

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

REPORT NUMBER 173 OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD

April 26, 2011

To the Governing Council,
University of Toronto

Your Board reports that it held a meeting on Tuesday, April 26, 2011 at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall at which the following were present:

Professor Ellen Hodnett, Chair
Professor Louise Lemieux-Charles, Vice-Chair
Professor David Naylor, President
Professor Cheryl Misak, Vice-President and Provost
Professor Scott Mabury, Vice-Provost, Academic Operations
Professor Cheryl Regehr, Vice-Provost Academic Programs
Professor R. Paul Young, Vice-President, Research
Professor Catherine Amara
Professor Maydianne Andrade
Professor Jan Angus
Professor Dwayne Barber
Mr. Hanif Bayat-Movahed
Professor Ronald Beiner
Ms Patricia Bellamy
Professor Terry Carleton
Mr. Louis Charpentier
Professor Brian Corman
Professor Elizabeth Cowper

Professor Alister Cumming
Mr. Tyler Currie
Professor Gabriele D'Eleuterio
Professor Karen Davis
Mr. Ken Davy
Professor Miriam Diamond
Ms Caroline Di Giovanni
Professor Suzanne Erb
Professor Alan Galey
Mrs. Bonnie Horne
Ms Cathy Hughes
Ms Jemy Joseph
Professor Christina Kramer
Mr. Kent Kuran
Professor Jim Lai
Ms Cecilia Livingston
Professor Michael Luke
Professor Heather MacNeil
Professor Henry Mann
Dr. Thomas Mathien
Professor Douglas McDougall
Professor Don McLean
Professor Angelo Melino
Professor Matthew Mitchell
Mr. Liam Mitchell

Professor David Mock
Ms Carole Moore
Professor Carol Moukheiber
Professor Amy Mullin
Professor Michelle Murphy
Professor Sioban Nelson
Professor Linda Northrup
Mr. Jeff Peters
Ms Judith Poë
Dr. Susan Rappolt
Professor Yves Roberge
Professor Jeffrey Rosenthal
Professor Seamus Ross
Professor Lock Rowe
Ms Helen Slade
Professor Sandy Smith
Ms Lynn Snowden
Miss Maureen J. Somerville
Professor Romin Tafarodi
Mr. Daniel Taranovsky
Dr. Roslyn Thomas-Long
Mr. Gregory West
Professor Charmaine Williams
Mr. Dickson Yang

Regrets:

Professor Varouj Aivazian
Professor Derek Allen
Professor Cristina Amon
Professor Jan Barnsley
Professor Sylvia Bashevkin
Mr. Justin Basinger
Professor Denise Belsham
Professor Katherine Berg
Ms Annie Claire Bergeron-Oliver
Professor Parth Bhatt
Ms Marilyn Booth
Professor Sujit Choudhry
Professor Will Cluett
Professor David Cook
Professor Gerald Cupchik
Professor Christopher Damaren

Mr. Shaun Datt
Professor Charles Deber
Professor Joseph Desloges
Professor Darryl Edwards
Mr. John A. Fraser
Professor Meric Gertler
Professor Robert Gibbs
Professor Avrum Gotlieb
Professor Rick Halpern
Professor Russell Hartenberger
Ms Emily Holland
Professor Ira Jacobs
Professor Alison Keith
Ms Min Hee (Margaret) Kim
Dr. Chris Koenig-Woodyard
Dr. Nancy Kreiger
Mr. Nykolaj Kuryluk
Mr. Rishi Maharaj

Professor Roger L. Martin
Professor Mark McGowan
Professor Faye Mishna
Professor Mayo Moran
Professor Julia O'Sullivan
Professor Janet Paterson
Professor Ito Peng
Professor Ato Quayson
Mr. Shakir Rahim
Professor Andrea Sass-Kortsak
Miss Priatharsini Sivananthajothy
Professor Richard Sommer
Dr. Shelly Weiss
Professor Njoki Wane
Professor Wendy Ward
Professor Catharine Whiteside

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 Franco Vaccarino, Vice-President and Principal, University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC)
Ms Sally Garner, Executive Director, Planning and Budget

Professor Edith Hillan, Vice-Provost, Academic and Faculty Life

Secretariat:

Ms Mae-Yu Tan

In Attendance:

