

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL
REPORT NUMBER 151 OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD
June 4, 2007

To the Governing Council,
University of Toronto

Your Board reports that it held a meeting on Monday, June 4, 2007 at 1:00 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall at which the following were present:

Professor Michael R. Marrus (Chair)	Professor Ragnar Buchweitz	Professor Diane Massam
Professor Brian Corman (Vice- Chair)	Mr. Ewen Weili Chen	Professor Thomas Mathien
Professor David Naylor, President	Dr. Christena Chruszez	Professor Faye Mishna
Professor Vivek Goel, Vice- President and Provost	Professor John Coleman	Professor David Mock
Dr. John R. G. Challis, Vice- President, Research and Associate Provost	Mr. Tim Corson	Professor Sioban Nelson
Professor S. Zaky, Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget	Mr. Joe Cox	Professor Mariel O'Neill-Karch
Professor Stewart Aitchison	Professor Alister Cumming	Mr. Roger P. Parkinson
Professor Cristina Amon	Professor Guy Faulkner	Professor Susan Pfeiffer
Professor Christy Anderson	Dr. Shari Graham Fell	Professor Cheryl Regehr
Professor George Baird	Professor Jane Gaskell	Professor Jolie Ringash
Professor Clare Beghtol	Ms Bonnie Goldberg	Mr. Paul Ruppert
Professor Donald Brean	Ms Pamela Gravestock	Professor Pekka Sinervo
	Professor Hugh Gunz	Professor Tattersall Smith
	Professor Rick Halpern	Professor Brian Cantwell Smith
	Mrs. Bonnie Horne	Miss Maureen J. Somerville
	Professor Charles Jones	Professor Lisa Steele
	Professor Bruce Kidd	Professor Suzanne Stevenson
	Dr. Joel A. Kirsh	Dr. Robert S. Turnbull
	Dr. Gillian MacKay	Dr. Cindy Woodland

Regrets:

Professor Varouj Aivazian	Professor Jonathan Freedman	Mr. Matto Mildenerger
Professor Derek Allen	Ms Linda B. Gardner	Professor John R. Miron
Professor Jan Angus	Professor Avrum Gotlieb	Professor Michael Molloy
Professor Gage Averill	Professor William Gough	Professor Mayo Moran
Professor Sylvia Bashevkin	Mr. Billeh Hamud	Ms Carole Moore
Mr. Brian Beaton	Professor Brad Inwood	Professor Donna Orwin
Professor David R. Begun	Professor Yuki Mayumi Johnson	Professor Janet Paterson
Professor Reina Bendayan	Professor Gregory Jump	Ms Theresa Pazonis
Professor Katherine Berg	Mr. Mohammed Khan	Professor Robert Reisz
Dr. Terry Blake	Dr. Wajahat Khan	Professor Richard Reznick
Ms Marilyn Booth	Mr. Umar Khan	Professor Andrea Sass-Kortsak
Mr. Ryan Matthew Campbell	Dr. Chris Koenig-Woodyard	Professor Gareth Seaward
Professor George Elliott Clarke	Professor Hon C. Kwan	Professor Anthony N. Sinclair
Professor David Cook	Dr. Lesley Ann Lavack	Professor J.J. Berry Smith
Mr. Kristofer T. Coward	Professor Robert Levit	Professor Ron Smyth
Mr. Ken Davy	Professor Lori Loeb	Mr. Omar Solimon
Professor Luc F. De Nil	Professor Roger L. Martin	Professor Lorne Sossin
Miss Saswati Deb	Mr. Geoffrey Matus	Professor Kim Strong
Dr. Raisa B. Deber	Professor Brenda Y. McCabe	Professor Rinaldo Wayne Walcott
Professor Miriam Diamond	Professor Douglas McDougall	Dr. Donald A. Wasylenki
Professor Dickson Eyoh	Professor Mark McGowan	Professor Catharine Whiteside
Mr. John A. Fraser	Ms Vera Melnyk	Mr. Patrick Wong

Non-voting Assessors:

Professor Edith M. Hillan, Vice-
Provost, Academic

In Attendance:

Mr. Jason Bechtel, Counsel,
Office of the Vice-President,
Research and Associate Provost

In Attendance (cont'd)

Mr. Joseph Mulongo, Treasurer,
Graduate Students' Union

Non-voting Assessors: (cont'd)

Professor Cheryl Misak, Acting Vice-President and Principal, UTM
 Ms Catherine Riggall, Vice-President, Business Affairs
 Ms Elizabeth Sisam, Assistant Vice-President, Campus and Facilities Planning
 Mr. Louis Charpentier, Secretary of the Governing Council

In Attendance (cont'd)

Mr. Neil Dobbs, Deputy Secretary of the Governing Council
 Ms Sheree Drummond, Assistant Provost
 Dr. Anthony Gray, Special Advisor to the President
 Ms Helen Lasthiotakis, Director, Policy and Planning, Office of the Vice-President and Provost
 Ms Iлона Molnar, Executive Secretary, Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students
 Mr. Henry Mulhall, Assistant Secretary of the Governing Council

In Attendance (cont'd)

Ms Komala Prabhakar, Assistant Dean (Administration) and Registrar, Faculty of Architecture, Landscape, and Design
 Ms Silvia Rosatone, Manager, Office of Convocation
 Ms Meredith Strong, Interim Special Assistant to the Vice-President, University Relations
 Ms Linda Vranic, Director, Operations, Office of the Vice-President, Research and Associate Provost

Secretariat:

Ms Cristina Oke, Secretary
 Ms Mae-Yu Tan

Add to Agenda

With the agreement of members, the Report of Donations over \$250,000 for February 1 through April 30, 2007 was added to the agenda as item 14.

