

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL
REPORT NUMBER 105 OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD

March 29th, 2001

To the Governing Council,
University of Toronto.

Your Board reports that it held a meeting on Thursday, March 29th, 2001 at 4:15 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall. An attendance list is attached to this report. In this report, items 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13 are recommended to Governing Council for approval, item 14 is for Executive Committee confirmation, and the remaining items are reported for information.

Chair's Remarks

The Chair reported with regret that Professor David Mock's mother had died the previous week. On behalf of the Board, he extended his deepest sympathy to Professor Mock.

The Chair welcomed Professor Ronald Venter to the meeting, his first as Vice-Provost, Space and Facilities Planning.

1. Report of the Previous Meeting

The report of the previous meeting, dated February 15th, 2001, was approved.

2. Business Arising Out of the Report

A member referred to three items. In response, Professor Sedra said that he would report on matters at the Faculty of Law under his report. The Chair noted that the Agenda Committee had dealt with the member's other two matters at its meeting. The member asked that his list of questions, sent to the Agenda Committee concerning admission practices and diversity in the Faculty of Law, be sent to members of the Board. The Chair agreed.

3. Report Number 91 of the Agenda Committee

The Chair noted that this report was presented for information.

4. Budget Report 2001-2002

(arising from an excerpt to Report Number 70 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Sevcik reported that the Planning and Budget Committee had considered the 2001-02 Budget Report on March 20. At its previous two meetings, the Committee had discussed in detail an update to the Long-Range Guidelines and Assumptions, 1998-2004, the Budget Projections and the Contractual Obligations and Policy Commitments.

The Committee had scrutinized the assumptions on which the Budget was constructed, provided advice to the administration, and satisfied itself that the academic allocations were appropriate. There had been extensive discussion about the proposed endowment for graduate student aid and about the budget reductions proposed as one-time-only for 2001-02 and 1.5% in base funding for 2002-03 and 2003-04. The Committee had heard two

4. **Budget Report 2001-2002** (cont'd)

eloquent presentations from Mr. Jorge Sousa, President of the Graduate Students' Union, in support of the increased emphasis on funding for graduate student aid and the endowment. Many members of the Committee also saw the endowment as a much-awaited opportunity to enhance the recruitment and retention of first-rate graduate students. With Professor Sedra's assurance that the one-time-only reduction would be applied only if necessary and not until the fourth quarter of 2001-02, and that any net positive variance that arose in the financial forecasts for the operating budget would be used to lessen the deficit control reduction, the Committee strongly supported the recommendation that the Budget Report be approved.

Professor Sedra reviewed the highlights of the Budget Report, 2001-02 using a powerpoint presentation, a copy of which is attached hereto as part of Appendix "A". Among the highlights were the following:

- the University was entering the fourth year of a six-year planning period ending in 2003-2004
- the forecasted annual deficit for 2003-04 was now \$14.1 million instead of the previously forecasted \$1.2 million deficit
- the amount of the provincial operating grant for next year has not been announced
- there could be significant increase in revenue through enrolment growth and research overhead
- a one-time-only deficit control reduction of 2.5% would be applied, if needed, in the fourth quarter of 2001-2002.

The Chair invited Mr. Jorge Sousa, President, Graduate Students' Union, to address the Board. Mr. Sousa noted that in the past, one of the main concerns of graduate students had been the lack of funding. In this year's Budget Report, that problem was being addressed. He was pleased to note the establishment of an endowment for graduate student support. Following the release of the Orchard Task Force Report on Graduate Student Support, graduate students were skeptical about the University's will to provide support packages. In his opinion, the provision in the Budget was a breakthrough. He applauded Professors Sedra and Orchard. He believed the benefits would outweigh the costs and the University would find it easier to recruit outstanding graduate students with guaranteed support packages. There were, however, concerns arising from the need to make budget reductions.

A member echoed the previous speaker's remarks about the endowment for graduate student support. However, he was concerned about funding for non-doctoral stream and professional program students. In view of the escalating non-regulated fees in a number of professional disciplines, he asked if there was a source of funds for these students. Funding was mostly in the form of loans and he wondered what help there would be in managing their debt load. He understood that the revenue from the increased fees was to improve quality of programs but two divisions, Law and Management, did not have approved academic plans. He asked when these would be available. Professor Sedra noted the commitment in the Policy on Student Financial Support which stated that "no student offered admission to a program at the University of Toronto should be unable to enter or complete the program due to lack of financial means." This guarantee applied to all students. He understood that the form of student support in Law and Management was strongly reliant on loans but there were debt remission programs for those who wished to pursue careers in which their incomes were substantially lower than the norm. With respect to the academic plans, although Management's plan was not yet approved, the Faculty had already received a number of allocations to improve program quality. Professor Sedra expected the plan for Management to be ready by June and the one for Law in the fall.