Professor Emeritus Michael Marrus, member of the Governing Council
Ms Maria Pilar Galvez, member-elect of the Governing Council
Mr. Bill Simmons, Assistant Vice-President, University Development
Professor Jill Matus, Vice-Provost, Students
Mr. Andrew Arifuzzaman, Chief Strategy Officer, University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC)
Mr. Steve Bailey, Director, Office of Space Management
Ms Melissa Berger, Program and Planning Officer, University of Toronto Mississauga (UTM)
Professor Tom Bessai, Director, Bachelor of Arts Program in Architectural Studies, Faculty of Arts and Science
Mr. Horatio Bot, Assistant Dean, John H. Daniels Faculty of Architecture, Landscape and Design (FALD)

Ms Andrea Carter, Employment Equity Officer and Accessibility of Ontarians with Disabilities Act Officer
Mr. Neil Dobbs, Assistant Secretary of the Governing Council
Ms Sheree Drummond, Assistant Provost
Professor Steven Fong, Associate Dean, Academic, FALD
Ms Nora Gillespie, Legal Counsel, Office of the Vice-President and Provost and Office of the Vice-President Human Resources and Equity
Dr. Anthony Gray, Special Advisor to the President
Ms Pamela Gravestock, Associate Director, Centre for Teaching Support and Innovation (CSTI)
Ms Emily Greenleaf, Research Officer and Faculty Liaison, CSTI
Dr. Jane Harrison, Director, Academic Programs and Policy, Office of the Vice-President and Provost

Mr. Anwar Kazimi, Committee Secretary, Office of the Governing Council
Professor George Luste, President, University of Toronto Faculty Association
Mr. Steve Moate, Senior Legal Counsel, Office of the President
Mr. Gavin Nowlan, President, Arts and Science Students' Union
Mr. Fred Thwainy, President of the Bachelor of Arts Architectural Studies Society, Faculty of Arts and Science
Professor Sandy Welsh, Acting Vice-Dean, Teaching and Learning, Faculty of Arts and Science
Professor Anthony Wensley, Director, Institute of Communication, Culture and Information Technology, UTM

In this report, items 8 and 9 require Executive Committee confirmation, and items 5, 6, 7, and 10 are recommended to the Governing Council for approval. The remaining items are reported for information.

1. Approval of Report Number 172 of the Meeting held on March 17, 2011

Report Number 172 of the meeting held on March 17, 2011 was approved.

2. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting

There was no business arising from the Report of March 17, 2011.

3. Report Number 171 (April 15, 2011) of the Agenda Committee

Report Number 171 was received for information.

The Chair said that, at its March meeting, the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs (AP&P) had considered carefully five reviews of academic programs and units. Its report had been presented to the Agenda Committee, and the Committee had decided that a highlight of the findings should be provided at the April 26th meeting of the Board. The Chair then called on Professor McDougall to give an overview of AP&P's findings.

Professor McDougall reported that, once again, the most important outcome had been the clear recognition by the reviewers that the University of Toronto offered outstanding programs. The reviewers had also identified some areas of concern and had offered some suggestions including the following.

- They had found that the Faculty of Law was in dire need of additional space.
- The Faculty of Medicine had been urged to improve co-ordination among researchers who were dispersed across the campus, the affiliated teaching hospitals, and their research institutes.
- It had been noted that the Joseph L. Rotman School of Management could benefit from expanding its MBA program applicant pool and improving yields among the very best applicants.
- The faculty in the UTSC Management program were concerned about their opportunities for graduate supervision and about compensation of their Department for their graduate teaching, and they felt a need for greater autonomy for their Department within UTSC.
- At UTM, Political Science students had less access to their professors than would be desirable, given that faculty spent a substantial proportion of their time carrying out research and graduate teaching on the St. George Campus.

Overall, AP&P had been satisfied that the administrators in all of the divisions were taking appropriate action to respond to the concerns. It had been noted, however, that in three of the five reviews, questions about tri-campus relations had been raised. A follow-up report from UTSC that had been requested previously by AP&P had also been provided at its March meeting. The Committee learned that, under the leadership of Dean Rick Halpern, UTSC had worked quickly to address problems in the Department of Humanities.

There were no questions.