In this report, item 5 is recommended to the Executive Committee for confirmation, items 6, 7, 8, 9 and 13 (h) are recommended to the Governing Council for approval and the remaining items are reported for information.

1. Approval of Report Number 150 of the Meeting held on May 2, 2007

Report Number 150 of the meeting held on May 2, 2007 was approved.

2. Business Arising Out of the Report

There was no business arising from the Report.

3. Report Number 138 of the Agenda Committee (May 25, 2007)

Members received Report Number 138 of the Agenda Committee for information.

4. Report from the Vice-President and Provost

Professor Goel deferred his report to allow the President to make a presentation to the Board.

Towards 2030: Planning for a Third Century of Excellence at the University of Toronto.

President Naylor provided an overview of *Towards 2030* to the Academic Board during which the following points were highlighted.

4. Report from the Vice-President and Provost (cont'd)***Towards 2030: Planning for a Third Century of Excellence at the University of Toronto*** (cont'd)**Key Issues:****(a) University's Role in Education and Scholarship**

- Using indexed publications as a measure of research strength, it appeared that only colleagues appointed to Harvard University published more than scholars with appointments at the University of Toronto.
- The University's current enrolment balance did not currently reflect the research focus of the University: In 2006-07, enrolment had been 82% undergraduate, and 18% graduate (6% professional masters, 4% masters and 8% Ph.D.).
- The student-faculty ratio at the University of Toronto (26.6) was the highest among its peer institutions: the Canadian peer mean was 22.1. This was also dramatically higher than all peer institutions in the USA.

Strategic Question:

- What is the appropriate balance between undergraduate and graduate enrolment for the University to achieve its core missions of education and research?

(b) Enrolment Growth

- Enrolment at the University had grown by 35% over the past ten years and by 50% over the past twenty years.
- Since 1997, enrolment had grown as follows: at the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM), by 4,185 students or 70%; at the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC), by 4,934 students or 96%; and at the St. George Campus, by 9,377 students or 23%.
- Since 1997, enrolment in professional masters programs had almost doubled, while doctoral enrolment had increased by 30%.
- Demand for post-secondary education was projected to intensify through 2031, particularly in the Greater Toronto Area (GTA).
- U of T could play a role in meeting demand for higher education in the GTA by:
 - developing a fourth GTA campus for U of T;
 - increasing enrolment on the existing campuses as much as possible;
 - partnering with outside institutions, and assisting their entry into the GTA;
 - promoting the creation of a new university in the GTA; and/or
 - promoting the conversion of an existing community college into a large-scale baccalaureate-only institution.

Strategic Questions:

- What is the right balance between graduate and undergraduate enrolment and between domestic and international enrolment?
- What is the optimum enrolment for the University as a whole and for each of the three campuses?
- How could the University exploit its strengths to promote a better pedagogical and student life experience for its undergraduate and graduate students alike?

4. Report from the Vice-President and Provost (cont'd)

Towards 2030: Planning for a Third Century of Excellence at the University of Toronto (cont'd)

(c) University's Financial Model

- Per-capita funding and the proportion of Gross Domestic Product (GDP) devoted to post-secondary education in Ontario was the lowest of all Canadian provinces.
- The Basic Income Unit (BIU) model of provincial funding that had begun in the 1960's was based upon crude estimates of the costs of educating students in differing programs, leading to a total institutional BIU count based on the number of students in various programs.
- This model did not appropriately account for the quality of academic programs and differing institutional roles in research.
- The model also did not offer incentives that were aligned with the University's institutional strengths and student experience-focused goals.
- In 1991-92, the provincial grant had accounted for 76% of the University's revenue, while tuition fees had accounted for 20% of the University's revenue.
- In 2004-05, the provincial grant had accounted for 48% of the University's revenue, while tuition fees had accounted for 37% of the University's revenue.
- The University was committed to accessibility and to the principle that no student should ever be forced to leave without completing his or her degree on the basis of financial need.
- The University's peer institutions had substantially higher per student funding:
- In 2005-06, the mean per-student funding of public peers of the Association of American Universities (AAU) had been \$55,703 (US), and that of private peers of the AAU had been \$269,202 (US), compared with the University of Toronto's per-student funding of \$22,607 (US).

