

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO  
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL  
REPORT NUMBER 119 OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD

May 8, 2003

To the Governing Council,  
University of Toronto.

Your Board reports that it held a meeting on Thursday, May 8, 2003 at 4:15 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall. An attendance list is presented at the end of this report. In this report, items 5, 6, 7 and 8 are recommended to Governing Council for approval, item 9 is presented for Executive Committee confirmation and the remaining items are reported for information.

A motion to adjourn no later than 6:30 p.m. was duly moved and seconded. The motion was carried.

With the Board's concurrence, the order of the agenda was varied to consider the academic administrative appointments first.

The Board moved *in camera*

**1. Academic Administrative Appointments**

The following academic administrative appointments were approved:

FACULTY OF ARTS AND SCIENCE

*Department of Computer Science*

Professor Craig Boutilier	Chair from July 1, 2004 to June 30, 2010 (Term is for five years, includes one year of research leave)
---------------------------	---

*Department of Geography*

Professor Joe Desloges	Chair from July 1, 2004 to June 30, 2007
Professor Larry Bourne	Acting Chair from July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004

*Department of Philosophy*

Professor Donald Ainslie	Chair from July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2008
--------------------------	--

FACULTY OF MEDICINE

*Department of Anaesthesia*

Professor David Richard Bevan	Chair from July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2006
-------------------------------	--

---

**1. Academic Administrative Appointments (cont'd)***Department of Nutritional Science*

Professor Thomas Wolever                      Acting Chair from July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004

*Department of Public Health Sciences*

Professor Kue Young                              Acting Chair from July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004

## UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO AT SCARBOROUGH

Professor Kwong-loi Shun                      Principal from January 1, 2004 to June 30, 2010

Professor Rudy Boonstra                      Vice-Principal, Research from June 1, 2003 to June 30, 2005

*Department of Computer and Mathematical Sciences*

Professor Alberto Mendelzon                      Chair from July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2005

The Board moved into open session.

Professor Neuman reported that the Governing Council had, prior to the meeting, approved the appointment of Professor Kwong-loi Shun as Vice-President of the University of Toronto at Scarborough and the Board had approved his appointment as Principal. Later in the meeting, the President reported that he had spoken to Professor Shun. He was excited about coming to UTSC and to Toronto. The President noted that the Chancellor-elect, Senator Vivienne Poy, had been helpful in assuring Professor Shun of the vibrancy and multi-cultural nature of the City.

**2. Report of the Previous Meeting**

The Chair noted that a member had requested a change to his motion concerning the referral back of the budget.

The report of the previous meeting, dated April 10, 2003, as amended, was approved.

**3. Business Arising**

The Chair recalled that at the previous meeting a member had asked for an amendment to the Report of March 20 concerning the Post-doctoral Office. The member said that he had asked a question about English as a Second Language (ESL) programs for post-doctoral fellows and that it was not recorded in the Report. The Chair noted that the Secretary had no record that this question had been asked and he was reluctant to change the Report. He said that in answer to the member's question he had learned that at present post-doctoral fellows could take ESL courses at the School of Continuing Studies. The Office was putting together a proposal with SCS to offer an ESL program suited to the needs of post-doctoral fellows.

### 3. Business Arising (cont'd)

The Chair also reported that the Agenda Committee had discussed the request for documentation made under other business and this matter was reported in the Report of the Agenda Committee, the next item on the agenda.

### 4. Report Number 105 of the Agenda Committee

The report was received for information.

A member clarified his request for documentation with respect to the LSAT case before the Ontario Human Rights Commission. He had not requested all the documentation but rather a one-page sheet on the value of LSAT in the admission process. He noted that the use of the LSAT was a major issue in the United States. The Chair indicated that the member could approach the Faculty with his request.

### 5. Capital Project: Rotman Management Building Extension – Project Planning Report (arising from Report Number 88 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Mock explained that this was a project for the addition of a third and fourth floor to the Rotman Management Building to provide badly needed space for the delivery of the Faculty's academic program. It was important to the program's integrity that additional space be contiguous to the existing space and the construction of a new building adjacent to the current one was not financially feasible at this time nor in the foreseeable future.