4. Report of the Vice-President and Provost

(a) Appointments

Professor Misak informed the Board of the appointments of Principals of two of the federated universities. Professor Domenico Pietropaolo had been appointed Principal of St. Michael's College for a five-year term effective July 1, 2011. Professor Pietropaolo held the Goggio Chair in Italian Studies, was Chair of the Italian Studies Department, and was also a professor of drama. Professor David Cook's term as Principal of Victoria College had been extended to June 30, 2012.

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

(b) Towards 2030 – A View from 2012

Professor Misak announced that in the Fall, 2011, a series of town hall meetings would be held with the University community as part of a process to examine progress that had been made since the *Towards 2030* planning initiative had been undertaken four years ago. The Academic Board would be engaged in the upcoming process, and members' input would be sought.

5. Committee on Academic Policy and Programs, Planning and Budget Committee, and Academic Board: Terms of Reference Revisions Regarding Approval of Academic Programs

The Chair informed members that they were being asked to consider a proposal for revisions to the terms of reference of the Board and two of its standing committees. The proposal addressed the approval of academic programs. One section dealt with the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs (AP&P) terms of reference and had been considered by that Committee on April 5, 2011. The second part dealt with the Planning and Budget Committee (P&B) terms of reference and had been presented to the Committee at its meeting of April 6th. The third part concerned the terms of reference of the Academic Board. If the Board recommended the proposal, it would then be considered for approval by the Governing Council at its meeting on May 19, 2011.

Mr. Charpentier commented on the context of the proposal to amend the three terms of reference, noting that two processes had unfolded in parallel - the Task Force on Governance's comprehensive review, and the Council of Ontario Universities' (Ontario Council of Academic Vice-Presidents) review and restructuring of the quality assurance processes for undergraduate and graduate programs. The proposals for changes had been developed as a result of collaboration between the bodies involved. It was important to note that, because of the *University of Toronto Act, 1971*, decisions made by the Academic Board required confirmation by the Executive Committee of the Governing Council, as the Board was not composed of a majority of governors. However, it was also important to note that the Executive Committee's role was to assure itself that due process had been followed, rather than to re-debate decisions made by the Board.

Professor Regehr then highlighted the main components of the proposal. She explained that proposals for new academic programs, both graduate and undergraduate, would need to undergo a more uniform approval process, including an external review conducted prior to consideration by governance. As well, it was expected that broad consultation both with members of the University community and external stakeholders would take place. It was recommended that, if there were no budgetary implications arising from the proposal for units outside of the host division, approval of the program by P&B would no longer be necessary.

Professor McDougall said that APP had strongly supported the proposal. The Committee had been satisfied that the removal of certain steps in the process, such as those previously taken by the Graduate Education Council, would not reduce the opportunity for students to state their views, particularly since students were well represented on the divisional councils, at AP&P, and at the Academic Board. The divisional councils would assume greater responsibility, including the

5. Committee on Academic Policy and Programs, Planning and Budget Committee, and Academic Board: Terms of Reference Revisions Regarding Approval of Academic Programs (cont'd)

authority to approve program modifications. To discharge that responsibility, it was expected that the Councils would review and strengthen their constitutions. Professor Diamond reported that P&B had also supported the proposal. She noted that P&B would continue to be the lead committee in considering recommendations to establish or close academic units.

Invited by the Chair to comment, Professor Emeritus Michael Marrus, a member of the Task Force on Governance (TFOG), said that the Governing Council had accepted the TFOG's recommendations that duplication within governance be reduced and that the flow of business be streamlined. There would be no diminution of the Academic Board's authority or that of its standing committees. The goal was for governance processes to function with greater efficiency than at present. The measure of achieving that would be that value would be added by each governance body that considered a proposal.

In response to a question, Mr. Charpentier replied that a number of matters would still require consideration by the Governing Council. Noting that the Board had been assured of appropriate consultation during the academic proposal development phase, the Chair asked whether or not such consultative processes would occur simultaneously. Professor Regehr explained that, in general, consultation occurred at all stages of development of a proposal and was carried out in a very efficient manner. A key element contained in a new template for program proposals was a section for the summary of consultations that had occurred. It was anticipated that feedback would be provided to the administration or the AP&P by members of the University community if sufficient consultation did not take place.

Professor Regehr said that the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance (Quality Council) was composed of nine representatives of various universities, a lay member, and a member from Alberta. Professor Regehr was a member of the Quality Council, and Professor Sandy Welsh, Acting Vice-Dean, Teaching and Learning, Faculty of Arts and Science, was a member of the Council's recently formed Appraisal Committee. Professor Misak commented that the University was fortunate to have representatives of the University and its sister institutions on the Quality Council.

