THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

REPORT NUMBER 164 OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD

November 12, 2009

To the Governing Council,
University of Toronto

Your Board reports that it held a meeting on Thursday, November 12, 2009 at 3:35 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall at which the following were present:

Professor Louise Lemieux-Charles, Chair
Professor Cheryl Misak, Vice-President and Provost
Professor Scott Mabury, Vice-Provost, Academic Operations
Professor Cheryl Regehr, Vice-Provost Academic Programs
Ms Binish Ahmed
Professor Varouj Aivazian
Ms Yvette Ali
Professor Maydianne Andrade
Professor Jan Angus
Mr. Konstantin Anosov
Professor Gage Averill
Professor Ronald Beiner
Professor Parth Bhatt
Ms Marilyn Booth
Professor Terry Carleton
Mr. Louis Charpentier
Professor Will Cluett
Professor Gerald Cupchik
Professor Gabriele D'Eleuterio
Professor Christopher Damaren
Professor Charles Deber

Ms Netila Demneri
Mr. Sybil Derrible
Professor Joseph Desloges
Professor Miriam Diamond
Professor Wendy Duff
Professor Meric Gertler
Professor Robert Gibbs
Ms Joeita Gupta
Professor Rick Halpern
Mr. Adam Heller
Professor Ellen Hodnett
Mrs. Bonnie Horne
Ms Jemy Joseph
Professor Alison Keith
Professor Bruce Kidd
Ms Min Hee (Margaret) Kim
Dr. Lesley Ann Lavack
Professor Rhonda Love
Professor Heather MacNeil
Professor Henry Mann
Professor Douglas McDougall
Professor John R. Miron
Ms Michelle Mitrovich
Professor Michelle Murphy

Professor Linda Northrup
Ms Judith Poe
Mr. Matthew Purser
Professor Ato Quayson
Professor Doug Reeve
Professor Jolie Ringash
Professor Seamus Ross
Professor Lock Rowe
Professor Andrea Sass-Kortsak
Ms Helen Slade
Professor Tattersall Smith
Professor Richard Sommer
Professor Elizabeth M. Smyth
Ms Lynn Snowden
Miss Maureen J. Somerville
Professor Richard Sommer
Professor Suzanne Stevenson
Miss Sabrina Tang
Mr. Daniel Taranovsky
Mr. Gregory West
Professor Catharine Whiteside
Professor Charmaine Williams
Mr. Jason Wong
Dr. Cindy Woodland

Regrets:

Professor Stewart Aitchison
Professor Derek Allen
Professor Cristina Amon
Professor Sylvia Bashevkin
Ms Patricia Bellamy
Professor Denise Belsham
Professor Katherine Berg
Mr. Andrew Brown
Ms Katarina Cadete
Professor Sujit Choudhry
Professor David Cook
Professor Brian Corman
Professor Elizabeth Cowper
Professor Alister Cumming
Ms Saswati Deb

Ms Caroline Di Giovanni
Professor Darryl Edwards
Professor Guy Faulkner
Mr. John A. Fraser
Professor Jane Gaskell
Professor Avrum Gotlieb
Ms Tulika Gupta
Professor Russell Hartenberger
Dr. Allan S. Kaplan
Dr. Chris Koenig-Woodyard
Professor Christina Kramer
Professor Jim Lai
Professor Audrey Laporte
Professor Robert Levit
Professor Hy Van Luong
Professor Roger L. Martin
Professor Mark McGowan

Professor Angelo Melino
Dr. Ahmed Mian
Professor Faye Mishna
Professor David Mock
Professor Shahrzad Mojab
Ms Carole Moore
Professor Mayo Moran
Professor Sioban Nelson
Professor Janet Paterson
Professor Ito Peng
Dr. Susan Rappolt
Professor Wendy Rotenberg
Mr. Paulo Simas
Professor Romin Tafarodi
Ms Rita Tsang
Professor Njoki Wane
Dr. Donald A. Wasylenki

Non-voting Assessors:

Professor Angela Hildyard, Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity

Mr. David Palmer, Vice-President, Advancement
Ms Catherine Riggall, Vice-President, Business Affairs

Professor Edith Hillan, Vice-Provost, Faculty and Academic Life
Ms Elizabeth Sisam, Assistant Vice-President, Campus and Facilities Planning

52798

In Attendance:

Professor Wiliam Gough,
  Member of the Governing
  Council
Prof. Lorraine Ferris, Faculty of
  Medicine, Associate Vice
  Provost, Relations with
  Health Care Institutions
Mr. Neil Dobbs, Deputy
  Secretary of the Governing
  Council
Ms Sheree Drummond, Assistant
  Provost
Dr. Anthony Gray, Special
  Advisor to the President

Mr. Tony Kern, Facilities and
  Services
Mr. Christopher Lang, Director,
  Appeals, Discipline and
  Faculty Grievances
Ms Helen Lasthiotakis, Director,
  Policy and Planning, Office of
  the Vice-President and
  Provost
Ms Bryn MacPherson-White,
  Director, Office of the
  President and University
  Events

Mr. Henry Mulhall, Assistant
  Secretary of the Governing
  Council
Mr. Zoran Piljevic, Director,
  Information & Instructional
  Technology Services,
  University of Toronto at
  Scarborough
Mr. Ron Swail, Assistant Vice-
  President, Facilities and
  Services

Secretariat:
Ms Mae-Yu Tan

In this report, items 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10 are recommended to the Governing Council for approval. The remaining items are reported for information.

1. Welcome and Introductory Remarks by the Chair

The Chair welcomed new and continuing members to the first meeting of the Academic Board for 2009-2010. She introduced Professor Varouj Aivazian, the Vice-Chair of the Board; and Professor Cheryl Misak, Vice-President and Provost, and the Board's senior assessor. The Chair acknowledged the voting and non-voting assessors who were in attendance. The Chair also introduced the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs, Professor Andrea Sass-Kortsak and Professor Doug McDougall. She noted that the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Planning and Budget Committee were Professor Avrum Gotlieb and Professor Wendy Rotenberg; the Senior Chair of the Academic Appeals Committee was Professor Lorne Sossin.

The Chair explained that the Academic Board was the largest of the Governing Council's Boards and Committees, with 122 members. Its membership was designed to represent effectively the academic diversity of the University, with each academic division being represented by its head and at least one elected member of its teaching staff. Most of the business of the Board came from its Standing Committees, particularly the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs and the Planning and Budget Committee. A third Standing Committee, the Academic Appeals Committee, occasionally reported items to the Board. Members would observe that at the Board meetings, the Chair of the respective Committees would present the item being recommended for approval, highlighting the key points of the discussion that had occurred at the Committee meeting. The Chair stated that it was most effective for members to raise issues on matters under consideration at the level of governance at which they were first introduced, rather than later in the governance process. Members of the Board were encouraged to attend meetings of the standing committees; the meeting schedules were on the website of the Office of the Governing Council.

The Chair noted that the Academic Board was the entry-level body for certain items, including divisional constitutions, policies on the nature of academic employment, policies and procedures with respect to academic discipline, and name changes of academic units.

The Chair said that members of the Board were expected to act in the best interests of the University of Toronto and not as an agent of a particular constituency. The Board had an obligation to ensure that the University was strengthened by the decisions that the Board made. Meetings of the Board would be conducted in an atmosphere of respect and collegiality, but with some measure of formality. Members were asked to stand and introduce themselves when invited by the Chair to speak. The Chair expressed her desire that the Board meetings would provide an opportunity for members to express their views on matters under consideration, and she encouraged members to participate freely in discussions of the Board.

52798

1.   Welcome and Introductory Remarks by the Chair (cont'd)

A member, who identified herself as a student with a visual disability, expressed dissatisfaction with the meeting documentation that had been provided to her by the Office of the Governing Council[1], noting that it was incomplete. She stated that, in her view, the Secretariat had not been fulfilling its commitments to which she and the Secretary of the Governing Council had agreed to in the fall. Professor Misak assured the member that steps would be taken to ensure that she received complete materials in the future.

2.   Approval of Report Number 163 of the Meeting held on June 1, 2009

Report Number 163 of the meeting held on June 1, 2009 was approved.

3.   Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting

Item 15 (c): Annual Report on Degrees, Diplomas, and Certificates Awarded, 2008

The Chair noted that, at the previous meeting, a member had expressed surprise at the reported number of completed degrees for the Faculty of Arts and Science (FAS), which had appeared low to him. The FAS had confirmed that the figures presented were correct. However, they had noted that the figures had excluded upgrades to four-year degrees from Bachelor of Arts/Bachelor of Science degrees. Assistant Dean Glenn Loney had contacted the member to assure him of the correctness of the figures.