A member asked whether the possibility of adding future floors had been considered in the original construction of the building and whether this was something that would be a part of future capital project design processes. Professor Venter said that when the building had been planned there had been no discussion of adding two additional floors. It was now being proposed that they be added with the appropriate re-inforcement of the parking garage.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

#### YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDED

1. THAT the project planning report for the Expansion to the Joseph L. Rotman Building, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "A", be approved in principle.
2. THAT the project scope of 488 nasm, approximately 880 gsm, of new space be approved at an estimated total project cost of \$3,999,000 to \$4,400,000, with funding as follows:
  - (i) Contribution of \$3 million received from a supporter of the Rotman School of Management and assigned to this project.
  - (ii) Contribution of \$341,000 from the Rotman Building Construction Project. This represents the balance of funds allocated to the original Joseph L. Rotman Building project.
  - (iii) Contribution of \$658,000 or as requested to be raised from external donors to meet the complete project cost. Project will only proceed to construction once all funds identified in (ii) and (iii) are received.

---

**6. Capital Project: Lash Miller Laboratories – Project Planning Report**  
(arising from Report Number 88 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Mock said that the undergraduate Chemistry laboratories in the Lash Miller Building had not been upgraded or renovated for many years. With the increased enrolment expected in the Faculty of Arts and Science this September, it had become critical – both for safety considerations and for the effective delivery of the Chemistry program – that these laboratories now be significantly renovated and upgraded.

A member said that he was supportive of upgrading the laboratory facilities in the Chemistry building but this item and the previous one concerned changes to one of the newer buildings and one that had recently been extensively renovated. There were still a large number of buildings that were inaccessible. He, therefore, proposed the following notice of motion:

THAT \$5,600,000 immediately be allocated to ensure accessibility to currently inaccessible University of Toronto facilities.

A member referred to a comment in the Report of the Planning and Budget Committee, on page 5, which stated that the laboratories could safely accommodate only 28 students while they were currently required to accommodate 90 and by the fall, it was expected that space would be needed for 120 students. He asked if there were safety concerns. Professor Venter recalled that the laboratories had been built in the 1960s. All safety requirements had been met. However, as enrolment increased, the number of fume hoods required would also increase and it was necessary to upgrade and make better use of the space.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDED

THAT the Project Planning Report to Upgrade and Renovate the Undergraduate Chemistry Laboratories within the Lash Miller Building, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix “B”, be approved in principle;

THAT the project scope to upgrade and renovate the undergraduate chemistry laboratories within the Lash Miller Building be approved at an estimated total project cost of \$5,300,000 to \$5,600,000 with funding as follows:

- (i) contribution of \$4,000,000 from approved growth enrolment funds to be allocated by the University of Toronto towards this project;
- (ii) contribution of \$700,000 from the Department of Chemistry; and, contribution of \$900,000 from the Faculty of Arts and Science.

**7. University of Toronto at Mississauga: Establishment of Departmental Structure**  
(arising from Report Number 88 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Mock noted that the Planning and Budget Committee also considered plans and proposals to establish, disestablish or significantly restructure academic units. The Committee reviewed the proposed departmental structure at UTM, which had come forward after extensive consultation at UTM and approval by the Erindale College Council.

A member noted that the proposed departments had faculty sizes ranging from 12 to 22 and asked for clarification. Professor Orchard responded that the current structure was based on three divisions. The departmental structure was new and the number of faculty in each new department was the result of the amalgamation of the appropriate groups to form them. It

---

**7. University of Toronto at Mississauga: Establishment of Departmental Structure**  
(cont'd)

was expected that the faculty size would increase as enrolment expanded and new faculty were hired.

It was noted that there had been an amendment to the original documentation concerning the names of two departments; the amended names were the Department of Biology and the Department of French, German and Italian. The full amended list of departments was attached to this report.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDED

THAT the Departmental Structure of the University of Toronto at Mississauga described in Professor McCammond's amended memorandum of March 28, 2003, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "C", be approved, effective July 1, 2003.

