of strengthening the teaching – research relationship to benefit students, and
- increasing government funding levels in terms of a sustained commitment to support research.

4. **Growing Ontario's Innovation System: The Strategic Role of University Research: University's Response** (cont'd)

During discussion the following points were raised:

- A member remarked that increasing the number of graduate scholarships seemed like a good idea. However, the trend in the US seemed to be to decrease scholarships in favour of increasing project support from which graduate students could be funded. Professor Munroe-Blum noted that scholarship levels in the US were far superior to those in Ontario. Therefore, the US authorities could afford to shift funding to projects. In Ontario, both scholarship support and project support needed to be increased.
- A member noted the absence of any reference to the negative effects of increasing tuition fees. Professor Munroe-Blum replied that her report did not deal with operating resources. In general, however, there was a need for adequate and even improved operating funding if the research endeavour was not to be undermined.
- A member said that there was need to support scholarly work in fields other than science and technology that would help the people of Ontario deal with innovation. Professor Munroe-Blum agreed that the social factors were very important.
- A member noted that there were two aspects to innovation: the creation of new ideas and the translation of those new ideas into social and economic benefits. While the latter aspect was a secondary one, it was a most valuable one to the government and people of Ontario. The Board should, therefore, stress that the government should not only support research but also support the translation of research outcomes to social and economic benefits by helping to establish new companies, reducing barriers to entry of businesses that applied research outcomes. The government should not stand by while the products of Canadian research and the businesses developing those products fled to the US.
- A member disagreed with Professor Munroe-Blum's comment that small awards resulted in small thinking, a comment she had made in support of the recommendation that the cap be lifted on the size of research grants. He noted a great deal of very good research was done on very small grants.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

Whereas research and scholarship are central to both the mission of the University and the benefit and prosperity of the Province; and

Whereas the University applauds the articulation of a provincial policy framework for the support of research and scholarship; and

Whereas the University agrees that a policy framework premised on university autonomy, peer review, excellence and accountability together with appropriate funding is best suited to the dynamic world of knowledge and innovation; and

4. **Growing Ontario's Innovation System: The Strategic Role of University Research: University's Response (cont'd)**

Whereas, within the context of the urgent need for improved operating funding, the University applauds the identification of the need for substantially increased resources for research;

Therefore:

The University of Toronto welcome the issuance of the report, *Growing Ontario's Innovation System: The Strategic Role of University Research* (1999), prepared for the Government of Ontario by Professor Heather Munroe-Blum, and strongly endorse the directions recommended therein.

The President again thanked Professor Munroe-Blum for her report which had been received with such critical acclaim.

5. **School of Graduate Studies: Master of Science in Planning Program - New Field in Urban Design**

arising from Report Number 76 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs and Report Number 56 of the Planning and Budget Committee

Professor Rolph introduced the proposal for a new field in Urban Design within the existing Master of Science in Planning (MScPl) program offered by the Program in Planning, Department of Geography. This new field was one of three new initiatives for teaching Urban Design at the University, as recommended by the Provost's Task Force on Graduate Programs in Architecture, Landscape Architecture, Planning and Urban Design. The other two programs were also on the agenda - the Master of Urban Design (MUD) in the Faculty of Architecture, Landscape, and Design and a Master of Urban Design Studies (MUDS) in the Program in Planning, Department of Geography.

She noted that at the meeting of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs there was much discussion on the need for the variety of programs in this discipline, the distinguishing characteristics of the different programs, and the type of clientele the programs would attract.

The main distinguishing characteristics of the three programs were as follows:

- The new field in MScPl was an analytically rigorous program that would provide students with a more advanced level of qualifications from which to offer consultation and to advise on design issues.
- The MUDS degree was more policy oriented, for non-practicing designers.
- The MUD was a two-year post-professional program designed to include an intensive studio component as part of its core courses. This program would qualify students as professional urban design practitioners.