4. Budget Report 2001-2002 (cont'd)

In response to a member's question, Professor Sedra said that the proposed support package for graduate students was \$12,000 plus tuition. That for international students was the same. A member asked if there were plans to eliminate the differential fee for international students. Professor Sedra indicated that there were no plans to eliminate the differential but the funding package would, in effect, do that except for international students supported by their governments. A member noted that those who were supported by their governments were expected to pay back the loan from their home government.

The President reminded the Board that the reason there was a fee differential was because the provincial government did not provide any operating funding for international students. He and his colleagues had been advocating funding for these students to the Ministry and had been explaining the positive effects of having international students in the province's university community. If they were funded, the differential fee would no longer be necessary. He also reported that he was lobbying to have the provincial government create a new program similar to the Ontario Student Opportunity Trust Fund for graduate students. He was optimistic about these efforts and noted the tremendous effect a matching government program would have on attracting graduate student support for the endowment.

A member noted the effect of rising utilities costs on the budget in increasing the deficit. He suggested that a working group be established to discuss the possibility of a hedging program and perhaps a contingency fund similar to that for currency fluctuations in the library. Professor Sedra said that these were good suggestions and he would study them.

A member also expressed his gratitude for plans to increase graduate support. He was, however, concerned about departmental budget reductions. He noted that at the last meeting, the Board had allocated \$5 million to an external body. In his view, that amount could have been used to offset half of the expected shortfall. He was concerned about the effect of increasing fees on students who were at the University and those who could not come to the University because of the cost. As well, he noted his concern about graduate students with increasing debt loads; he believed that students did not trust the debt reduction programs. If the University hoped to attract quality students, including international students, in the member's opinion, it would have to be a more welcoming place. The level of government funding was not improving; it was only concerned with addressing funding for enrolment growth. The member stated that fees were a disincentive to attend university and asked why they could not be abolished. The University must do more to lobby for increased operating support. He suggested that the various student associations would be prepared to join any lobbying efforts. Physical accessibility issues also needed to be addressed as did environmental policies. He asked that a sheet from the Canadian Federation of Students on fees be distributed. Professor Sedra stated emphatically that this and all universities were constantly making representations for increased support to both levels of government. The President said that it would be unrealistic to think that tuition fees could be abolished.

A member repeated a rumour that more graduate students were being admitted than the number for which the departments had funding packages. Was this situation being monitored? Secondly, she expressed her concern that the one-time-only reductions be carefully monitored to prevent debilitating erosion of departmental infrastructures. Faculty could accomplish a great deal if they were provided with secretarial and administrative support.

4. **Budget Report 2001-2002** (cont'd)

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the proposed Budget Report for 2001-02, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "A", be approved.

5. **Capital Project: Sidney Smith Hall - Patio Enclosure - Users' Committee Report**
(arising from Report Number 68 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Sevcik explained that this was a proposal to close in the space on the podium level of the existing overhang extending from both the east and west building faces of Sidney Smith Hall. Additional space would be used for food services and bookable tables for student groups in the east patio, and quiet study space with connectivity for laptops in the west patio.

A member recalled a plan to make the front of Sidney Smith Hall accessible using an elevator and he wondered whether this was included in this proposal. Professor McCammond said that all new construction would be accessible. Dean Amrhein said that the proposed elevator would be very expensive and that it was part of a renovation plan for the south end of the building, to be done after the east and west phases. An elevator would require a great deal of infrastructure which was not there at present.

In response to a question about retail space, Dean Amrhein said that he would resist adding retail space to an academic building. He noted the presence of shops on the perimeter of the University on Spadina, College and Bloor streets.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the Users' Committee Report for the Sidney Smith Hall Patio Enclosure, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "B", be approved in principle to accommodate student activities including food facilities, lounge space, study space and club space;

THAT the project scope as described in the Users' Committee Report be approved, at a total cost of \$1,647,000 including furnishings for the east enclosure (\$400,000 to be from ancillary services contingent upon a new food service being present) and an equal cost for the west enclosure; and,

THAT the project be recommended for implementation at such time as funding has been identified and becomes available

6. **Capital Project: Sidney Smith Hall, Infill Project - Users' Committee Report**
University Infrastructure Investment Fund: Allocation
(arising from Report Number 68 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Sevcik noted that the Committee considered reports of users' committees and recommended to the Academic Board approval in principle of capital projects. This was a proposal to add space on the third floor level of the Sidney Smith Hall above the existing two-storey lobby, adjacent to existing departmental space, to create additional space for the