Strategic Questions:

- Which approach to accessibility and specialization was best-suited to the University of Toronto?:
 - the California model (featuring two groups of universities, one with a stronger undergraduate focus and the other more academically demanding and more research-intensive);
 - The Beijing University model (China has created a more pyramidal system, with pinnacle institutions such as Beijing and Tsinghua Universities receiving highly differential funding);
 - The University of Melbourne model (on its own initiative, Melbourne is restructuring its enrolment to focus on graduate education, including substantial expansion of professional masters' degrees).
- What alternative sources of funding should be considered by the University?
 - Tuition self-regulation with redistribution of tuition revenues into bursaries to maintain access;
 - German-style competitive funding with extra support to designated research-intensive institutions based on provincial or national competitions;
 - Prioritization of expendable and capital gifts in philanthropy, together with expanded annual giving;
 - Increased revenues from commercialization.

4. Report from the Vice-President and Provost (cont'd)

Towards 2030: Planning for a Third Century of Excellence at the University of Toronto (cont'd)

(d) Campuses, Colleges and Affiliates

The Tri-Campus Model

- There had been significant enrolment expansion and recent capital development at UTM and UTSC.
- Each campus was increasingly autonomous and individuated, and each was developing partnerships with local colleges and communities.
- While each campus had close ties to the Faculty of Arts and Science, relationships with other faculties were also being developed.
- Each campus was developing distinctive departmental structures and unique programs: e.g. Management of Innovation, Biomedical Communications, and Forensic Sciences at UTM; and Arts Management, Bachelor of Business Administration, and more generally co-operative education at UTSC.

Strategic Questions:

- Should the University pursue a regional system with greater campus autonomy similar to that found in several jurisdictions in the United States?
- To what extent should the academic offerings of the campuses be differentiated?
- Should campus enrolments be realigned?

Federated Universities and Colleges

- The roles of the federated universities (St. Michael's, Trinity, Victoria) and the constituent colleges (University, Innis, New, Woodsworth) were evolving steadily, with all colleges becoming focal points for inter-disciplinary programs.
- These divisions helped disaggregate the St. George campus into student-friendlier and navigable neighbourhoods.
- The colleges vary somewhat in student services provided, and there is some uncertainty about who should be doing what as between the colleges and the academic programs in Arts and Science or other divisions.

Strategic Questions:

- How can the University better engage commuter students within the colleges?
- How could the currently uneven relationship between the colleges and academic programs be addressed?
- Is there significant overlap or non-integration in university and college student services? If so, can services be rendered more efficient and integrated?

Hospital Partners

- The University had full affiliation agreements with ten hospitals as well as agreements with several community hospitals and health service providers.
- More than 50% of the University's research funding was held by hospital-based faculty.
- More than 1800 graduate students pursued studies and research opportunities in hospital-based programs.
- The University had developed collaborative policies and agreements with its hospital partners.
- Opportunities existed for commercialization, collaboration on fundraising and philanthropy, and public policy initiatives with the University's hospital partners.

4. Report from the Vice-President and Provost (cont'd)

Towards 2030: Planning for a Third Century of Excellence at the University of Toronto (cont'd)

Strategic Question:

- In what dimensions could the University's partnership with research hospitals be further enhanced?

(e) Governance and Administration

- The University's governance mechanisms worked well, but there was substantial repetition of items given the overlapping mandates of the three Boards. Some items were presented five times (all three Boards plus Executive Committee and finally the Governing Council).
- Only the Governors could decide whether they wanted to review some aspects of the mandates of the various boards and committees of governance.
- There were responsibilities funded divisionally by UTSC and UTM that were funded centrally on the St. George campus. The new budget model would help iron out some of these discrepancies, but a review of 'Who does what?' and 'Who pays for what?' was arguably overdue.

Strategic Questions

- What administrative structure was best suited for the University's tri-campus model?
- Was the distribution of revenues and responsibilities across the three campuses sustainable?
- Was the University's governance model optimally structured for debate, accountability and oversight?

Timelines and Process

Phase I: Summer 2007

- Presentations to Principals and Deans and to governance bodies including the Executive Committee of Governing Council, the University Affairs Board, the Academic Board, the Business Board and the Governing Council itself.
- Distribution in *The Bulletin* (June 12, 2007)
- Posting on University website (<http://www.towards2030.utoronto.ca/>) .
- Speeches, presentations, off-line sessions to the University community;
- Fostering of discussion and soliciting of feedback from the community.

Phase II: Fall 2007

- Establishment of standing committees and task forces, based on issues distilled from Phase I.
- Framing of issues and options.
- Public forums, including symposia, conferences, faculty council meetings, Town Halls, and special purpose lectures.
- Continuation of electronic distribution, feedback, on-line forums, and the President's blog.

Phase III: Early 2008

- Creation of synthesis document.
- Articulation of long-term directions.
- Development of recommendations to inform academic planning cycle and to guide advancement and university relations activities.