4.   Reports Number 156 (June 1, 2009), **157** (September 17, 2009), and 158 (November 3, 2009) **of the Agenda Committee**

The Chair drew members' attention to the discussion of the Undergraduate Program Review Audit Committee: Audit Report contained in the Sept. 17th Report.

The reports were received for information. There were no questions.

5.   Report of the Vice-President and Provost

(a)   Agreement with CUPE 3902, Unit 3

Professor Misak advised that the University had reached a tentative agreement with the sessional instructors who belonged to the Canadian Union of Public Employees (CUPE) local 3902, Unit 3. She expressed the University's gratitude to Professor Angela Hildyard, Vice President, Human Resources and Equity, and her bargaining team for their tireless dedication in working to a resolution.

(b)   Academic Program Continuity Planning

Professor Misak stated that there had been ongoing planning within the University for an H1N1 outbreak. The program continuity group had been working hard to ensure that, in the event a significant number of students and faculty members were suddenly absent from classes, programs would continue. The University had put in place a feature on the Repository of Student Information (ROSI) that enabled students to make a declaration of illness that served as a substitute for medical verification of influenza-like illness. The intent had been that, with the availability of the online tool, students would be less likely to visit their physicians and risk communication of the disease. To date, there had been no evidence of abuse of the system. Professor Misak noted that the University had received a limited quantity of the H1N1 vaccine which would be made available to students in priority categories. She added that the University had been planning since last year for H1N1, and many Ontario universities had adopted the University's planning documents.

---

[1] Secretary's Note: Arrangements between the member and the Office of the Governing Council have been in place since September, 2009. Staff in the Secretariat have investigated the error, informed the Board Chair of arrangements that are in place, and are confident that the error will not occur again.
52798

5.   Report of the Vice-President and Provost (cont'd)

(b)   Academic Program Continuity Planning (cont'd)

A member asked whether accommodations had been put in place for staff. Professor Hildyard replied that, in accordance with Toronto public health guidelines, staff were not required to supply medical certificates in relation to their absence to their supervisors.

6.   Non-Hospital Clinical Site Template Agreement

The Chair explained that each proposal presented to the Board for its consideration would be prefaced by a standard cover sheet that would outline jurisdictional information, previous actions taken, highlights of the proposal, financial implications, and the recommendations. She encouraged members to review the cover sheets in preparation for each Board meeting.

The Chair stated that the proposed template for non-hospital clinical site agreements had been considered by the Planning and Budget Committee (P&B) at its meeting of October 28, 2009. If recommended by the Academic Board, the proposal would be considered for approval by the Governing Council on December 10th.

Professor Desloges introduced the proposal[2], which had been included in the agenda package distributed to members of the Board, and he outlined the discussion that had occurred at the P&B meeting[3].

Referring to Section XIII.3 of the proposed template agreement, a member asked who would arrange for liability insurance coverage for students while they were on site. Professor Catharine Whiteside, Dean, Faculty of Medicine, and Vice-Provost, Relations with Health Care Institutions, assured the member that the University would assume responsibility for all such arrangements and each program would be required to document the insurance coverage.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

(1) THAT the proposed template for non-hospital clinical site agreements with the University of Toronto, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "A", be approved, effective immediately;

(2) THAT the Vice-President and Provost, or designate, be authorized to sign such agreements on behalf of the Governing Council, provided that the agreements conform to the approved template; and

(3) THAT the agreements signed under the provisions of this resolution be filed with the Secretary of Governing Council.

---

[2] http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/AssetFactory.aspx?did=6559
[3]

http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/Assets/Governing+Council+Digital+Assets/Boards+and+Committees/Planning+and+Budget+Committee/2009-2010+Academic+Year/r1028.pdf
52798

7.   School of Graduate Studies and Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering: Master of Engineering in Telecommunications – Program Closure

The Chair said that the proposal from the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering and the School of Graduate Studies for the closure of the Master of Engineering in Telecommunications (M.Eng.Tel.) program had been considered by the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs (AP&P) at its meeting of September 15, 2009 and by P&B at its meeting of October 28, 2009. If recommended by the Academic Board, the proposal would be considered for approval by the Governing Council on December 10th.