6. **Capital Project: Sidney Smith Hall, Infill Project - Users' Committee Report**
University Infrastructure Investment Fund: Allocation (cont'd)

Departments of History and of Political Science. Both have identified a serious lack of space for faculty and for graduate students, a major factor in effective recruitment of both.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the Users' Committee Report for the Sidney Smith Hall Third Floor Infill Project, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "C", be approved in principle;

THAT the project scope as described in the Users' Committee Report, to construct approximately 670 gross square metres, be approved at an estimated cost of \$2,164,000;

THAT phase 1 be recommended for implementation with funding of \$455,000 from the Faculty of Arts and Science, \$100,000 available for the construction of the seminar room, and \$1,289,000 from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund, with phase 2 recommended to proceed when the source of additional funding of \$320,000 is identified; and

THAT an allocation of \$1,289,000 from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund be approved.

7. **Capital Project: Bahen Centre for Information Technology - Link to Koffler Student Services Centre**
University Infrastructure Investment Fund: Allocation
(arising from Report Number 69 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Sevcik said that the Committee also approved significant changes in project scope. An indoor link between the Koffler Student Services Centre and the Bahen Centre for Information Technology was desirable to provide convenient access for students to a major classroom and laboratory area. This proposal was coming forward now because of the difficulty in effectively designing the link to minimize loss of space in the Koffler building. Because of the sequential tendering of the project, the additional cost was no more than if the link had been included in the original allocation.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT a link between the Bahen Centre for Information Technology (BCIT) and the Koffler Student Services Centre be included in the scope of the BCIT project;

THAT an additional \$750,000 from the UIIF be allocated to the project.

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

8. **Academic Transitional Fund: Allocation to the Faculty of Law**
(arising from an excerpt to Report Number 70 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Sevcik reported that the Faculty of Law had a current shortfall in private donor funding for two projects that were ready to commence. The proposed allocation was for a loan to allow construction to begin while the Faculty continued fund-raising.

A member expressed his continuing concern that the renovation would house the Centre for Innovation, a body that was not “neutral” in its academic direction in his opinion.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT an allocation of \$850,000 be approved from the Academic Transitional Fund to the Faculty of Law as a loan to be repaid by the Faculty over the next three years.

Documentation for this item is attached hereto as Appendix “E”.

9. **Capital Project: Botany Greenhouse Relocation - Users’ Committee Report**
(arising from an excerpt to Report Number 70 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Sevcik said that the Department of Botany was a national and international research leader. The current greenhouse had been constructed in 1932 and was now an outdated facility unable to support research of this caliber and magnitude. The proposed relocation of the botany activities was to the Earth Sciences Building, with the possibility that the current greenhouse would be removed to the campus of the University of Toronto at Scarborough.

A member asked if the moving of the greenhouses to the Scarborough campus was a part of the cost. Professor Venter explained that the greenhouses on the corner of College Street and University Avenue were of historical value. Moving them to Scarborough was something that was currently being considered but the costs for such a relocation were not part of the proposal. The greenhouses would not have to be moved until the site was needed for the Pharmacy project. There remained about a year in which to make a decision about the greenhouses. He noted that the structure that holds the glass together was disintegrating. With respect to the proposal before the Board, it concerned moving the botany activities from the greenhouses to another structure at the Earth Sciences Centre.

It was duly moved and seconded,

THAT Professor Robert Wright, Associate Dean, Faculty of Architecture, Landscape, and Design, be invited to address the Board.

The vote was taken on the motion.
The motion was carried.

Professor Wright, speaking on behalf of Dean Richards, noted that any proposal for construction at the corner of College and University should include provision for preserving the historic and architecturally significant greenhouses located on that site. He believed the Users’ Committee understated the value of these superb artifacts. He asked that the University find new uses for these structures and that the Academic Board take a stand on this important issue. He suggested that the Board pass a motion acknowledging the historic, architectural and

9. **Capital Project: Botany Greenhouse Relocation - Users' Committee Report**
(cont'd)

urban design importance of these exquisite structures and determine to preserve and reuse them.

Professor Venter explained that there were on going discussions with the City regarding the historical designation. He reiterated that the current proposal did not affect the greenhouses. He took the comments under advisement and said that the points made would be considered in any proposals for moving the greenhouses.

A member noted that the new home for the botany activities would be built on a green space on the south side of the Earth Sciences building. He regretted that yet another green space would be disappearing.