5. **School of Graduate Studies: Master of Science in Planning Program - New Field in Urban Design** (cont'd)

Professor Rolph commented that the programs provided several routes into urban design, as well as providing an interdisciplinary link. They were built on the same courses, provided high standards, and offered students options and bridges within the disciplines. Members were in support of the initiatives. Providing the versatility of parallel streams into a discipline was a positive approach.

Professor Mock reported that resources were already in place for the new field and that the Planning and Budget Committee had received a memorandum on resource implications for information.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the proposal for the establishment of a new field in Urban Design in the Master of Science in Planning (MScPl), effective September 1, 2000, as described in the submission from the School of Graduate Studies, dated November 1999, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "B", be approved.

6. **School of Graduate Studies: Proposal for a New Master of Urban Design Studies (MUDS) Program**

arising from Report Number 76 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs and Report Number 56 of the Planning and Budget Committee

Professor Rolph introduced this proposal for a Master of Urban Design Studies program - a one-year degree program directed at students from a variety of disciplinary backgrounds related to planning who wished to enhance their understanding of urban design issues as a complement to their career interests. The MUDS degree was not a professional degree in that it did not grant certification. It would serve those who needed some training in urban design but who did not need to be professional planners.

Professor Mock indicated that resources were already in place for this new program and that the Planning and Budget Committee had received a memorandum on resource implications for information.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the proposal for the establishment of a new Master of Urban Design Studies (MUDS) program, effective September 1, 2000, as described in the

6. **School of Graduate Studies: Proposal for a New Master of Urban Design Studies (MUDS) Program** (cont'd)

submission from the School of Graduate Studies, dated November 1999, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix “C”, be approved.

7. **School of Graduate Studies: Proposal for a New Master of Urban Design (MUD) Program**

arising from Report Number 76 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs and Report Number 56 of the Planning and Budget Committee

Professor Rolph noted that this proposal was for a Master of Urban Design, a two-year post-professional degree. Individuals with a prior professional degree in Architecture, Landscape Architecture, or a graduate degree in Urban Planning with a design specialization and/or professional experience, would be eligible to apply.

Professor Mock indicated that resources for this new degree program were considered as part of the Faculty’s academic plan and the introduction of the program now had no additional resource implications.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the proposal for the establishment of a new Master of Urban Design (MUD) program, effective September 1, 2000, as described in the submission from the School of Graduate Studies, dated November 26, 1999, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix “D”, be approved

The President took the opportunity to congratulate Deans Richards and Amrhein as well as Professors Sedra and Tuohy for their considerable efforts over a number of years to strengthen all offerings in the areas of architecture, landscape architecture and urban design. The programs were now much stronger and more distinctive.

8. **Capital Project: Gerstein Science Information Centre: Phase 2**

arising from Report Number 56 of the Planning and Budget Committee

Professor Mock introduced this proposal for a change in the scope of Phase 2 of the Gerstein Science Information Centre, to provide more study space, with upgrades that include wiring for computers, in the East Addition and Renovation.

On June 24, 1999, the Governing Council approved the Users’ Committee Report, which described a significant expansion and refurbishment of the Gerstein Science Information Centre at an estimated cost of approximately \$20 million. The work was separated into seven phases with external funding to be sought from private and government sources. The

8. Capital Project: Gerstein Science Information Centre: Phase 2 (cont'd)

University has received a private donation to fund 40% to a maximum of \$5.6 million of the cost of Phase 2 of the project.

The Users' Committee report anticipated an addition of 23,600 gross square feet, the provision of 352 new study spaces and an increase in stack capacity of 4,939 shelves. The addition would act as an organizing element for the building to address way-finding issues and to provide vertical and horizontal connections. The cost of Phase 2 was originally estimated at \$8.24 million.