4. Report from the Vice-President and Provost (cont'd)

***Towards 2030: Planning for a Third Century of Excellence at the University of Toronto* (cont'd)**

Discussion

A member asked if the provincial government would support university differentiation. President Naylor replied that funding for research and for graduate enrolment had resulted in differential government support for provincial institutions. However, differentiation based on tuition fees and per student funding would have a different political dynamic.

A member asked for clarification of the relationship between the first and second phases of *Towards 2030*. It appeared to him that the process moved directly from dissemination in Phase 1 to establishment of discussion groups based on responses to Phase I. President Naylor replied that there would be opportunities for individuals to feed back on Phase I to shape discussion groups and re-work questions raised in Phase I. He emphasized that in some respects *Towards 2030* was in part a formalization of some of the ad hoc plans and initiatives underway at the University, and in part served to crystallize long-term issues that had arisen during past academic planning cycles.

The Chair thanked the President for his presentation, and offered the support of the Academic Board during the *Towards 2030* exercise.

5. Constitution: Faculty of Architecture, Landscape, and Design

Professor Goel reminded members that the Academic Board was responsible for approving divisional Constitutions. The revisions to the Constitution of the Faculty of Architecture, Landscape, and Design were intended to accommodate the new responsibilities and authority transferred to the Faculty Council from the School of Graduate Studies, and to update the Constitution to reflect current programs and best practice.

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the Executive Committee Confirm

THAT the revised Constitution of the Faculty of Architecture, Landscape, and Design, which was approved by the Faculty Council on March 28, 2007, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "A", be approved.

6. Research Policies: Inventions Policy

The Chair explained that this *Policy* had been considered by the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs (AP&P) on May 25, 2007, The *Policy* would be considered for approval by the Governing Council on June 25, 2007, on the recommendation of the Academic Board. The Chair thanked Mr. Chen for introducing items from AP&P and from the Planning and Budget Committee on behalf of the Chairs and Vice-Chairs of those Committees, all of whom were unable to attend the Board meeting.

Mr. Chen informed members that this revised *Policy* was the final outcome, for this governance year, of the broad review of research policies that had been led by Vice-President Challis. There had been broad consultation, including consultation with the University of Toronto Faculty Association (UTFA), on this revised *Policy*. The key objectives of the revised *Policy* were to encourage invention disclosures from the University community and to encourage technology

6. Research Policies: Inventions Policy (cont'd)

transfer. The *Policy* also dealt with the disestablishment of the University of Toronto Innovations Foundation.

Mr. Chen explained that intellectual property developed by a University inventor would continue to be jointly owned by the inventor and the University, until either party acted to assign ownership to the other. Where an inventor wished to obtain legal protection for the invention and to commercialize it, she or he could choose to turn to the successor to the Innovations Foundation – the Innovations Group in the Office of the Vice-President, Research and Associate Provost.

Mr. Chen noted that the Innovations Foundation had charged a fee of 50% of net revenue for its services. The maximum management fee now to be charged by the Innovations Group was 20% of net revenue - a substantially more favourable arrangement for inventors. With respect to revenue sharing, the inventor would receive 75% of net revenue after any management fee, and the University would receive 25%. Where the inventor retained ownership, and responsibility for protecting and developing the invention, she/he would pay no management fee and would receive the full 75% of net revenue. That remained unchanged. Where the inventor assigned ownership and responsibility to the University, the 20% management fee would be applied and the University would receive 25% of the remaining net revenue, for a total of 40%. The inventor would receive 60%. Again, that was a substantial improvement for inventors and a substantial incentive to assign ownership and responsibility to the University.

The Chair congratulated Professor Challis and all others involved in the review of research policies for the work that they had done.

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the revised *Inventions Policy*, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "B", be approved, replacing the *Policy* approved by the Governing Council on May 3, 1990 and amended on June 3, 2002.

7. Capital Project: Project Planning Report - Relocation of Capital Projects and Facilities and Services

The Chair observed that this Project Planning Report had been considered by the Planning and Budget Committee (P&B) on May 22, 2007. The Project Planning Report would be considered for approval by the Governing Council on June 25, 2007, on the recommendation of the Academic Board.

Mr. Chen explained that members of P&B had been informed that the top floor of 255/257 McCaul Street, the recently-approved site of the St. George Examination Facility, would be renovated to accommodate the Department of Capital Projects and much of the Department of Facilities and Services. The proposed project, which had a total project cost of \$6 million to be funded through borrowing, would be implemented concurrently with renovations for the Examination Centre. With the relocation of the two administrative departments, space would be released at 215 Huron for the phase two expansion of the Departments of Mathematics and Statistics.

A member of P&B had asked whether the Office of Environmental Health and Safety, which was located on the seventh floor of 215 Huron Street, would also be relocated. Ms Sisam had replied that reorganization of space in 215 Huron Street would be examined as a future project.

7. Capital Project: Project Planning Report - Relocation of Capital Projects and Facilities and Services (cont'd)

A member of the Board noted that employees of the Departments of Capital Projects and Facilities and Services would be sharing the elevators and stairs with those using the examination facilities, and asked whether this would cause any problems. Ms Sisam replied that the flow of movement within the building had been examined in light of building code requirements, and no problems were anticipated.

