

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

REPORT NUMBER 177 OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD

January 26, 2012

To the Governing Council,
University of Toronto

Your Board reports that it held a meeting on Thursday, January 26, 2012 at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall at which the following were present:

Professor Ellen Hodnett, Chair	Professor Elizabeth Cowper	Ms Natalie Melton
Professor Hugh Gunz, Vice-Chair	Professor Christopher Damaren	Mr. Liam Mitchell
Professor David Naylor, President	Professor Karen Davis	Professor Matthew Mitchell
Professor Cheryl Misak, Vice- President and Provost	Professor Luc De Nil	Professor David Mock
Professor Scott Mabury, Vice- President, University Operations	Professor Charles Deber	Professor Mayo Moran
Professor Cheryl Regehr, Vice- Provost, Academic Programs	Professor Joseph Desloges	Professor Amy Mullin
Dr. Francis Ahia	Mr. Cary Ferguson	Professor Michelle Murphy
Professor Donald Ainslie	Professor Meric Gertler	Professor Siobhan Nelson
Professor Benjamin Alarie	Dr. Carol Golench	Professor Emmanuel Nikiema
Mr. Larry Alford	Professor Avrum Gotlieb	Dr. Graeme Norval
Professor Derek Allen	Professor Rick Halpern	Professor Julia O'Sullivan
Professor Catherine Amara	Professor Robert Harrison	Professor Elizabeth Peter
Professor Cristina Amon	Mrs. Bonnie Horne	Professor Yves Roberge
Professor Maydianne Andrade	Mr. Peter Hurley	Professor Andrea Sass-Kortsak
Ms Katherine Ball	Mr. Adnan Hussain	Ms Helen Slade
Ms Marilyn Booth	Professor Ira Jacobs	Miss Maureen J. Somerville
Professor David Cook	Ms Anne Kerubo	Professor Suzanne Stevenson
Professor Brian Corman	Dr. Chris Koenig-Woodyard	Ms Caitlin Tillman
	Mr. Ben Liu	Mr. Chirag Variawa
	Ms Cecilia Livingston	Dr. Shelly Weiss
	Professor Henry Mann	Professor Sandy Welsh
	Professor Douglas McDougall	Professor Charmaine Williams
	Professor Angelo Melino	Professor Howard Yee

Regrets:

Ms Manal Al-Ayad	Ms Maria Pilar Galvez	Dr. Neil Rector
Professor Dwayne Barber	Professor Robert Gibbs	Ms Melinda Rogers
Professor Jan Barnsley	Professor Alison Keith	Professor Jeffrey Rosenthal
Dr. Katherine Berg	Professor Paul Kingston	Professor Seamus Ross
Professor Terry Carleton	Mr. Nykolaj Kuryluk	Professor Lock Rowe
Professor Will Cluett	Professor Jim Lai	Ms Ava-Dayna Sefa
Ms Virginia Coons	Professor Heather MacNeil	Mr. Kevin Siu
Mr. Tyler Currie	Mr. Aly-Khan Madhavji	Professor Sandy Smith
Mr. Michael Da Silva	Professor Roger L. Martin	Professor Richard Sommer
Professor Miriam Diamond	Professor Don McLean	Professor Mark Stock
Professor Darryl Edwards	Professor Faye Mishna	Dr. Roslyn Thomas-Long
Professor Susanne Erb	Professor Carol Moukheiber	Dr. Sarita Verma
Professor Zhong-Ping Feng	Ms Yuchao Niu	Professor Njoki Wane
Mr. John A. Fraser	Professor Janet Paterson	Professor Catharine Whiteside
Professor Alan Galey	Professor Domenico Pietropaolo	Professor Joseph Wong
	Ms Judith Poë	Mr. Tony Han Yin
		Ms Grace Yuen

Non-voting Assessors: Professor Angela Hildyard, Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity Professor Edith Hillan, Vice-Provost, Faculty and Academic Life	Ms Gail Milgrom, Acting Assistant Vice-President, Campus and Facilities Planning	Secretariat: Ms Mae-Yu Tan
In Attendance: Mr. Steve Bailey, Director, Office of Space Management Mr. Julian Binks, Director, Planning and Estimating, Real Estate Operations Professor Eric Bredo, Chair, Theory and Policy Studies in Education, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE)	Mr. Paul Donoghue, Chief Administrative Officer, University of Toronto Mississauga Ms Sheree Drummond, Assistant Provost Professor Esther Geva, Chair, Human Development and Applied Psychology, OISE Dr. Jane Harrison, Director, Academic Programs and Policy	Ms Limin Jao, OISE Mr. Don MacMillan, Registrar, OISE Ms Evelyn McMullen, OISE Ms Sharon Pauker, OISE Professor Rinaldo Walcott, Chair, Sociology and Equity Studies in Education, OISE Mr. Christopher Smith, OISE Professor Jeanne Watson, Associate Dean Programs, OISE

In this report, items 2 and 3 are recommended to the Governing Council for approval. The remaining items are reported for information.