On the advice of Library staff and after consultation with the donor, a proposed increase in scope for Phase 2 would provide 31,000 gross square feet with a significant increase in study space to add an additional 400 user seats over what was originally proposed. The estimated cost of the revised Phase 2 was \$12 million. There was a further proposal that, while the University searched for other funding, any shortfall be allocated from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund (UIIF).

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the revised scope of Phase 2 of the Users' Committee Report for the Gerstein Science Information Centre approved on May 17, 1999 as described in Professor McCammond's memorandum dated December 2, 1999, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "E", at an estimated cost of \$12 million to be derived from the SuperBuild Growth Fund, private donations, and the University Infrastructure Investment Fund, be approved; and

THAT as funding is received from the SuperBuild Growth Fund and private donations, any shortfall be met by an allocation of not more than \$7 million from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund.

9. Capital Project: Flavelle House – Interim Users' Committee Report

arising from Report Number 56 of the Planning and Budget Committee

Professor Mock noted that the Faculty of Law had been awarded partial funding from the Ontario Research and Development Challenge Fund in the amount of \$600,000 for the implementation of the Center for Innovation. This Centre's goal was to be one of the top centres for inter-disciplinary research, analysis and policy advice on innovation law and policy, in the world.

The Flavelle House attic, currently unfinished and unoccupied space, was proposed to house 12 faculty offices accommodating 14 workstations. Planned elevator upgrades, also included in this proposal, would make this space fully accessible. The projected cost for the attic renovation was estimated at \$2,140,000. As well as the funding from the ORDCF, it

9. Capital Project: Flavelle House – Interim Users’ Committee Report (cont’d)

was proposed that the University allocate \$600,000 from the UIIF. The Faculty of Law would provide the remaining \$940,000.

A member asked if the renovations would have any negative effects on the historic building. Dean Daniels said that there would be no impact on the building. The attic which now contained ventilation equipment could be easily converted, the only change to the facade being the addition of one dormer window. A member noted that the renovation called for only faculty offices. Dean Daniels said that this was an interim report. There were other space needs in the Faculty that still needed to be addressed such as classrooms and student space. These would be dealt with in a later users’ report.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the Interim Report of the Users’ Committee for the Attic Renovation, Flavelle House, dated December 2, 1999, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix “F”, be approved in principle at a cost of \$2.14 million, with the sources of funds as described in Professor McCammond’s memorandum dated December 2, 1999; and

THAT an allocation of \$600,000 from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund, be approved.

10. Capital Project: Heart and Stroke/Richard Lewar Centre for Excellence for Cardiovascular Research - Users’ Committee Report

arising from Report Number 56 of the Planning and Budget Committee

Professor Mock explained that the Centre was part of a Faculty of Medicine initiative and would focus on detailed physiological analysis of mouse models of cardiovascular disease, and would house specialized cardiovascular analysis laboratories. The terms of reference of the Users’ Committee included determining how space and facilities should be organized and located within the FitzGerald Building, and the identification of capital and equipment costs associated with the renovations.

The Centre would be housed on the first basement level of the FitzGerald building, located adjacent to the Medical Sciences building and the planned Centre for Cellular and Biomolecular Research. The Centre would be well situated to assist in the cross-fertilization of research and analysis with the health sciences complex.

The total project cost was estimated at \$1,474,000. Funding for the project was already in hand and has been provided by donations from the Lewar family and the Ontario Heart and Stroke Foundation, the Canada Foundation for Innovation, and the ORDCF. With

10. Capital Project: Heart and Stroke/Richard Lewar Centre for Excellence for Cardiovascular Research - Users' Committee Report (cont'd)

this funding it was expected that the cost of the renovation to be borne by the Centre would be 20% of the total estimated cost.