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

1. THAT the third floor of 255/257 McCaul Street be assigned to the Capital Projects Department and to portions of the Facilities & Services Department.
2. THAT the renovation of the third floor of 255/257 McCaul Street, 2200 gross square metres, and an archive storage room on the first floor, 167 gross square meters, with a total project cost of \$6.0 million, as described in the Project Planning Report which is attached hereto as Appendix "C", be approved and funded through borrowing.

8. Capital Project: Interim Project Planning Report – Varsity Centre 2007

The Chair observed that this Interim Project Planning Report had been considered by the Planning and Budget Committee (P&B) on May 22, 2007. The interim Project Planning Report would be considered for approval by the Governing Council on June 25, 2007, on the recommendation of the Academic Board.

Mr. Chen informed members of the Board that Professor Goel had provided members of the Planning and Budget Committee with a detailed briefing on the highlights of the Interim Project Planning Report - Varsity Centre 2007. The Provost had emphasized that this was an interim project planning report; a number of issues, including sources of funding, secondary effects of the project, and support from the operating budget, would have to be resolved before the final project planning report was submitted to governance.

Professor Goel had explained that the components of Varsity 2007 that were being recommended for approval in principle for construction at this time were the Beacon, Box Office and South entrance building. All other components were being recommended for approval in principle, subject to additional work being done to explore appropriate funding and secondary effects of the project.

Mr. Chen summarized the points that had been raised by members of P&B during the thorough discussion by the Committee.

- A member had asked whether University of Toronto students participating in intramural sports would have priority over external groups in the use of the Varsity Centre.
 - Professor Goel had confirmed that priority for the use of Varsity Centre facilities would be given to intramural sports. However, such usage would be contingent upon the availability of funds to pay for the cost of student use. If funding was insufficient, other options might be explored.
- A member had commented that the proposed Centre for High Performance Sport presented a wonderful opportunity for sports development not only for the University, but also for the Province of Ontario, which lacked such a facility.

8. Capital Project: Interim Project Planning Report – Varsity Centre 2007 (cont'd)

- In response to a question, Professor Goel had indicated that the Varsity Campaign Advisory Board had been working for many months to establish support for the project. The University was optimistic that the Varsity Centre project was feasible, and that commitments for financial support would be obtained by the proposed deadline of December 31, 2007.

Addresses by Non-Members to the Board

The Chair advised members of the Board that two speaking requests had been received from recognized Campus Groups prior to the meeting: the Graduate Students' Union (GSU) and the Association of Part-Time Undergraduate Students (APUS). In keeping with the practice of the Governing Council and its Boards and Committees¹, the requests had been granted, and the speakers would be given three minutes to address the Board.

The Chair thanked the GSU for providing a written communication to the Board, and reminded members that the GSU letter had been distributed on June 1, and copies had been available at the door.

The Chair noted that the *Procedures for Non-Members to Address Governing Council, its Boards and Committees* provided some discretion to the Chair in granting speaking requests for items on the agenda of a meeting. Requests were granted after the Chair had taken into account the relevance of the intervention to the agenda item, whether the members already possessed the information being offered, the length of the agenda, the number of speaking requests received and the maintenance of good relations with recognized campus groups representing students, faculty and staff. It was the Chair's view that the membership of the Academic Board provided a wide range of perspectives to matters before the Board, and that deliberations of the Board were not necessarily enhanced by interventions from a number of speakers.

The Chair invited Mr. Mulongo to address the Board. Mr. Mulongo noted that the Varsity Centre was a priority for the University, and that the GSU supported intermural and intercollegiate athletics at the University. The GSU was concerned, however, with the proposal to approve in principle the interim project planning report when funding for the project was uncertain. It was the view of the GSU that the proposal should be tabled until next year when the funding for the capital project was more certain. Mr. Mulongo re-iterated the opposition of the GSU to student levies or fee increases for capital projects.

The Chair invited Ms Molnar to address the Board. Ms Molnar stated that the Centre for High Performance Sport was not a priority for members of APUS, 70% of whom were women, and many of whom were working as well as studying. APUS objected to the assignment of a portion of Site 12 to the Centre for High Performance Sport. APUS had recently been given temporary office space in the former Margaret Fletcher Daycare facility that was located on Site 12, after having been relocated from the Woodsworth College Residence in 2006. She repeated the opposition of APUS to student levies.

The Chair thanked the speakers for their comments.

Discussion

Professor Goel again emphasized that the Board was being asked to approve in principle the planning and construction of the Varsity Entrance Building and the renovations to Varsity Arena, on site 21 at 299 Bloor Street West, and of the Centre for High Performance Sport on Site 12, 100 Devonshire Place. The south end of Site 12 was being assigned to the Varsity 2007 project until December 31, 2007, at which time the financial viability of the project would be assessed. Approval was also being sought for the construction of the South Entrance Building, Beacon and Box Office at a total project cost of approximately \$10 million, with the funding obtained from donations. Professor Goel reminded members of the Board that it had recently become the practice to submit interim project planning reports to

¹ <http://www.utoronto.ca/govcncl/tgc/2.03.10.pdf>

8. Capital Project: Interim Project Planning Report – Varsity Centre 2007 (cont'd)

Discussion (cont'd)

governance for approval in principle where there were significant issues warranting discussion and to provide assurance to potential benefactors of the commitment of the University to the project.