Chair's Remarks

The Chair welcomed members and guests to the meeting. She stated that the nomination period for seats on the Academic Board and the Governing Council had closed the previous week and she announced the following Academic Board results.

Teaching Staff acclaimed to the Board for a three-year term from July 1, 2012 to June 30, 2015

Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering

- Professor Lacro Pavel

Faculty of Arts and Science

- Professor Alison Keith^{1*}
- Professor Russell Pysklywec
- Professor Locke Rowe*
- Professor Sandy Welsh*

Faculty of Dentistry

- Professor Jim Lai*

Faculty of Forestry

- Professor Terence Carleton*

¹ *Indicates a member of the Academic Board in 2011-2012.

Chair's Remarks (cont'd)

Faculty of Medicine

- Professor Luc De Nil*
- Dr. Neil Rector*

Faculty of Music

- Professor Cameron Walter

University of Toronto Mississauga

- Professor Gary Crawford

University of Toronto Scarborough

- Professor Maydianne Andrade*

Teaching Staff who have been acclaimed through a by-election

Faculty of Arts and Science

- Professor Dwayne Benjamin, term effective immediately to June 30, 2013
- Professor John Magee, term effective immediately to June 30, 2013

Ontario Institute for Studies in Education

- Professor Eric Bredo, term effective immediately to June 30, 2015

Leslie Dan Faculty of Pharmacy

- Dr. David Dubins, term effective immediately to June 30, 2015

Elections Required:

- One Teaching Staff seat – Faculty of Arts and Science -
Two candidates from the Department of Cell and Systems Biology:
 - Professor Mounir AbouHaidar
 - Professor Vincent Tropepe
- One Librarian seat – Three candidates:
 - Ms Julie Hannaford, Robarts Library
 - Ms Bonnie Horne, Gerstein Science Information Centre*
 - Dr. Harriet Sonne de Torrens, UTM Department of Visual Studies

The Chair said that nominations would be accepted between February 6 and 17, 2012 for the following two teaching staff seats that remained vacant. One seat for a representative from the Faculty of Arts and Science would be for a term from March 1, 2012 to June 30, 2013. Another seat for a representative from the Faculty of Medicine would be for a three-year term from July 1, 2012 to June 30, 2015.

Chair's Remarks (cont'd)

The Chair thanked those members who would continue to serve in 2012-13 for their ongoing commitment to governance at the University, and she welcomed the new members who would join the Board. The Chair asked members to continue to encourage their peers to participate in the University's governance processes by nominating them to serve and by voting during the election period that would be held between February 27 and March 9, 2012. Members were invited to direct any questions about the elections to Mr. Anwar Kazimi, Chief Returning Officer, or Ms Mae-Yu Tan, Deputy Returning Officer, in the Office of the Governing Council. Information about applications for co-opted (appointed) members of the Academic Board, including administrative staff, alumni, and students, would be made available in mid-March.

1. Report of the Vice-President and Provost

The View from 2012

Professor Misak reported that, over the past five months, she had been engaged with the University community in assessing the progress that had been made since the University's long-term strategic directions had been outlined in the *Towards 2030: A Third Century of Excellence at the University of Toronto*² document that had been prepared by the President in September, 2008. Professor Misak noted that she was nearing the final stages of a broad consultation process and a number of themes had clearly emerged. It was Professor Misak's intention to present a summary of her findings thus far at the next Board meeting for the Board's input.

One of the areas that had been identified in the *Towards 2030* document as requiring improvement was that of the recruitment, admissions, and experiences of first-entry students. Over the past three years, the University had focused on strengthening that area and the results had been very positive.

At the invitation of the Chair, Professor Matus gave a presentation on recruitment, admissions and first-year programs to the Board. The accompanying Powerpoint slides are attached as [Appendix "A"](#).

Among the matters that arose in the Board's discussion were the following.

a) Athletics and University Recruitment

A member commented that, in his view, the lack of focus on sports and athletics at the University in Professor Matus' presentation had been noticeable. He said that the University had a good reputation with respect to its athletes; that could be promoted more widely. Professor Misak replied that in fact the University's athletic teams and facilities were profiled in its promotional activity. She confirmed that that aspect of University life was highly valued and noted that, with the addition of the Goldring Centre for High Performance Sport, the University would flourish even more in that area.