A member was concerned that the Centre was located in the basement of the FitzGerald building which had no room for expansion. He asked whether other locations, such as the Medical Sciences Building (MSB), had been considered. Invited to respond, Professor Yip noted that the space allocated to the Centre was actually at ground level. Space in MSB was already in short supply and had not been considered as a viable choice. Professor Yip noted that this was not the only location at which cardiovascular research would be conducted. There would be other locations in the Health Sciences Complex as well as in hospitals.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the Users' Committee Report, dated December 1999, for the Lewar/HSFO Centre, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "G", be approved in principle at a cost of \$1.47 million, with funding to be provided by donations from the Lewar family, the Ontario Heart and Stroke Foundation, and funds obtained from the Ontario Research and Development Challenge Fund, and the Canada Foundation for Innovation.

11. Items for Information

(a) Report of the Vice-President and Provost

Professor Sedra wished members a happy new year.

(i) Labour Relations

Professor Sedra reported that the University and the United Steelworkers of America, the union representing the largest group of administrative staff, had arrived at a first collective agreement. This agreement had been ratified by the union and would be considered by the Business Board at its meeting on January 24th. Agreement had also been reached with the union representing the service workers. Both agreements had been reached under the leadership of Professor Finlayson.

Teaching Assistants, CUPE 3902 – Strike

Professor Sedra said that the news was not so good with respect to the teaching assistants (TA) dispute. The University's last position, which in his opinion was fair and firm, consisted of the following:

- a two-year offer, with a 2.75% increase immediately consisting of 1.5% across the board and 1.25% to recognize the 1996 rollback

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

- a 2% increase in September 2000
- a lump sum payment of \$120 immediately for each full-time TA, pro-rated for those with less than a full-time appointment
- a 50% increase in financial support toward dental rebates, and
- a guarantee of an additional year of appointment (from 3 to 4 years) for TAs who were PhD students.

He reported that on December 21st, the union executive had asked to consult with the membership. At a meeting on January 6th, with 300 out of 2400 TAs in attendance, the membership voted overwhelmingly to go on strike as of 3 p.m. Friday, January 7th. The University decided to lock out the TAs so that there would be fair and equal treatment for all students in courses with TAs; it would not be fair for some tutorials to meet and not others. Payments to TAs were stopped centrally.

Professor Sedra reported that he had immediately declared a disruption to the academic program effective January 10th. This put into effect the section of the Grading Practices Policy governing procedures in the event of a disruption. Under the Policy, classroom procedures and marking schemes could be changed in order to take into account the absence of TAs.

He had been engaged with the deans of Arts and Science and Applied Science and Engineering and the Principals of Scarborough and Erindale, the divisions for whom 90% of the TAs work, to determine what steps could be taken to minimize the disruption to students and to ensure that classes continue to meet. The add date for “S” courses had been extended by one week to January 21st and the refund schedule for those courses has also been extended by one week. On either January 14th or January 17th, he would be announcing a date by which courses that use TAs must be restructured. It was important to reduce the disturbance and uncertainty in the academic programs for undergraduate students.

With respect to communications, Professor Sedra noted that all strike-related information was being posted on the web, linked to the U of T home page, www.utoronto.ca. This information includes lists of classes temporarily affected by the strike. Currently, there were 40 course sections in Arts and Science at risk, with another 15 at each of Scarborough and Erindale. These were mainly course sections where TAs were the sole instructors.

Picketing was allowed on public property for the purposes of communicating information as long as it did not restrict or prevent entry or exit from University premises. A problem at Erindale affecting traffic on Mississauga Road had been resolved and delays but no other problems have been encountered on the other campuses.

Professor Sedra referred to the establishment of the Task Force on Graduate Student Financial Support. A copy of a memorandum giving membership and terms of reference had been distributed to members as they arrived at the meeting. This task force would look at how the University could best achieve one of the goals outlined in the *Report of the Task Force on*

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

Tuition and Student Financial Support, namely, that doctoral-stream students be given multi-year packages of support competitive with those offered by peer universities. The task force would also look at the issues surrounding the “post-4” tuition fees.