A member observed that the approval process for the closure of an academic program would mirror that of its establishment, and the member asked whether closures would also require approval from the Quality Council. Professor Regehr said that only an annual report of program closures was required by the Quality Council. In response to a question, Mr. Charpentier stated, that if the Executive Committee considered a proposal to be controversial, it had the authority to forward the proposal to the Governing Council for its consideration.

5. Committee on Academic Policy and Programs, Planning and Budget Committee, and Academic Board: Terms of Reference Revisions Regarding Approval of Academic Programs (cont'd)

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

- (a) THAT the proposed amendments to section 3, 4.1, 4.4, and 4.9 of the Terms of Reference of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs, and the proposed amendments to the section of the Guidelines Regarding Levels of Approval dealing with academic program proposals, be approved;
- (b) THAT the proposed amendment to section 4.4.2 of the Terms of Reference of the Planning and Budget Committee be approved; and
- (c) THAT the proposed amendment to sections 5.3.1 and 5.3.2 of the Terms of Reference of the Academic Board be approved.

Documentation is attached hereto as [Appendix "A"](#).

6. *Policy on the Student Evaluation of Teaching in Courses*

The Chair noted that the proposal for the *Policy on the Student Evaluation of Teaching in Courses* had been forwarded to the Academic Board by the AP&P. If the Board recommended the proposal, it would then be considered for approval by the Governing Council at its May 19th meeting.

Professor Regehr provided an overview of the proposed *Policy*, which outlined the principles and parameters that should guide the evaluation of teaching in courses at the University. She noted that the details of the course evaluation process and administration would be contained in the *Provostial Guidelines for the Student Evaluation of Teaching in Courses*. A draft of the *Guidelines* had been made available to members of the Board for their information. Once the *Guidelines* had been fully developed, they would be provided again to AP&P for information.

Professor McDougall reported that, overall, AP&P had been supportive of the *Policy* and members had been pleased that the proposal would establish a process that would be consistent across the University. During the Committee's discussion, some concern had been expressed that the use of online evaluations would reduce participation rates. However, it had been noted that the response rates for paper surveys were already low in some cases, particularly in large classes. The University was planning to implement strategies that had proven successful in improving participation in other institutions. Some Committee members had been apprehensive of permitting individual instructors the right to opt out of releasing data from the evaluations. AP&P had been assured that such action was not the norm. Some faculty members did hold a principled belief that information from course evaluations should be private. Allowing them to opt out of releasing data would be important to secure broad buy-in for the *Policy*. There had also been some concern that teaching evaluations would provide data that was not strong enough to serve as a factor in personnel decisions such as promotion and tenure. While a great deal of consultation had been conducted to ensure accuracy of

6. *Policy on the Student Evaluation of Teaching in Courses* (cont'd)

data, it should be noted that, according to the *Provostial Guidelines for Developing Written Assessments of Effectiveness of Teaching in Promotion and Tenure Decisions*, course evaluations were just one aspect of the evaluation of teaching.

At the invitation of the Chair, Mr. Gavin Nowlan, President of the Arts and Science Students' Union (ASSU), addressed the Board. Mr. Nowlan acknowledged that ASSU had been consulted throughout the development process of the proposed *Policy* and had had an opportunity to raise questions with the Course Evaluation Working Group. However, there were still some aspects of the *Policy* which, in ASSU's view, needed further consideration. Students would prefer that all data collected be released. However, if it were necessary to retain the opt-out feature, it would be preferable for instructors to be permitted to do so only at the beginning of the process. They should not be able to opt out after having seen their evaluation results. Mr. Nowlan said that ASSU would like to see greater information regarding the use of an online system in the *Guidelines*. It would be important to ensure that response rates did not decline as a result of implementing an online evaluation system, especially given the widespread use of evaluation results by the student body. Mr. Nowlan closed by emphasizing ASSU's desire to ensure that it fulfilled its responsibility to the students while also continuing to work with the administration in the development of the *Guidelines*. Professor Misak praised ASSU's role in the current teaching evaluations process in the Faculty of Arts and Science. She said that it was the University's desire to replicate the systematic manner in which ASSU had administered the evaluations. At present, response rates varied dramatically across divisions. The *Policy* was designed to increase response rates and encourage the timely release of data by all divisions. It would, however, be necessary to accommodate the individual wishes of some faculty members by maintaining the opt-out clause in the proposed *Policy*.