Professor Sass-Kortsak introduced the proposal[4], which had been included in the agenda package distributed to members of the Board, and she highlighted the discussion that had occurred at the AP&P meeting[5]. Professor Desloges stated that the P&B Committee had been satisfied that there were no financial implications for the Faculty or the University and no questions had been raised by Committee members at its meeting[6].

There were no questions from the Board.

> On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried
>
> YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS
>
> THAT the proposal from the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering and the School of Graduate Studies to close the Master of Engineering in Telecommunications (M.Eng.Tel.) program be approved, effective immediately.

Documentation is attached hereto as Appendix "B".

8.   School of Graduate Studies and Faculty of Arts and Science: Master of Science in Applied Computing

The Chair stated that the proposal for the establishment of the Master of Science in Applied Computing (M.Sc.A.C.) program within the Faculty of Arts and Science had been considered by AP&P at its meeting of September 15, 2009 and by P&B at its meeting of October 28, 2009. If recommended by the Academic Board, the proposal would be considered for approval by the Governing Council on December 10th.

Professor Sass-Kortsak introduced the proposal[7], which had been included in the agenda package distributed to members of the Board, and she highlighted the discussion that had occurred at the AP&P meeting[8]. Professor Desloges then outlined the discussion that had taken place at the P&B meeting[9].

---

[4] http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/AssetFactory.aspx?did=6536
[5]

http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/Assets/Governing+Council+Digital+Assets/Boards+and+Committees/Committee+on+Academic+Policy+and+Programs/2009-2010+Academic+Year/r0915.pdf
[6]

http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/Assets/Governing+Council+Digital+Assets/Boards+and+Committees/Planning+and+Budget+Committee/2009-2010+Academic+Year/r1028.pdf
[7] http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/AssetFactory.aspx?did=6417
[8]

http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/Assets/Governing+Council+Digital+Assets/Boards+and+Committees/Committee+on+Academic+Policy+and+Programs/2009-2010+Academic+Year/r0915.pdf
[9]

http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/Assets/Governing+Council+Digital+Assets/Boards+and+Committees/Planning+and+Budget+Committee/2009-2010+Academic+Year/r1028.pdf
52798

8.   **School of Graduate Studies and Faculty of Arts and Science: Master of Science in Applied Computing** (cont'd)

In response to a number of questions posed by a member, Professor Craig Boutilier, Chair, Department of Computer Science, contended that the calibre of the program and students who would be admitted would be very high. The proposal for a small program in relation to the size of the Department had been intentional, and the sixteen-month program would be identical in length to that of the doctoral-stream masters program. Familiarity with research and computer science techniques would be a requirement, as students would have to translate novel research ideas into practice under the joint supervision of an associate in the industry and a research faculty member. Professor Boutilier agreed that the development of excellent communication skills was one important outcome of graduate programs. He noted that students in the proposed program would have the opportunity to strengthen such skills through the required course *Communication for Computer Scientists* and when engaging with members of the community and participating in the industrial internship.

Professor Boutilier explained that, while students would be permitted to take up to 1.0 full course equivalent (FCE) of the 7.0 FCEs required for the program from related departments, prior approval of the Program Director would be needed to ensure the appropriateness of the requested course.

Members raised some questions about the accessibility and value of the proposed industrial internship. Professor Boutilier assured the Board that the Department possessed the resources to assist students in obtaining suitable placements. It was anticipated that, in the short-term, students would carry out their placements within the Greater Toronto Area (GTA), thus allowing the Department to closely monitor the internships in the initial stages of the program. For this reason, the required evening course that students would take during their eight-month internship would be held on campus. It was possible that, in the future, the course would be offered online or through a distance learning format. Professor Boutilier stated that the program would allow graduate students to work with Departmental members who had developed research with potential industrial application. Students in the proposed M.Sc.A.C. program would have the opportunity to work on the implementation and development of ideas on-site, work which doctoral-stream masters students were not typically able to perform during their program.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the establishment of the proposed Master of Science in Applied Computing (M.Sc.A.C.) program within the Faculty of Arts and Science be approved, commencing September 2010.

Documentation is attached hereto as Appendix "C".

9.   **Capital Project: Utilities Infrastructure Upgrade for St. George Campus**

The Chair explained that the proposed capital project for the Utilities Infrastructure Upgrade for the St. George Campus had been considered by P&B at its meeting of October 28, 2009. If recommended by the Academic Board, the proposal would be considered for approval by the Governing Council on December 10th. The Chair noted that authorization for execution of the project had been approved by the Business Board on November 9th, subject to Governing Council approval.