A member of the Board commented that the name 'Centre for High Performance Sport' might be causing some confusion as it suggested a facility intended for elite athletes. Professor Kidd replied that the name reflected the University's pursuit of excellence, and noted the number of Centres of Excellence affiliated with the University. The Centre for High Performance Sport would be available to all students of the University, and would accommodate academic and research activities of the Faculty of Physical Education and Health.

Professor Kidd noted that Governing Council policy required that operating costs of extra-curricular activities be covered by students. External groups who used the facilities would be charged appropriate fees. Capital costs for the project would be funded by donors and friends of the Faculty.

A member of the Board described his area of research in physical activity, and explained that the phrase 'High Performance Sport' had a broad definition within the discipline.

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

1. THAT the planning and construction of the Varsity Entrance Building and the renovations to Varsity Arena, on Site 21, 299 Bloor Street West, and of the Centre for High Performance Sport on Site 12, 100 Devonshire Place, as contained within the Interim Project Planning Report, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "D", be approved in principle.
2. THAT the south end of Site 12, 100 Devonshire Place, be assigned to Varsity 2007 until December 31, 2007 at which time the financial viability of the project can be assessed.
3. THAT the components of the project for Varsity Centre, approximately 7753 net assignable square metres be approved in principle at a total project cost of approximately \$69.8 million (premised on a tender date of October 2008) to be funded by fundraising initiatives.
4. THAT the first components of Varsity 2007, the South Entrance Building, and the Beacon and Box Office be approved in principle to proceed to construct approximately 600 net assignable square metres as detailed in the Interim Project Planning Report and having a total project cost of approximately \$10 million on Site 21 as funding for these components is obtained from donations. No financing is required.

9. Capital Project: Interim Project Planning Report – Student Commons

The Chair observed that this Interim Project Planning Report had been considered by the Planning and Budget Committee (P&B) on May 22, 2007. The interim Project Planning Report would be considered for approval by the Governing Council on June 25, 2007, on the recommendation of the Academic Board.

Mr. Chen informed members of the Board that members of the Planning and Budget Committee had been reminded that, in September 2005, the Committee to Review Student Activity Space had recommended the development of a new large node of student activity space. After consideration of several development sites on campus, the Project Planning Committee had proposed site 12 for the Student Commons facility.

9. Capital Project: Interim Project Planning Report – Student Commons (cont'd)

The Project Planning Committee had toured the new Student Campus Centre at Ryerson University and, upon the advice of the Ryerson staff, had included identification of a model for governance as one of the recommendations in the Interim Report.

Mr. Chen commented that it was expected that students would contribute to the costs of the Student Commons in the form of a levy, and student leaders had planned to hold a referendum in the Fall 2007. The University had made a commitment to the students to contribute fifty cents against each dollar raised through the levy for the capital costs of the project, consistent with contributions to student centres on the UTM and UTSC campuses.

At the P&B meeting, Professor Goel had expressed the hope that decisions of whether or not to proceed with the Varsity Centre and the Student Commons project would be made together, given the proposed shared common elements of the facilities.

Mr. Chen noted that members of P&B had praised the proposal to provide additional student activity space on campus. Some concern had been expressed about the proposed location on the north end of campus, as health sciences students might feel somewhat removed from the new Student Commons and Varsity Centre. Professor Goel had replied that the Student Commons would be only one large node of student activity, along with others such as Hart House, centres within the colleges, and enhanced space in the Medical Sciences Building. The accessibility of the nodes was most important to assist in engaging commuter students, and the proximity to public transit in the northern part of the campus was a significant advantage.

Addresses by Non-Members to the Board

The Chair invited Ms Molnar to address the Board. Ms Molnar commented that she had made most of her points during the previous agenda item. She re-iterated that APUS would not support either the Varsity 2007 or the Student Comments project that were being proposed.

Discussion

A member of the Board asked whether there was any limit on the height of buildings in the Varsity 2007 project. Ms Sisam replied that current zoning regulations would allow a building of 7.5 stories above ground. A review of all University sites was currently underway, and might result in applications for variances to zoning.

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

1. THAT the Interim Project Planning Report for the Student Commons on the St. George Campus, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "E", be approved in principle, and that a portion of site 12 be assigned for this project, co-locating activities with Varsity Centre for High Performance Sport.
2. THAT approval of the final report be contingent on identification of the total capital project cost, operating costs, funding and governance of the proposed facility.