Professor George Luste, President of the University of Toronto Faculty Association (UTFA), was then invited by the Chair to speak. Professor Luste outlined the concerns and comments of some members of the UTFA. Noting that teaching was an important part of the University's mission, he pointed to the significance of the evaluation of an instructor's teaching. Such an evaluation could have an impact on the career of a faculty member, particularly with respect to tenure, promotion, and merit decisions. Professor Luste said that overlap of the current and proposed evaluation systems was necessary, and he explained that when considering grievances, it was often helpful to compare current and past data related to a faculty member's teaching. He also noted that the Board was being asked to approve only the more general *Policy*, not the *Guidelines*. In his view, the latter contained the more consequential material. There also seemed to be a need for greater distinction between the concepts of teaching evaluation and course evaluation within the *Policy*. As well, questions had been raised regarding the role that statistically significant data versus qualitative data would serve in the analysis of the evaluation results. In closing, Professor Luste recommended that the proposed *Policy* be referred back for further discussion and consideration. In response, Professor Misak again clarified that course evaluation was only one component of teaching evaluation conducted at the University. Both qualitative metrics, including letters from students, and quantitative metrics were used.

Professor Regehr said that staff in the Centre for Teaching Support and Innovation (CTSI) were in the process of testing some of the proposed questions together with questions from current

6. *Policy on the Student Evaluation of Teaching in Courses* (cont'd)

evaluation forms with a few groups of students. In their view, it would not be prudent to require all divisions to administer two sets of evaluation forms; it was feared that this would definitely result in a drop in response rate. It would be possible, however, to compare results from the proposed evaluation system with those from the past system, as divisions already collected evaluation data in a systematic manner. As well, reports which could be generated quickly in the proposed system, would allow for comparisons using varying criteria such as the size or year of a course. Divisions that wished to participate in a Summer 2011 pilot phase or in the Fall 2011 implementation would be identified and provided with support.

Among the matters that arose in questions and discussion were the following.

a) Online Evaluation and Response Rates

Members asked whether the response rates would be affected by a shift from a paper survey to an online tool. Professor McDougall said that that question also had been raised at the AP&P meeting. Members had been of the view that students might be more likely to respond to an online evaluation, as they would have the choice of using a range of electronic devices. As well, students could complete the evaluation outside of the classroom; such improved access might lead to an increase in response rates. Professor Regehr noted that, at the University, paper response rates typically ranged from 40% to 65% in most divisions. However, response rates as low as 12% occurred in some large courses. She noted that the response rate at Penn State had increased approximately 15% (to 85-90%) after an online evaluation tool had been adopted. One possible means of combining both evaluation models would be to ask students to bring their devices with them and allot time for the evaluation to be completed during class. The Working Group was continuing to explore the best means of administering the evaluation tool.

A member suggested that the response rate for an online evaluation system would be less representative than the current system. Currently, the respondents were those students who chose to attend class. With an online system, the respondents might self select such that only those with more extreme opinions (positive or negative) might choose to complete the evaluation form. Professor Naylor commented that a question on the evaluation form asking whether or not the student regularly attended class might be helpful. Professor Misak noted that discussions had taken place with some divisions regarding self-report questions that addressed the frequency of attendance.

In response to a question, Professor Misak said that it was not the intent of the Working Group to hold the final marks of students who had not completed the evaluation. It was possible that students would receive an electronic reminder to consider completing the evaluation form before they accessed their grades. However, participation would not be mandatory.

A member stated that, in her view, it was imperative that the transition to online evaluations be made as soon as possible, given the ecological implications of continuing to use paper surveys.

6. *Policy on the Student Evaluation of Teaching in Courses* (cont'd)

b) Gender Bias

In response to questions from a member, Ms Gravestock stated that issues regarding gender bias in course evaluation had been considered and current literature in the field had been reviewed. The Working Group had shaped its framework with the findings of the research in mind. The Chair reminded the Board that it was being asked to consider only the *Policy*, not the *Guidelines*.

c) Teaching Evaluation

A member commented that it was important to give students an opportunity to provide meaningful feedback on teaching. In her view, such input was more likely to be obtained after students had had time to reflect on an instructor's teaching, rather than from a questionnaire completed quickly in class. Professor Misak said that letters from students carried significant weight in the teaching evaluation process. No change to that process was being contemplated.