**8. School of Graduate Studies: Master of Arts in Teaching - Discontinuation**  
(arising from Report Number 88 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Mock reported that the Master of Arts in Teaching in English had continuing low enrolment over the last number of years and departmental priorities had changed. The program would be phased out so that currently enrolled students would be able to complete their program, but there would be no new students admitted. There were no significant financial implications to the discontinuation of this program.

A member asked whether low enrolment was reason enough to close a program if there were no costs involved. Professor McCammond said that it was incorrect to say that there were no costs. Enrolment had been three full-time equivalent students for the last few years. It was not feasible to offer the program. Another member noted that this Board regularly approved the establishment of exciting new programs. It was reasonable to disestablish programs without academic importance or low enrolment. Decisions were made in the divisions about the best way to expend the resources. In this case, students were not choosing to take this degree.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDED

THAT the proposal for discontinuation of the MA(T) degree in English, be approved, with no new students admitted to the program, effective immediately.

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

**9. University of Toronto at Mississauga: Constitution - Amendments**

Professor Orchard recalled that earlier this academic year the Board had approved an amendment to separate the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM) from the Faculty of Arts and Science. UTM had then engaged in the department planning process and a committee had been established to review the Constitution. The substantive changes

---

**9. University of Toronto at Mississauga: Constitution – Amendments (cont'd)**

included moving elections from March to September, electing students from the College as a whole instead of by division, and adding retired teaching staff to the Council membership. In response to a question, he confirmed that students had been represented on the review committee.

A member commended the notion of retired teaching staff on the Council and suggested the Academic Board consider doing the same.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the Erindale College Council Constitution, as amended, dated April 11, 2003, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix “E”, be approved.

**10. Items for Information**

- (a) Report of the Vice-President and Provost
  - (i) Awards

Professor Neuman reported that the American Academy of Arts and Science had honoured five current members of the University’s teaching staff with membership: University Professor James Arthur, University Professor Richard Bond, Professor Geoffrey Hinton, University Professor Linda Hutcheon and University Professor Janet Rossant.

- (ii) SuperBuild Announcement

Professor Neuman said that the University of Toronto had received \$55.8 million in the recent SuperBuild announcement. This was 34% of the funding available, more than the usual *pro rata* share the University might have expected. The funding was targeted for UTM and UTSC, areas of the GTA where the population growth and demand for higher education was heaviest. UTSC would be constructing a new classroom building and UTM would build a new student resources centre.

- (iii) Review of Capital Expenditures

Professor Neuman noted that the Long-Range Budget Guidelines would be ready in June. There were considerable challenges, including the question of revenue generation, in drafting new Guidelines. The goal was to bring new revenue into the University. As well, expenditure patterns were being studied. There were redundancies in University activities that could be deleted. A small working group had been struck to review capital expenditures and consider the ratio of debt to assets. It was to consider capital projects in terms of academic priority and fiscal feasibility. Only projects with secured funding and top academic priority would proceed. This would lower the debt to equity ratio and contain costs. She noted that the academic planning process had been slowed to allow for input from the new Guidelines. The previous target date for the draft academic plan had been late April; this had now been moved forward to mid June.

---

**10. Items for Information (cont'd)**

- (a) Report of the Vice-President and Provost (cont'd)
- (iv) Appointments and Status Changes / Appointment of Professors Emeriti

Professor Neuman drew attention to the list of appointments and status changes, including the appointment of one professor emeritus. A member asked if the Board would use “emerita”. It was noted that the word “emerita” was not grammatically correct in Latin but the Board could choose to coin the term. Following comments from several speakers, the Chair said that he would bring the matter to the attention of the Agenda Committee.

- (v) University Professors Selection Committee: Membership

The membership of the Committee was presented for information. The Committee would be meeting in June.

- (b) Items for Information in Report Number 88 of the Planning and Budget Committee

Members had no questions on this report.

- (c) Report Number 278 of the Academic Appeals Committee

Noting the length of time it had taken the student to get a decision on this appeal, a member said that she had a general question about timelines. She recalled that earlier this year, the School of Graduate Studies had reviewed its timelines and she wondered whether this issue should be reviewed across the University. Professor Goel indicated that such a University-wide review was underway.