Finally, Professor Sedra commented on comparisons to recent settlements TAs reached at other universities. U of T's annual budget for TAs was about \$14 million, which represented only about 20% of the funds available to graduate students. There were also additional sources of support for graduate students amounting to \$70 million. At York University, for example, between 75 and 80% of graduate student support came from teaching assistantships.

Dr. Cook was the University's spokesperson on matters concerning the strike.

A member noted that the *Grading Practices Policy* required a week's notice before changing course requirements. He asked whether this delay would be taken into account in setting the date by which courses must be restructured. Professor Sedra affirmed that this would be taken into account.

A member who was a graduate coordinator expressed his distress over the division between University management and the students. The administration was taking decisions that appeared hostile and, he believed, that would come back to haunt the University. He said that the tuition fee waiver question was a sensitive issue. Restructuring courses to proceed without the TAs would amount to telling TAs to stay on strike until the end of term. Locking out was also a problem. He said it was very important to find an appropriate solution.

A member commented that his workload had increased with his two TAs being on strike. He said that issues of principle were hard to resolve; strike settlements usually involved money. He suggested that an increased lump sum payment could have the same effect as waiving or reducing tuition fees without the sacrifice of any principles by either party. The University could fund the increased lump sum payment using the money it had saved each week the strike was on. He was concerned about the need to serve the undergraduate students and the divisiveness caused by restructuring the courses and, in effect, telling the TAs the University could manage without them. He hoped that a settlement could be reached as soon as possible. A major issue of principle was dividing the parties but it could be reduced to a money issue. What the TAs did with a lump sum payment or how they viewed it was up to them.

A member expressed concern that about 70 courses were at risk through the strike. He noted that for spring courses, the matter could be resolved by dropping courses and adding others, but the fact that certain courses would be unavailable might affect a student's completion of requirements for a particular degree. There would be real problems if there was need to withdraw year-long courses.

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

Dean Amrhein reported that the chairs, principals and the program directors from large programs had held lengthy meetings to try to deal with the effects of the disruption. Clearly, the hardest cases were the year-long courses with a CUPE member as the designated instructor. The Faculty of Arts and Science would not be cancelling those courses but alternative action had not yet been decided. The number 70, noted by the Provost, referred to sections of courses not courses. Only a small number were stand alone courses. He commented that the goal in the Faculty of Arts and Science was to minimize the disruption to undergraduate programs. While he hoped there would be a quick resolution, the settlement with the TAs must be one that was sustainable in the long run. He could not imagine the University functioning without TAs. He had received urgent requests from undergraduates for clarity regarding the offering of their courses. Irreversible changes to courses would have to be announced before reading week. He was aware of the impact such a decision would have on the strike. He agreed that the question of tuition was one that should be reviewed by the new Orchard task force on graduate student support. It was not fair that 25% of the graduate students should be able to have tuition waived, while the same option was not available to the other 75%. He was encouraged that the task force was a strong one and would begin meeting shortly.

A member expressed his concern that in every course, any tutorial missed was a serious loss. He believed that the University would suffer in the long run. He questioned why it had taken so long to set up the task force to look at graduate student support when the goal had been set about two years ago. He believed that graduate students should not pay tuition at all. In the physical and life sciences, the students were often supported by faculty member's research grants. The problem arose concerning graduate students in the humanities and social sciences. The task force should have been established sooner to address this longstanding issue.

A member noted that other items on the agenda focussed on projects and buildings which appeared to be University priorities but the University lacked respect for people. TAs were very important to academic programs and their work was hard. Many did the job very well, but they were going into debt doing so. He said that the situation was unconscionable. There was not at this moment a good learning or teaching environment and research would be affected as well. He believed that the administration was out of touch with graduate students' real costs. The strike was divisive and the University had said that it would not discuss the tuition waiver issue. With respect to the new task force, he noted that there were only three students out of nine members which, in his opinion, was unacceptable. This University said that tuition waivers should not be provided to some graduate students (who were TAs) but not others. But there were already two groups of graduate students – those that had dental benefits and those that did not. He said that the University's argument was not viable. He wished to move a motion to direct the administration to return to the bargaining table.