A member expressed concern that instructors undergoing tenure review during the period of transition to the new evaluation process might be at a disadvantage. The member suggested that the *Policy* should state that course evaluation data should not be used as the sole measure of teaching effectiveness; a similar statement was included in the draft *Guidelines*. The member also suggested that pre-tenure or pre-promotion (teaching stream) instructors be given the option of using the existing method of evaluation if they were of the view that more data would then be available for their assessment. Lastly, the member suggested that the *Policy* should define the period during which the evaluations must be conducted, as the timing could influence the outcome of the evaluations. Professor Misak reiterated that course evaluations were only one mode of evaluation outlined in the Provostial guidelines on assessments of effectiveness of teaching.

d) Opt-out Feature

A member suggested that instructors should have the choice to "opt-in" to share their evaluation data with students, rather than being offered the choice to "opt-out". Professor Misak replied that some individual faculty members and, she believed, the UTFa, felt very strongly that the clause be opt-out, not opt-in.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the proposed *Policy on the Student Evaluation of Teaching in Courses*, a copy of which is attached hereto as [Appendix "B"](#), be approved.

7. University of Toronto Mississauga and Faculty of Information: Specialist Program in Interactive Digital Media

The Chair informed members that the proposal from the University of Toronto Mississauga (UTM) and the Faculty of Information for a new Specialist Program in Interactive Digital Media had been reviewed by AP&P on April 5th. If the Board recommended the proposal, it would then be considered for approval by the Governing Council on May 19th.

Professor McDougall provided a brief overview of the proposed program, which would represent the first formal involvement of the Faculty of Information in undergraduate teaching. Under the new Quality Assurance Process, the curriculum had undergone an external review, and the reviewer's suggestions had been incorporated into the proposal. Ms Maria Pilar Galvez, member-elect of the Governing Council and an undergraduate student in the UTM Institute of Communication, Culture and Information Technology (ICCIT), enthusiastically expressed her support for the proposed program, which in her opinion would be of great benefit to both the students and the ICCIT.

No questions were raised by members of the Board.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the proposed Bachelor of Arts (B.A.) Specialist Program in Interactive Digital Media, as described in the proposal dated February 1, 2011, a copy of which is attached hereto as [Appendix "C"](#), be approved, effective July 1, 2011.

8. John H. Daniels Faculty of Architecture, Landscape, and Design: Degree Requirements and Transfer of the Honours Bachelor of Arts Major Program in Architectural Studies from the Faculty of Arts and Science to the John H. Daniels Faculty of Architecture, Landscape, and Design

The Chair said that the proposal had been considered recently by both AP&P and P&B. If it was approved by the Board, the proposal would then require Executive Committee confirmation at its meeting on May 9, 2011.

Professor Diamond reported that P&B had considered the proposal to transfer the Honours Bachelor of Arts major program in Architectural Studies from the Faculty of Arts and Science to the John H. Daniels Faculty of Architecture, Landscape and Design (FALD). FALD currently provided the teaching and administrative support for the liberal arts based program. Transfer of the direct entry program would require no new or additional financial resources from the University's central budget. Discussion at the P&B meeting had focused on the ability of students to transfer in and out of the proposed program. The Committee had been advised that students would be able to transfer into either of the two Faculties, provided that the admission requirements of each were met. Discussions concerning the ability of students in the FALD program to complete a major in the Faculty of Arts and Science were ongoing. Professor McDougall stated that AP&P had also reviewed the proposal because of the need to establish the curriculum and its degree-level expectations in FALD. Those requirements would remain unchanged.