10. Items for Information

Members received the following reports for information:

- (a) Report on Degrees, Diplomas and Certificates Awarded, 2006
- (b) Report on Appointments and Promotions
 - The Chair noted that two names in the Report on Appointments and Promotions had been misspelled. The correct names were Professor Gil Gross and Professor Joel Kirsh.
- (c) Report Number 130 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs
- (d) Report Number 119 of the Planning and Budget Committee

There were no questions on these reports.

11. Date of Next Meeting

The Chair explained that the 2007-08 meeting schedule was being finalized, and would be distributed to members in the summer.

12. Other Business

(a) Chair's Remarks

The Chair expressed his appreciation to all those who had contributed to the work of the Board during the past year.

He thanked the **assessors** who brought matters forward to the Boards and Committees, and acknowledged the contributions of the two assessors whose terms were ending on June 30th:

Professor John Challis, who, in his role as Vice-President, Research and Associate Provost, had served as an assessor to the Board, AP&P and P&B since 2003, and who was returning to teaching and research duties effective July 1st, and

Professor David Farrar, who, in his role as Deputy Provost and Vice-Provost, Students, had served as an assessor to the Board and AP&P since 2003. On behalf of the Board, the Chair congratulated Professor Farrar on his appointment as Vice-President Academic and Provost of the University of British Columbia, effective September 1, 2007.

The Chair thanked the members of the Agenda Committee, including the Vice-Chair, Professor Brian Corman, Professor Clare Beghtol, Professor Mariel O'Neill-Karch, and Mr. Ewen Chen, who had overseen the flow of the business of the Board, and who had been diligent in approving academic administrative appointments on behalf of the Board.

The Chair acknowledged the work of the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs, Professor Andrea Sass-Kortsak and Professor Doug McDougall, and of the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Planning and Budget Committee – Professor Avrum Gotlieb and Professor Miriam Diamond.

The Chair thanked all members of the Board for their contribution to the governance of the University. He acknowledged the service of those members whose terms ended on June 30, and informed those whose terms were continuing that they would receive information about the 2007-08 Board over the summer.

12. Other Business (cont'd)**(a) Chair's Remarks (cont'd)**

In conclusion, the Chair thanked members of the Governing Council Secretariat for their support. He informed members of the retirement of the Secretary of the Board at the end of September 2007, and acknowledged the generous support and expert advice that Ms Oke had provided to him during his term as Chair. In recognition of her service, Ms Oke was presented with a chair on behalf of the Governing Council and its Boards and Committees. The plaque noted that it was "in recognition of exemplary service to governance at the University of Toronto 2001 – 2007".

Ms Oke thanked the Chair and members of the Board for their good wishes.

(b) Provost's Remarks

On behalf of the assessors and members of the Board, Professor Goel thanked Professor Marrus for his service as Chair of the Academic Board in 2006-07.

The Chair wished all those present a safe and relaxing summer.

The Board moved *in camera*.

13. Report of the Striking Committee**(a) Co-opted Membership of the Academic Board ²**

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the following be appointed as co-opted members of the Academic Board for 2007-08:

Administrative and Professional Staff ³

* Ms Bonnie Goldberg, Faculty of Law

Ms Michelle Mitrovich, Faculty of Arts & Science, Victoria College (to June 30, 2010)

Alumni

Mr. Mitchell Chan, Faculty of Arts and Science

* Dr. Christena Chruszez, Faculty of Dentistry

* Mr. Roger Parkinson, Faculty of Arts and Science

² * Indicates a member of the Board or Committee in 2006-07.

³ Continuing Co-opted Administrative and Professional Staff members of the Board are:
Ms Pamela Gravenstock (Office of Teaching Advancement; to June 30, 2009) and
Mr. Paul Ruppert (Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering; to June 30, 2008)

13. Report of the Striking Committee (cont'd)

(a) Co-opted Membership of the Academic Board (cont'd)

Students

Full-time Undergraduate

- * Mr. Ryan Campbell, Faculty of Arts and Science
- Ms Tiffany Chow, Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering
- Mr. Aaron Christoff, Faculty of Arts and Science, Trinity College
- Miss Milka Ignjatovic, Leslie Dan Faculty of Pharmacy
- Mr. James Janeiro, Faculty of Arts and Science, Victoria College
- Miss Jemy Mary Joseph, University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC)
- Mr. Kaspar Ng, Leslie Dan Faculty of Pharmacy
- Mr. Joshua Rubin, Faculty of Arts and Science, Victoria College
- Miss Pamela Santora, Faculty of Arts and Science, Woodsworth College

Graduate

- Mr. Taufik Al-Sarraj, Chemistry, University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM)
- Ms Emily Gregor, Higher Education, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education/UT (OISE/UT)
- Mr. Ahmed Yousif, Physics, Faculty of Arts and Science

(b) Membership of the Agenda Committee

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the following be appointed to the Agenda Committee for 2007-08:

Student

- Mr. James Janeiro, Faculty of Arts and Science, Victoria College

Teaching Staff

- * Professor Clare Beghtol, Faculty of Information Studies
- Professor Rick Halpern, New College