Professor Desloges introduced the proposal[10], which had been included in the agenda package distributed to members of the Board, and he outlined the discussion that had occurred at the P&B meeting[11].

---

[10] http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/AssetFactory.aspx?did=6560
11

http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/Assets/Governing+Council+Digital+Assets/Boards+and+Committees/Planning+and+Budget+Committee/2009-2010+Academic+Year/r1028.pdf
52798

9.   Capital Project: Utilities Infrastructure Upgrade for St. George Campus (cont'd)

A member commented that, in his opinion, the proposed projects for a new electrical feeder, chiller, and upgrades at the central steam plant were quite conventional in their approach, and he asked whether alternative solutions had been considered. Mr. Ron Swail, Assistant Vice-President, Facilities and Services, pointed to the University's long history of sustainable energy projects and stated that greater steps would be taken to advertise those projects in the future. Mr. Bruce Dodds, Director of Utilities, Facilities and Services, added that the proposed projects would enable the University to enhance the existing district energy system on campus, which was much more efficient than a distributed system. Mr Dodds also noted that the University had considered deep lake cooling, an unconventional method of providing chilled water, but the system was currently oversubscribed.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the Utilities Infrastructure Renewal program of projects be approved, at a total cost not to exceed $11.232 million, with funding as follows:

$5 million from utilities infrastructure renewal funds and the balance as a loan to be repaid by increasing the annual utilities budget by $720,000.

Documentation is attached hereto as Appendix "D".

10.   Capital Project: Project Planning Report for UTSC South Campus Data Centre

The Chair explained that the proposed capital project for the University of Toronto at Scarborough Data Centre had been considered by P&B at its meeting of October 28, 2009. If recommended by the Academic Board, the proposal would be considered for approval by the Governing Council on December 10th. The Chair noted that authorization for execution of the project had also been approved by the Business Board on November 9th, subject to Governing Council approval.

Professor Desloges introduced the proposal[12], which had been included in the agenda package distributed to members of the Board, and he outlined the discussion that had occurred at the P&B meeting[13].

The Chair noted that a member had submitted three questions pertaining to the proposed project in advance of the meeting, and she thanked the member for doing so. Professor Rick Halpern, Vice-Principal (Academic) and Dean, University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC), then responded to the questions that had been raised. He stated that, while the original goal had been to complete the proposed project by January 30, 2010, in reality, the project would likely be completed by late spring or early summer of 2010. With respect to the member's second question, Professor Halpern explained that a diagram of the site had not been included in the proposal because it was to be located on the roof of an existing building. In response to the member's question about the process of consultation and approval that had occurred regarding the site of the proposed data centre, Professor Halpern said that a committee had looked at a number of options, taking into account technical, architectural and financial implications. Membership of the committee had included representatives from UTSC's Information & Instructional Technology Services, Facilities Department, Design and Construction Department, and teaching staff, as well as staff from the University's central Capital Projects Department. The chosen site had been selected because it had proved to be the most feasible and cost effective location. Upon

---

[12] http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/AssetFactory.aspx?did=6561
[13]

http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/Assets/Governing+Council+Digital+Assets/Boards+and+Committees/Planning+and+Budget+Committee/2009-2010+Academic+Year/r1028.pdf
52798

10.   Capital Project: Project Planning Report for UTSC South Campus Data Centre (cont'd)

completion of the proposal, it had been presented to the UTSC Information Technology Advisory Committee and the UTSC Department Heads and Principal Executive Group, prior to being forwarded to P&B and the Governing Council's Business Board.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

(1) THAT the Project Planning Report for the University of Toronto at Scarborough Data Centre, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "E", be approved in principle.

(2) THAT the project scope, comprising new construction of 182 square meters at a total project cost of $3,904,000.00 be approved with the full funding from the University of Toronto at Scarborough.

11.   Undergraduate Program Review Audit Committee: Audit Report

The Chair informed the Board that AP&P had received for information the Audit Report of the Undergraduate Program Review Audit Committee at its meeting of September 15th. At its meeting of September 17th, the Agenda Committee had also received the report for information, and it had decided that the Report should be provided to the Board for information.