8. John H. Daniels Faculty of Architecture, Landscape, and Design: Degree Requirements and Transfer of the Honours Bachelor of Arts Major Program in Architectural Studies from the Faculty of Arts and Science to the John H. Daniels Faculty of Architecture, Landscape, and Design

In response to a question, Professor Steven Fong, Associate Dean, Academic, FALD, said that FALD had been contributing to undergraduate education for approximately eighty years. In 2000, FALD had decided to concentrate its limited resources on establishing strong graduate professional programs on par with others offered throughout North America. In recent years, FALD had determined that its graduate programs were very successful and it was now able to turn its attention back to the undergraduate program in architecture to which it had always been very committed. Mr. Fred Thwainy, President of the Bachelor of Arts Architectural Studies Society, added that the proposed transfer would result in a home for architecture students where they could more easily obtain assistance and guidance as needed.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDED

That the Executive Committee Confirm

- 1) THAT the proposed Faculty-level Honours Bachelor of Arts degree requirements for the Major Program in Architectural Studies, as outlined in the proposal to transfer that program from the Faculty of Arts and Science to the John H. Daniels Faculty of Architecture, Landscape, and Design, be approved, effective September 1, 2012; and
- 2) THAT the transfer of the Honours Bachelor of Arts Major Program in Architectural Studies from the Faculty of Arts and Science to the John H. Daniels Faculty of Architecture, Landscape, and Design be approved, effective September 1, 2012.

Documentation is attached hereto as [Appendix “D”](#).

9. University of Toronto at Scarborough Alternative Name Change

Noting that the Academic Board was responsible for approving name changes of academic units, the Chair said that the proposal for a change to the University of Toronto at Scarborough’s (UTSC) alternative name would require Executive Committee confirmation at its next meeting if approved by the Board.

Professor Misak introduced the proposal, explaining that Governing Council had approved the alternative name “*University of Toronto at Scarborough*” for Scarborough College in 1998. UTSC was now proposing to change its alternative name to the “*University of Toronto Scarborough*”, removing the “at”, as that name had been in use for a number of years by UTSC members. On March 29, 2011, the UTSC Council had approved the proposal. While the original motion had stated that the name change should be adopted immediately, it was being proposed that the effective date be changed to July 1, 2011 as the Office of Convocation had already produced the parchments for the upcoming June convocation using the current name of *University of Toronto at Scarborough*.

9. University of Toronto at Scarborough Alternative Name Change (cont'd)

Professor Franco Vaccarino, Vice-President and Principal of UTSC, commented that the proposed name reflected that campus' evolution over the years. Widespread consultation with community members had confirmed that the proposed name had been in use for some time.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDED

That the Executive Committee Confirm

THAT Scarborough College's alternative name of the *University of Toronto at Scarborough* be changed to the *University of Toronto Scarborough*, effective July 1, 2011.

Documentation is attached hereto as [Appendix "E"](#).

10. Capital Project: 2011 Campus Master Plans

The Chair said that the 2011 Campus Master Plans for each of the three campuses had been considered by P&B at its previous meeting. If recommended for approval by the Board, the proposal would be considered by the Governing Council on May 19th.

Professor Mabury, Vice-Provost, Academic Operations, stated that Ms Elizabeth Sisam, Assistant Vice-President, Campus and Facilities Planning, had led the consultations on the plans. He then provided an overview of the proposal, which was designed to accommodate planned enrolment growth and research expansion and to create an enriched and vibrant campus environment.

Professor Diamond reported that Professor Mabury and Ms Sisam had also given a detailed presentation on the Campus Master Plans to P&B. A member of that Committee had commented that the Design Review Committee (DRC) had discussed the Plans in detail. The input from the professional experts and lay members of the DRC had added great value to its discussions. Professor Diamond said that at the P&B meeting, a member had expressed the view that there was more emphasis on open spaces in the proposed Master Plan for UTSC, compared with that for the St. George campus. Ms Sisam had explained that the Master Plans presented information at a high level; the integration between built and open spaces would be considered when individual projects were planned. Ms Sisam had also assured the Committee that there were no plans to reduce the amount of open space on the St. George campus.

Professor Vaccarino congratulated Professor Mabury on the excellent presentation that he had given. He commented that the proposal demonstrated the steps being taken by the University to prepare for the future, and he pointed to the importance of consideration of transit issues, which differed vastly at UTM and UTSC than at the St. George campus.

A member noted that, due to a variety of factors, a number of University employees were unable to use public transportation to travel to and from work, although it was the more environmentally friendly option. Professor Mabury replied that sustainability was one of the key principles of the

10. Capital Project: 2011 Campus Master Plans (cont'd)

framework for the Master Plans, and the University would continue to work towards achieving a balance between competing interests. Specific design issues would be resolved as capital projects were developed. Professor Mabury also commented that the parking spots on the St. George campus were not yet at capacity.