- (d) Employment Equity Report, 2002

Professor Neuman said that the cover letter from Professor Hildyard summed up the report well. The rate of hiring of women and minorities was encouraging but not as encouraging as the administration would like. There was clearly work to be done. Part of the academic planning process included an equity framework document. She had also been visiting divisional gender equity committees and search committees to review strategies for recruiting new teaching staff. Some groups were not as well versed on the strategies and practices for recruiting from the pool of women and visible minorities as they might be. Increasing the pool was not just this University's issue - it was one for all universities. The University played a leadership role in this matter and it wanted to be part of the solution.

A member noted that the percentage of women faculty in the sciences had dropped significantly despite recruiting new hires. She asked if there was a retention problem. Professor Goel responded that the pool for the sciences was the pool with the least representation of women. The University brought the women in at the junior level, and, as they were successful, other universities hired them away. Thus retention was a very important issue.

A member asked what was the approximate annual cost of the equity offices in the period the report covered. He was unable to determine that number from the Budget Report. He recalled that in the past, the Provost had provided an estimate of the costs, about \$2 million he believed. The University was facing serious cutbacks and he suggested that the drive for

---

**10. Items for Information (cont'd)****(d) Employment Equity Report, 2002 (cont'd)**

“diversity” had meant that significant additional costs had been incurred. On page 17, for example, there was reference to the establishment of a new Director of Faculty Renewal position.

With respect to the report itself, the member had some concerns. He suggested that the text did not meet standards of scholarly or journalistic accuracy expected in a university. For example, the fourth recommendation on page 22 was referred to as “the third and last recommendation.” On page 16, a conference was incorrectly titled “Equity and Excellence” instead of “Excellence through Equity,” the reverse order and the word “through” in the proper title giving a very different meaning from the one printed. He hoped that in future more care would be taken with textual accuracy.

Professor McCammond responded to the member’s request for an estimate of the cost of the equity offices. He suggested that the previous number given might have been closer to \$0.5 million. He said that he would not have included the Faculty Renewal position in his total but he would be glad to review the matter with the member. Professor Goel cautioned that it was important to distinguish employment equity from the equity offices which had a much broader mandate. He believed that the Faculty Renewal position supported retention and recruitment. Professor Neuman said that they would try to disentangle the duties and provide an estimate of the costs.

It was duly moved and seconded

THAT Ms Julia Munk, Vice-President Equity at the Students’ Administrative Council be invited to address the Board.

The vote was taken. The motion passed.

Ms Munk commended the report but she wished to raise a concern with the wording. On page 20 the report noted “a lack of easily accessible information on disabilities.” She disagreed with that statement. The report also went on to say that many able-bodied persons had a “sense of unease,” later referred to as “common discomfort,” when dealing with persons with a visible disability. She said that persons with disabilities would find the language offensive. Professor Neuman thanked Ms Munk for her comments and said that such comments would not be used again.

A member said that in previous years the employment equity issue had been problematical and difficult. He commended the administration’s efforts, particularly in the hiring of Professor Shun who would ameliorate the loss of Professor Julia Ching in the area of Confucian philosophy. He also referred to the matter of Dr. Chun. With respect to the report, he said that he had found it difficult to read. The recommendations identified the problems. With respect to disability issues, it was his understanding that there were 51 buildings that were not accessible, including the admissions and awards building. This was a serious problem and the reason he had given the notice of motion that the University spend over \$5 million on this problem. He supported the recommendations concerning connections with First Nations House and the aboriginal communities. He hoped that significant and just not ceremonial contact would be made. With respect to the number of women, he said that momentum was not being maintained; the percentage of participation was, in fact, decreasing. Pages 18 and 19 also showed that the percentage of minorities was decreasing in all divisions especially in the social sciences. This was a serious issue and it had not been



---

**10. Items for Information (cont'd)****(d) Employment Equity Report, 2002 (cont'd)**

discussed at this Board this year. The University must respond in a serious manner. He referred to the recommendations proposed by the Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students which included an affirmative action policy in hiring and admissions, the development of a human rights code, an investigation of the effects of systemic racism, a review of equity policies and employment procedures, the provision of awareness and sensitivity courses and workshops, and budget support for curriculum changes that reflect a diversity of cultural knowledge and experiences.