A member gave notice of the motion proposed by Professor Wright.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDED

THAT the Users' Committee Report for the Relocation of the Botany Greenhouse, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "F", be approved in principle; and,

THAT the project scope as identified in the Users' Committee Report be approved at a cost of \$6,065,810 with funding of \$2,760,800 from each of the Canada Foundation for Innovation (C.F.I.) and the Ontario Innovation Trust (O.I.T.), and the remainder of \$544,210 to be funded as a secondary effect from the Pharmacy Building Project.

10. **Capital Project: Woodsworth College Residence - Change in Scope**
University Infrastructure Investment Fund: Allocation
(arising from an excerpt from Report Number 70 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Sevcik recalled that the original design for the proposed construction of a new residence project at the corner of Bloor and St. George had not included a basement. It was proposed to modify the design to create an additional 1,315 net assignable square metres (nasm) below grade. The new space would accommodate video and film storage for the University Library. Mechanical services would be relocated from the first floor to the basement creating unassigned space for future allocation by the Provost.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDED

THAT the change of scope in the Woodsworth College Residence of 1,315 nasm, as described in the memorandum from Professor Venter, dated March 14, 2001, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "G", be approved; and

THAT an allocation of \$1,360,000 from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund be approved.

11. **School of Graduate Studies: Institute of Medical Science - Disestablishment**
Faculty of Medicine: Institute of Medical Science - Re-establishment
Academic Priorities Fund and Enrolment Growth Fund: Allocations
(arising from an excerpt from Report Number 70 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Sevcik explained that it was customary for institutes to begin in the School of Graduate Studies and when they were mature units to move to the Faculty with which they shared research interests. This was a proposal to move the Institute for Medical Science from the School of Graduate Studies to the Faculty of Medicine. There were no financial implications to the move.

It was proposed, as well, that an allocation in base funding, that had been requested for the Institute by the School of Graduate Studies and delayed until the Institute was finally re-located, be approved. The allocation was in recognition of significant growth in the Institute.

A member asked whether the move had implications for academic matters such as a possibility of more teaching assistantships. Professor Sedra commented that the relocation of the Institute was proposed in order to exploit the synergies of being within a large multi-departmental faculty.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDED

THAT the Institute of Medical Science be disestablished as an academic unit in the School of Graduate Studies and re-established as the Institute of Medical Science in the Faculty of Medicine, effective May 1, 2001; and

THAT an allocation of \$120,000 in base from the Academic Priorities Fund and of \$25,000 in base from the Enrolment Growth Fund to the Faculty of Medicine for the Institute of Medical Science be approved.

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

12. **School of Graduate Studies: Institute for the History and Philosophy of Science and Technology - Disestablishment**
Faculty of Arts and Science: Institute for the History and Philosophy of Science and Technology - Re-establishment
(arising from an excerpt to Report Number 70 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDED

THAT the Institute for the History and Philosophy of Science and Technology be disestablished as an academic unit in the School of Graduate Studies and re-established as the Institute for the History and Philosophy of Science and Technology in the Faculty of Arts and Science, effective May 1, 2001.

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

13. University Infrastructure Investment Fund: Allocation - Faculty of Nursing
(arising from an excerpt to Report Number 70 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Sevcik commented that this was a proposal to proceed with much-needed renovations to the administrative areas of the Faculty of Nursing, making available more space for reception, alumni and development services and improved space for student services.

A member noted that this building was inaccessible and asked when this issue would be dealt with. Professor Venter said that renovations for this building had been proposed in a number of phases. The accessibility issue would be discussed in the summer of this year. A member from the Faculty of Nursing said that the Faculty had received some funding from SAC and it was actively pursuing funding opportunities.

Another member noted that the Faculty was listed on page 15 of the Budget Report which showed the status of the University Infrastructure Investment Fund. Professor McCammond explained that in the future, the Faculty of Nursing would need a new facility. In the meantime, there were a number of smaller renovation projects to complete.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDED

THAT an allocation of \$354,000 from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund for renovations to the Faculty of Nursing Building be approved.

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

14. Woodsworth College: Constitution – Revisions

Principal Hildyard said that the revisions to the Constitution followed a lengthy consultation process. The Constitution had been simplified. Two changes included an increase in the number of students on Council and the elimination of members from the Council representing now defunct offices.

A member congratulated the Principal on increasing the number of students. However, he asked why the faculty members of the Council were chosen by the Principal. Professor Hildyard said that Woodsworth College had no faculty associated with the College. Instead, she chose faculty related to the College through the various College programs.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the revised Woodsworth College constitution be approved.