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

The Chair noted that labour relations matters were within the jurisdiction of the Business Board. The Academic Board could, however, consider a motion expressing its view on the matter.

It was duly moved and seconded,

THAT the Academic Board urge the administration to return to the bargaining table.

A member commented that the job of TA had a strong academic component. He suggested that scholarships be offered to graduate students who volunteered to be TAs.

Another member suggested that too many lines were being drawn in the sand. He thought the way the strike was being handled put more courses at risk. Were there not requirements of a course such as essays or tests that could be put off until a time when it was reasonable to assume the TAs would be back at work. This could be a negotiating strategy and one that would give some flexibility.

A member stated that it was not his responsibility to minimize the disruption to undergraduate students. He would do what he had originally planned to do and he would not do any work that had been assigned to a TA. Minimizing disruption was the administration's job. TAs wanted equitable treatment. Many other employee groups had tuition benefits. The University had increased tuition fees, which in effect lowered the value of a teaching assistantship. He suggested the University restore the net value of the teaching assistantships to 1991 levels, before the large fee increases were instituted.

A member suggested a friendly amendment to the motion concerning the tuition waiver issue: the addition of the words "and consider the creative ways of dealing with the tuition issue that were raised at the meeting of the Academic Board". The amendment was accepted by both the mover and the seconder.

Professor Sedra asked what the creative suggestions were. A member referred to using a lump sum payment as an alternative to a tuition waiver.

Another member said that she was not adverse to urging the administration to return to the table, but it could not negotiate by itself. She was, therefore, opposed to the motion.

The President apologized for leaving the meeting to take a phone call from a senior official with the federal government and for missing much of this discussion. He believed it was not productive to give tactical directions to the administration concerning its bargaining positions. There were nuances and subtleties to negotiating on an ongoing basis. It was unhelpful to have advice on tactical matters. He said that labour-relations matters were within the jurisdiction of the Business Board but the Academic Board was entitled to speak on any

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

matter it wished. The administration continued to spend a large part of each day working on this matter and there was no lack of the intensity of effort by him, the Provost and other senior members of the administration. It was helpful, though, to hear members comments on the issues. He said that the administration would take account of all that had been said. The administration was also consulting with principals and deans. As well, a meeting of PDAD&C was scheduled for early next week. He urged members to vote against the motion.

The vote was taken on the motion.

The motion was defeated.

(ii) Professor Sedra – Award

The President announced that Professor Sedra had been awarded the Golden Jubilee Medal of the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers for exceptional contributions toward advancing in various forums the Society's goals during the first 50 years of its history.

(iii) Appointments and Status Changes

The report was presented for information.

(b) Items for Information in Report Number 76 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs

There were no questions on this report.

(c) Items for Information in Report Number 56 of the Planning and Budget Committee

Professor Mock drew attention to the discussion of the Varsity Stadium development plans and of the submission to the SuperBuild Growth Fund.

12. Date of Next Meeting

The Chair noted that the next regular meeting of the Board would be held on March 9th, 2000.

The Board moved into closed session.

13. Academic Administrative Appointments

The following academic administrative appointments were approved:

Faculty of Arts and Science

Professor Eric Fong	Associate Dean, Research from January 1, 2000 to June 30, 2000
---------------------	---

OISE/UT

Institute of Child Study

Professor Robbie Case	Director from January 1, 2000 to December 31, 2004
-----------------------	---

School of Graduate Studies

Professor Donald Cormack	Vice-Dean from July 1, 2000 to June 30, 2005
--------------------------	---

Professor Sedra reported for information that Professor Richard Helmstadter has been appointed Acting Principal of Victoria College from January 1, 2000 to June 30, 2000.

The meeting adjourned at 6:25 p.m.

Secretary
January 14th, 2000

Chair