A member thanked the administration for the report and noted that it was important to have institutional intents in written format. The framework on equity that was part of the academic planning process was eagerly anticipated. She focused on recommendations 3 and 4. Recommendation 3 proposed that women and minorities in the University work within their departments and with the Provost's Office to offer insights and ideas on how to attract and retain other women and minorities. She agreed that those already in the University could open doors for others. The problem of retention could be addressed if those individuals already here felt comfortable in the University environment. Outreach to the community was also important and would allow the University to tap into external expertise. She suggested that the University model the achievements in the recruitment of women and use it to build a model necessary to be successful in the recruitment of visible minorities. She believed that information was currently lacking that would allow the University to be successful in attracting and retaining minorities. Professor Neuman thanked the member for her comments.

A member suggested the issue of employment equity needed attention and that it must be re-visited. He believed that in past years, equity offices had faced budget cuts and through the efforts of students and staff they had been returned to full-time status. The equity conference mentioned previously had been a great initiative but where did the University go from here. He gave the following notice of motion:

THAT the University create a task force to implement a University-wide strategy to improve employment equity.

A member suggested that the University should move beyond outreach and create academic partnerships with those it served.

A member referred to the President's comment on the first page of the report that the faculty be representative of the student body and country. He noted the decline in percentages of the four categories. What was missing was any indication of the input of the student body or the country. How would the University move beyond identifying an intent? There were no mechanisms in place of which he was aware. He drew members' attention to comments made on this topic by Mr. Jason Price at the February meeting of Governing Council.

A member commented that the report was a useful document but there was still some way to go in reaching the University's objectives in terms of employment equity. The report, however, did not detail the amount of work done by the search committees and the efforts made to deepen the pool of applicants. There was a great deal more activity here than just compiling statistics. The effort was significant. The search committees were required to document what they did. He believed that it was not more good will and willingness that was needed but rather patience.

---

**11. Date of Next Meeting**

The Chair noted that the next regular meeting of the Board would be held on Wednesday, June 4, 2003.

**12. Other Business**

A member referred again to the Dr. Chun issue but another member expressed his concern about comments made about the department involved.

A member also noted his understanding that he could approach the Faculty of Law about the LSAT but he wanted the Board to study the issue.

Another member reported that the TOEFL exams were not being administered in China because of the SARS situation and he asked about potential problems arising from this. He also noted a problem arising from the closure of the consulate and the issuing of visas to study here. Professor Goel explained that it was the June sitting of the TOEFL exam that had been cancelled. Those who wished to apply to the University for admission should have sat the test earlier. The cancelled June sitting might have consequences for January admissions. With respect to the implications of SARS, the University was working with the Public Health Department to determine how to deal with students coming from countries with SARS. The University was not banning these students but was ensuring their health needs were met while protecting the safety of the University community. The University was also cognizant of health issues in residences. It was a difficult issue to deal with. Of course, the University had no control over the issuance of visas.

The Board moved *in camera*.

**13. Tribunal Selection Committee: Appointment of Co-Chairs**

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT Ms Melanie Aitken (Bennett Jones LLP), Mr. Peter Brauti (McCarthy Tétrault LLP), and Ms Laura Trachuk (Vice-Chair, Ontario Labour Relations Board) be appointed as Co-Chairs of the University Tribunal for the period July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2006.

The meeting adjourned at 5:50 p.m.