(c) Membership of the Academic Appeals Committee

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the following be appointed to the Academic Appeals Committee for 2007-08:

Chairs:

- * Professor Emeritus Ralph Scane, Senior Chair
- Mr. Tad Brown
- * Ms Bonnie Goldberg
- * Ms Kate Hilton
- * Ms Kaye Joachim
- * Professor Edward Morgan
- Professor Lorne Sossin

13. Report of the Striking Committee (cont'd)**(c) Membership of the Academic Appeals Committee (cont'd)****Members:**

- Professor Christy Anderson, School of Graduate Studies
- * Professor Jan Angus, Faculty of Nursing
- Professor Clare Beghtol, Faculty of Information Studies
- Professor Katherine Berg, Faculty of Medicine
- Professor Ragnar Buchweitz, UTSC
- Professor Yuki Johnson, Faculty of Arts and Science
- Dr. Chris Koenig-Woodyard, UTM
- Professor Hy van Luong, Faculty of Arts and Science
- Professor Anthony Sinclair, Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering
- * Dr. Cindy Woodland, Faculty of Medicine

(d) Membership of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the following be appointed to the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs for 2007-08:

Administrative and Professional Staff

- * Ms Bonnie Goldberg, Faculty of Law

Students

- Mr. Taufik Al-Sarraj, graduate, Chemistry (UTM)
- Ms Tiffany Chow, full-time undergraduate, Applied Science and Engineering
- Ms Emily Gregor, graduate, OISE/UT
- Miss Milka Ignjatovic, full-time undergraduate, Faculty of Pharmacy
- Mr. James Janeiro, full-time undergraduate, Faculty of Arts and Science, Victoria College

Teaching Staff

- * Professor Derek Allen, Trinity College
- Professor Jan Angus, Faculty of Nursing
- * Professor Gage Averill, Faculty of Music
- Professor Katherine Berg, Faculty of Medicine (Physical Therapy)
- * Professor Ragnar Buchweitz, UTSC
- Professor Elizabeth Cowper, Faculty of Arts and Science (Linguistics)
- Professor Robert Gibbs, Faculty of Arts and Science (Philosophy)
- Professor Yuki Johnson, Faculty of Arts and Science (East Asian Studies)
- Dr. Chris Koenig-Woodyard (UTM)
- Professor Audrey Laporte, Faculty of Medicine (Health Policy, Management and Evaluation)
- * Professor Douglas McDougall, OISE/UT (Curriculum, Teaching and Learning), **Vice-Chair**
- * Professor Cheryl Regehr, Faculty of Social Work
- * Professor Andrea Sass-Kortsak, Faculty of Medicine (Public Health Sciences), **Chair**
- Professor Suzanne Stevenson, Faculty of Arts and Science (Computer Science)

13. Report of the Striking Committee (cont'd)

(e) Membership of the Planning and Budget Committee

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the following be appointed to the Planning and Budget Committee for 2007-08:

Student

Mr. Ryan Campbell, Faculty of Arts and Science

Teaching Staff

- * Professor John Coleman, UTSC
- Professor David Cook, Victoria College
- * Professor Miriam Diamond, Faculty of Arts and Science (Geography) **Vice-Chair**
- * Professor Avrum Gotlieb, Faculty of Medicine (Lab. Med. & Pathobiology) **Chair**
- * Professor Gregory Jump, Faculty of Arts and Science (Economics)
- Professor Brenda McCabe, Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering (Civil)
- * Professor David Mock, Faculty of Dentistry
- * Ms Carole Moore, Chief Librarian
- Professor Wendy Rotenberg, Rotman School of Management
- * Professor Pekka Sinervo, Faculty of Arts and Science

Additional members of the Agenda Planning Group:

Professor John Coleman, UTSC

- * Professor David Mock, Faculty of Dentistry

(f) Discipline Appeals Board

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the following be appointed to the Discipline Appeals Board for 2007-08:

Students

- * Mr. Ryan Campbell, full-time undergraduate, Faculty of Arts and Science,
- Miss Milka Ignjatovic, full-time undergraduate, Faculty of Pharmacy
- Miss Jemy Mary Joseph, full-time undergraduate, University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC)

Teaching Staff

- * Professor Clare Beghtol, Faculty of Information Studies
- Professor Rick Halpern, New College
- Dr. Chris Koenig-Woodyard (UTM)

13. Report of the Striking Committee (cont'd)

(g) Advisory Committee on the University of Toronto Library System

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the following be appointed as the Board's representatives on the Advisory Committee on the University of Toronto Library System for 2007-08:

Professor Clare Beghtol, Faculty of Information Studies
* Professor Donna Orwin, Faculty of Arts and Science (Slavic Languages and Literature)

(h) Committee for Honorary Degrees

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the membership proposed for the Committee for Honorary Degrees for 2007-2008 in the Report of the Striking Committee dated June 4, 2007 be approved.

14. Quarterly Report on Donations - February 1, 2007 – April 30, 2007

Members received this report for information. There were no questions.

The meeting adjourned at 2:40 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

June 25, 2007