A member observed that the cooperation that had occurred between the University of Toronto and the federated Universities, as well as with the municipalities during the development of the Master Plans was apparent, and the member expressed her support for the proposal.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the Campus Master Plan for the University of Toronto Mississauga be approved in principle to allow the University to negotiate municipal acceptance and municipal approvals;

THAT the Campus Master Plan for the St. George Campus be approved in principle to allow the University to negotiate municipal acceptance and municipal approvals; and

THAT the Campus Master Plan for the University of Toronto at Scarborough be approved in principle to allow the University to negotiate municipal acceptance and municipal approvals.

Documentation is attached hereto as [Appendix "F"](#).

11. Annual Report: Employment Equity, 2010

The Chair determined that there was insufficient time remaining to allow for Professor Hildyard's presentation on the 2010 Employment Equity Report. Instead, she invited questions from members of the Board. A member observed that there appeared to have been a decline in the number of persons with disabilities, aboriginal persons, and visible minorities employed by the University. Professor Hildyard disagreed, indicating that there were no significant declines over previous years – in fact, in many areas there were small improvements. Changes in the reporting requirements for the Federal Contractors Program had simply made the underrepresentation more visible. It was the case, however, that persons with disabilities continued to be the group where under-representation appeared in the greatest number of occupational job classes. Under-representation of visible minorities and aboriginal persons also occurred in a limited number of occupational groupings. The University would continue to focus on encouraging aboriginal persons and persons with disabilities to apply for positions at the University. Ms Andrea Carter, the Employment Equity Officer and Accessibility of Ontarians with Disabilities Act Officer, had been actively working with the aboriginal community in this regard. With respect to the under-representation rates for persons with disabilities, it was possible that some employees were unwilling to disclose their status on the employment equity survey, thus resulting in the appearance of a greater gap than actually existed. Analysis of activity within the Office of Health and Wellbeing indicated

11. Annual Report: Employment Equity, 2010 (cont'd)

that many more employees had sought assistance for disability-related matters from that Office than had disclosed as having a disability on the survey. Of course, the University would continue to develop recruitment and retention initiatives for that designated group.

A member noted that a decrease in the proportion of women faculty appointed in the School of Graduate Studies Physical Sciences division (from 33% to 7%) had been identified in the Report. Professor Hildyard explained that was largely due to an increase in male applicants, rather than a decline in the number of female applicants. In response to the member's question regarding redress of salary for faculty members when a case of inequity had been documented, Professor Misak stated that current provincial compensation policy and legislation restrained universities from increasing salaries other than in certain exceptional circumstances. In view of the policy directives and legislation, the University had been advised to consider all salary anomaly requests in that legal and policy context and in accordance with the University protocol.

A member restated her request from the previous year that employment equity data by campus be provided in the Report. Professor Hildyard said that there were difficulties in presenting the data by campus since for many occupational categories the numbers would be too small to report. The full report was however presented to the joint employment equity committees, which had representation from both UTSC and UTM.

12. Annual Report: Vice-President, Research, 2010

The Chair expressed her apologies to Professor Young for being unable to invite him to give his planned presentation on the 2010 Annual Report of the Vice-President, Research due to time constraints. In response to a question about data collected on the number of patents granted within the University, Professor Young said that disclosures were now stronger than they had been in the past. Great effort had been taken to provide faculty with information regarding obtaining patents and the University was performing quite well.

13. Items for Information

Members received the following reports for information.

- (a) Appointments: University Professors Selection Committee
- (b) Appointments and Status Changes
- (c) Report Number 149 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs (March 1, 2011)
- (d) Excerpt from Report Number 150 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs (April 5, 2011)
- (e) Report Number 143 of the Planning and Budget Committee (April 6, 2011)

No questions were raised about any of the reports.

14. Date of Next Meeting

The Chair reminded members that the next meeting of the Board was scheduled for Wednesday, June 1, 2011, at 10:00 a.m. in the Council Chamber

15. Other Business

There were no items of other business.

The Board moved *in camera*.

16. Appointments: President's Teaching Award Recipients

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT Senior Lecturer Paul Gries, Professor Mark Kingwell, Senior Lecturer June Larkin, Professor Michael Lettieri, and Professor Susan Lieff receive the President's Teaching Award for 2010-2011.

The Chair thanked members for their attendance at the Board meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 6:30 p.m.

Secretary
May 10, 2011

Chair