Secretary  
May 9, 2003

Chair

**Present:**

Professor W. R. Cummins, Chair  
 Professor B. Corman, Vice-Chair  
 Professor R. J. Birgeneau, President  
 Professor S. Neuman, Vice-President and Provost  
 Professor V. Goel, Vice-Provost, Faculty  
 Professor D. McCammond, Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget  
 Professor C. Tuohy, Vice-President, Policy Development and Associate Provost and Interim Vice-President, Research and International Relations  
 Professor R. Abramovitch  
 Professor D. Affonso  
 Mr. S. Ahmed  
 Professor D. Allen  
 Professor G. Allen  
 Professor S. Aster  
 Professor M. Beattie  
 Professor C. Beghtol  
 Mr. M. Bonham  
 Professor N. Camerman  
 Mr. G. Chan  
 Mr. A. Chapnick  
 Professor M. Chipman  
 Professor S. Choudhry  
 Professor D. Clandfield  
 Professor L. De Nil  
 Professor S. Desser  
 Professor J. Donaldson  
 Professor C. Dyer  
 Professor D. Edwards  
 Professor M. Eichler  
 Dr. I. Elliston  
 Dr. S. G. Fell  
 Professor E. Fiume  
 Professor J. Furedy  
 Ms R. Ghosh  
 Ms B. Goldberg  
 Professor H. Gunz  
 Professor E. Hillan  
 Professor W. Hindmarsh  
 Professor E. Hodnett  
 Professor S. Horton  
 Professor L. Howarth  
 Ms M. Jackman  
 Professor B. Kidd  
 Professor R. Kluger  
 Dr. M. Letarte  
 Professor J. MacDonald  
 Professor M. Marrus  
 Professor R. Martin  
 Ms S. McDonald  
 Ms V. Melnyk  
 Mr. D. Melville

Professor C. Misak  
 Professor D. Mock  
 Ms C. Moore  
 Mr. E. Ohayon  
 Professor I. Orchard  
 Mr. J. Paterson  
 Professor P. Pennefather  
 Mr. C. Purchase  
 Mr. C. Ramsaroop  
 Mr. R. Sanders  
 Mrs. C. Seymour  
 Professor B. Sherwood Lollar  
 Professor P. Sinervo  
 Professor J. J. B. Smith  
 Professor P. Thompson  
 Professor V. Timmer  
 Mr. N. Turk-Browne

**Non-voting Assessors:**

Professor D. Farrar, Vice-Provost, Students  
 Professor R. Venter, Vice-Provost, Space and Facilities Planning

**Secretariat:**

Ms S. Girard, Secretary  
 Ms S. Rosatone

**Absent:**

Professor B. Baigrie  
 Professor J. Barber  
 Dr. M. Barrie  
 Professor N. Bascia  
 Professor D. Beach  
 Professor B. Benhabib  
 Professor M. Berkowitz  
 Ms H. Brabazon  
 Professor R. Bryan  
 Professor D. Cook  
 Professor F. Cunningham  
 Professor R. Daniels  
 Professor R. Deber  
 Professor M. Diamond  
 Ms R. Fernandes  
 Mr. J. Fraser  
 Professor E. Freeman  
 Professor M. Fullan  
 Professor R. Geist  
 Professor L. Girolametto  
 Professor A. Gotlieb  
 Professor M. Gotlieb  
 Mr. B. Greenspan  
 Professor A. Haasz  
 Dr. G. Halbert  
 Professor P. Halpern

Mr. A. Hamoui  
Mr. D. Herbert  
Ms B. Horne  
Mr. J. Hunter  
Professor M. Hutcheon  
Mr. M. Hyrcza  
Professor A. Johnston  
Professor A. Jones  
Professor G. Kerr  
Professor J. Lepock  
Professor L. Loeb  
Professor M. McGowan  
Professor D. Naylor

Professor M. O’Neill-Karch  
Professor P. Perron  
Professor C. Regehr  
Professor R. Reisz  
Professor K. Rice  
Professor L. Richards  
Professor B. Sampson  
Mr. V. Sekhar  
Professor D. Thiessen  
Professor T. Venetsanopoulos  
Ms S. Walker  
Professor L. Wilson-Pauwels

**In Attendance:**

Dr. B. FitzPatrick, Assistant Vice-President and Director, Office of the President  
Ms L. Lewis, Assistant Provost and Special Assistant to the Vice-President and Provost  
Ms J. Munk, Vice-President Equity, Students’ Administrative Council  
Ms M. Somerville, Chair, College of Electors