Professor Regehr explained that a number of changes were being made in Ontario with respect to the quality assurance of academic programs. In the past, Ontario universities had been subject to four types of program reviews, all of which required appraisal by external reviewers. These included administrative reviews of departments and faculties, which were generally conducted at the time of leadership change; undergraduate program reviews commissioned by the Dean of the division and which were monitored through an audit process conducted by the Undergraduate Program Review Audit Committee (UPRAC); graduate program reviews conducted by the Ontario Council of Graduate Schools (O.C.G.S.); and accreditation of professional programs by specific licensing bodies. The Council of Ontario Universities (C.O.U.) had determined that such a model was not ideal, and the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance (the "Quality Council"), a subgroup of the Ontario Council of Academic Vice-Presidents (OCAV), had been established to determine an alternative review process for all Ontario universities.

The Quality Assurance Task Force had recently submitted its final report to OCAV. Although some aspects of the framework would need to be finalized prior to its implementation, all Ontario universities were required to submit an Institutional Quality Assurance Plan (IQAP) by March 2010. A significant component of the proposed framework was the dissolution of O.C.G.S. and UPRAC as quality assurance monitors in Ontario and the responsibility of the Quality Council to oversee quality assurance. Reviews of all programs would be conducted by individual universities according to their own IQAP. The degree to which each university complied with its internal process would be audited by the Quality Council every seven years. An important feature of the framework was the ability of divisions to bundle their reviews. If they wished, divisions could arrange for their reviews to occur at the same time. Professor Regehr had been meeting with divisional leaders to discuss the framework and to ask them to develop a schedule of reviews that would be most appropriate for their division. She had explained that the reviews of programs would need to include benchmarks or data by which they could be compared to similar programs at peer institutions. New program approvals for both graduate and undergraduate programs would need to be approved by the Quality Council; however, the definition of a "new" program had not yet been finalized.

Professor Regehr then outlined several issues that had been identified in the 2008 UPRAC Audit Report that would require the University's attention. The University's ICAP would need to incorporate a

11.   Undergraduate Program Review Audit Committee: Audit Report (cont'd)

process for approving new programs that included degree level expectations and the ways in which they would be met. There was a need for the University to more explicitly charge reviewers to assess the quality of programs, so that the appearance of a leadership review would be diminished. In the future, the University would need to demonstrate that it was following its own policies and procedures, as it had not consistently done so in the past. In addition, a more robust process for following up on recommendations of program reviews, especially those that indicated problems in quality, would need to be established. Since O.C.G.S. would no longer exist, the University would need to develop internal mechanisms by which graduate programs would be required to cease functioning, if necessary.

Professor Regehr stated that the University was taking a number of steps in preparation for implementation of the Province's new quality assurance framework. The University was currently determining its process of reviews and process of new program approvals; it hoped to submit its ICAP prior to the March 2010 deadline. Benchmark data from various sources within the University would be compiled in order to assist units and divisions in preparing their self-study. Some of the University's policies and procedures would need to be altered to take into account the new framework, and a Working Group to review university procedures and policies in order to implement the new Quality Assurance Plan would need to be established.

In response to questions about the role of governance in the University's reviews, Professor Misak assured the Board that governance bodies would likely play an even greater role in the future.

A member asked about the type of support that would be provided to assist units and divisions in conducting comparisons of their programs to their peers. Professor Regehr responded that the administration was currently considering how best to provide relevant data to divisions on a more frequent basis. She noted that Research Services presently conducted such work, and data was available from a range of surveys and tools such as the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE).

A member had noted that the schedule of program reviews that had been contained in the documentation provided to the Board did not seem to be up-to–date. Professor Regehr stated that that schedule was no longer relevant, and she was in the process of collecting information about preferred schedules from each division.

12.   Academic Planning in the Context of Towards 2030

Professor Misak stated that, in the past, each division within the University had prepared and submitted an academic plan to the Office of the Provost every five to seven years. However, such synchronized academic planning across the University was no longer preferred. Rather, it would be more appropriate, given the new system of reviews of academic programs and units, to develop academic plans following the completion of such reviews. In that way, feedback from the external reviewers could be incorporated into the plans, and the unified process would be much simpler for everyone.

No questions were raised by members of the Board.

13.   Items for Information

(a)   Report on Approvals under Summer Executive Authority

The Chair reported that six items had been approved under the Governing Council's Summer Executive Authority that would have normally have been considered by the Board for approval. Of those, five had dealt with matters of individual appointments, and one had been the approval of the Master of Public Health degree name change.