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

15. Items for Information**(a) Report of the Vice-President and Provost**

Faculty of Law

Professor Sedra gave an update on the matter at the Faculty of Law. He said that there were two processes in place. Firstly, the students who allegedly had misrepresented their marks would be dealt with under the Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters. They would be meeting with the Dean shortly and would follow the steps laid down in the Code. Secondly, a fact-finding committee, chaired by University Professor Emeritus Peter Russell, would be seeking to clarify the facts concerning this incident. It would not be asked for an opinion or to determine if there had been any misconduct. The President had determined the membership in consultation.

A member said that the matter had been discussed at length at the Governing Council and that many had expressed concern with the chilling effect that this matter was having on the University community. Professor Sedra recalled that the discussion had been brief and few members had expressed concern about the proposed procedures. He emphasized that it was essential to investigate the issue to determine the facts. Another member supported the need to determine the facts, especially in the light of unsubstantiated speculation in the press.

A member indicated that he had two concerns. One was the difference in treatment of the students and the faculty when both could be dealt with under the Code. Secondly, he asked whether there was a provision in the fact-finding committee that allowed for cross-examination to test the validity of the evidence. He believed this was a valuable process. He also asked whether there were procedures set down for the fact-finding committee. Professor Sedra explained that it was not known at this time whether any infractions that could be dealt with under the Code had indeed occurred. That was the purpose of the fact-finding committee. When the committee's report was released, it would be evident how it had proceeded.

(b) Items for Information in Reports Number 86 and 87 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs

Professor Gallop referred members to an overview of the discussion of the recently completed reviews in the Report of the Agenda Committee. Both volumes of the summaries of reviews were available either on the web or through the Governing Council Secretariat. In Report Number 87, Professor Gallop referred to an addition to policy at the School of Graduate Studies which established deadlines for the completion of doctoral program components.

(c) Items for Information in Reports Number 68 and 69 of the Planning and Budget Committee

Professor Sevcik had no further comments to make on these reports.

(d) Report Number 254 of the Academic Appeals Committee

This report was presented for information. A member was concerned with the requirements for medical certificates which necessitated a number of visits to doctors. In the interest of reducing doctors' visits in general, she asked that other means of determining the same information be considered.

15. Items for Information (cont'd)(e) Report on Donations over \$250,000 - November 2000-January 2001

This report was presented for information. There were no questions.

16. Date of Next Meeting - May 3, 2001**17. Other Business**

A member raised an issue concerning the notification to a student of an appeal of a court decision concerning the Governing Council elections and the Chair ruled the matter outside the jurisdiction of the Academic Board.

The meeting moved into closed session.

18. Academic Administrative Appointments

The following academic administrative appointments were approved:

Faculty of Arts and Science*Department of Classics*

Professor Brad Inwood	Chair from July 1, 2001 to June 30, 2007 (with one year of leave during this period)
-----------------------	---

Department of Near and Middle Eastern Civilizations

Professor James Reilly	Chair from July 1, 2001 to June 30, 2006
------------------------	--

School of Graduate Studies*Centre of Criminology*

Professor Anthony Doob	Acting Director from July 1, 2001 to June 30, 2002 (leave replacement for R. Gartner)
------------------------	---

Faculty of Medicine*Department of Ophthalmology*

Professor Jeffrey Hurwitz	Chair from April 1, 2001 to June 30, 2006
---------------------------	---

Department of Radiation Oncology

Professor Mary Gospodarowicz	Chair from July 1, 2001 to June 30, 2006
------------------------------	--

Institute of Medical Science

Professor Ori Rotstein	Director from July 1, 2001 to June 30, 2005
------------------------	---

18. Academic Administrative Appointments (cont'd)

OISE/UT

Professor Kenneth Leithwood Associate Dean, Research from July 1,
2001 to June 30, 2006

University of Toronto Library

Ms Carole Moore Chief Librarian from July 1, 2001 to June
30, 2009 (with two six-month leaves to be
taken during this term) (re-appointment)

19. University Professors: Appointment

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT Michael Bliss, Department of History, Faculty of Arts and Science, Edward J. Davison, Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering, Sajeew John, Department of Physics, Faculty of Arts and Science, Geoffrey A. Ozin, Department of Chemistry, Faculty of Arts and Science, Thomas L. Pangle, Department of Political Science, Faculty of Arts and Science, and Janet Rossant, Department of Medical Genetics and Microbiology, Faculty of Medicine, be appointed University Professors as of January 1, 2001.

The meeting adjourned 6:00 p.m.

Secretary
March 30, 2001

Chair