13.   Items for Information (cont'd)

(b)   Semi-Annual Report: Academic Appeals Committee, Individual Cases, Fall 2009

The Chair said that, in June, the Board had appointed the Chairs and student and teaching staff members of the Academic Appeals Committee who heard and considered academic appeals made by students. She reminded members that it was not the Board's function to re-examine the decisions of individual cases; however, questions about the academic appeals process could be raised.

There were no questions.

(c)   Semi-Annual Report: University Tribunal, Individual Cases, Fall 2009

The Chair informed members that pages 2, 4, and 6 of Case 496 had been omitted from the hard copies of the Fall 2009 Semi-Annual Report of the University Tribunal. She stated that the complete package was available from the Board's website. The Chair asked Mr. Christopher Lang, Director, Appeals, Discipline and Faculty Grievances, to convey to the members of the Academic Appeals Committee and the Tribunal the Board's appreciation of their dedication, time, and service.

(d)   Calendar of Business 2009-10

The Chair said that the Board's Calendar of Business, which had been included in members' agenda packages, was part of a consolidated Governing Council Calendar of Business that was available on the Governing Council website. The online version of the Calendar was updated each Friday afternoon, reflecting any changes that were made. The Chair explained that the initial Calendar that was prepared each summer incorporated annual items that were presented to the Board during the governance year. However, at that time, it was not always possible to determine when other items of business might be ready for consideration, and that was one of the reasons that changes to the Calendar occurred throughout the year. Many items that originated within the divisions were brought forward to the Board on the recommendation of the Planning and Budget Committee or the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs. In the upcoming governance cycle three, there were no items for approval for either Committee and it had been considered appropriate to cancel their meetings. As such, there were few items to be presented at the Academic Board meeting of December 7, 2009. There were only two items for information - the Appointments and Status Changes Report and the Quarterly Report on Donations (August 1 to October 31, 2009). The Chair proposed that the Board's meeting of December 7, 2009 be canceled. No objections were voiced.

A member noted that the Board's meeting that had been scheduled for September 30th had also been cancelled, and she asked what the timeframe was for matters to be brought forward to the Board. Professor Regehr replied that the administration was currently consulting with the divisions to determine the most appropriate process for bringing items of business forward to governance. Professor Misak added that, because of the University's complexity, it was difficult to predict when matters would be ready for consideration by central governance bodies. She suggested that in the future, it might be more effective to have fewer scheduled meeting dates, but to retain reserve dates so that urgent matters which arose could be addressed in a timely fashion.

A member stated that, in her view, it was unusual to cancel so many governance meetings. She suggested that the University community be provided with the opportunity to present matters to the Board on those occasions when there were no items of business. Professor Misak agreed that it was valuable to have multiple fora for items of concern to be discussed within the University community. She argued, however, that Academic Board meetings were not a suitable venue for such deliberations, given its necessary formal structure. Professor Misak reported that she had formed an undergraduate advisory group composed of students to facilitate such communication.

52798

13.   Items for Information (cont'd)

(e)   Appointments and Status Changes

The Chair drew members' attention to the many Emeritus/Emerita status changes contained in the Appointments and Status Changes Report. She suggested that the Governing Council's recent approval of the *Policy on Emeritus/Emerita Status* had likely contributed to the increase in the number of requests for Emeritus/Emerita status.

Members also received the following reports for information:

(f)   Report Number 142 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs (September 15, 2009)
(g)   Report Number 133 of the Planning and Budget Committee (October 28, 2009)

There were no questions arising from the reports.

14.   Date of Next Meeting

The Chair stated that the meeting of December 7, 2009 had been cancelled and reminded members that the date of the next meeting was Thursday, January 28, 2010, at 4:10 p.m.

15.   Other Business

The Chair encouraged members who had not already done so to notify the Secretary if they wished to access agenda packages online from the Board's website, rather than receive a paper copy prior to each meeting. She noted that members were responsible for shredding any confidential documentation received as part of their agenda packages. Members could leave confidential material behind in the Council Chamber and the Secretariat would arrange for their disposal. She wished members a safe and happy holiday season.

The Board moved *in camera*.

16.   Quarterly Report on Donations - May 1, 2009 – July 31, 2009

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

The Board returned to open session.

<div align="center">The meeting adjourned at 5:15 p.m.</div>

_____   _____

Secretary   Chair
November 19, 2009

52798