² <http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/AssetFactory.aspx?did=5626>

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

a) Athletics and University Recruitment (cont'd)

Professor Matus added that sporting activities and athletics were featured in the University's *Viewbook*³, its promotional videos, and its recruitment website⁴. As well, the University's recruitment staff were very knowledgeable about the range of athletic and recreational activities available to students and they spoke about those subjects with prospective students.

b) Graduate Student Recruitment

A member praised the development of the University's recruitment strategies over the past few years and asked about ways in which graduate student recruitment was being enhanced. Professor Misak observed that prospective graduate students were influenced less by general recruitment materials because they were interested most in the department where they were considering registering and the faculty with whom they might work. Professor Corman elaborated that prospective graduate students tended to seek information about specific graduate units rather than the broader divisions in which they were housed. The School of Graduate Studies had been developing increasingly greater amounts and more sophisticated materials for prospective students. Professor Corman offered to give a presentation to the Board on central graduate recruitment activities.

The Chair thanked Professor Matus for her informative presentation.

2. Proposal for the Departmental Restructuring at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education

The Chair informed members that the proposal for the Departmental Restructuring at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE) had been considered by the Planning and Budget Committee (P&B) on January 11, 2012. If recommended by the Academic Board, the proposal would be considered for approval by the Governing Council on February 16, 2012.

Professor Misak made some introductory remarks and commended OISE for the extensive consultations that had been undertaken in the development of the current proposal. She welcomed the OISE representatives, including the academic administrators, faculty, and students, who were present at the Board meeting.

Professor Gottlieb gave an overview of the proposal. He stated that a Task Force had been established to rethink the structure of OISE's departments. Following broad consultation, a proposal for the disestablishment of the Department of Adult Education and Counselling Psychology and the renaming of three of the remaining four units had been developed. No changes in the program names or requirements would be required. The proposal had been approved by the OISE Faculty Council on December 7, 2011.

No questions were raised by members of the Board.

³ <http://discover.utoronto.ca/viewbook-2012>

⁴ <http://students.utoronto.ca/>

2. **Proposal for the Departmental Restructuring at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education** (cont'd)

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the Department of Adult Education and Counselling Psychology at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education be disestablished effective July 1, 2012, and three of the four remaining units be renamed as follows:

- the current Department of Human Development and Applied Psychology to the Department of Applied Psychology and Human Development;
- the current Department of Theory and Policy Studies in Education to the Department of Leadership, Higher and Adult Education; and
- the current Department of Sociology and Equity Studies in Education to the Department of Humanities, Social Sciences and Social Justice Education.

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

3. **Capital Project: Project Planning Report for the University of Toronto Mississauga North Building Reconstruction, Phase A**

The Chair said that the proposed Capital Project for the University of Toronto Mississauga (UTM) North Building Reconstruction, Phase A also had been considered by the P&B on January 11th and if recommended by the Academic Board would be considered for approval by the Governing Council on February 16th.

Professor Gotlieb provided a summary of the proposed capital project. Constructed in 1967, the North Building was the oldest structure on the UTM campus. While the building had been intended to serve only as a temporary structure, the growth in academic and research programs and student enrolments had not allowed for the removal of the building from active service, despite its substandard conditions. Phase A of the proposed project, the first of three planned phases, would entail reconstruction of a four-storey structure to replace the south portion of the existing two-storey North Building. The estimated total project cost was \$56-million. Professor Gotlieb then outlined the discussion that had occurred at the P&B meeting, a summary of which is contained in the Committee's report⁵.

The Chair noted that some questions had been received from a Board member and she thanked him for having submitted them in advance of the meeting, allowing for full responses to be obtained.

At the member's suggestion, Professor Scott Mabury, Vice-President, University Operations, outlined the difference between a 'gross square meter' (gsm) and a 'net assignable square meter' (nasm). He explained that a nasm referred to the usable portion of a building, whereas a gsm

⁵ <http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/AssetFactory.aspx?did=8167>

3. **Capital Project: Project Planning Report for the University of Toronto Mississauga North Building Reconstruction, Phase A (cont'd)**

included all space in a building. Older buildings typically had a conversion of 1.5 or 1 gsm= 1 nasm. However, in newer buildings, a conversion of 2 gsm=1 nasm was not uncommon, due to an increase in the number and complexity of systems housed in modern structures. Observing that the amount of space did not necessarily reflect the quality of space, Professor Mabury added that the condition of the North Building was extremely poor. Professor Misak concurred.

Referring to the Project Planning Report, the member asked for greater information about additional projected costs not contained in the budget. Professor Mabury replied that the estimated total project cost was \$56-million. It was expected that that amount or less would be spent on the project. Under the *Policy on Capital Planning and Capital Projects*⁶ the President or designate was authorized to approve a project cost increase up to the lesser of \$2-million or 10% of the project cost; any greater increase would require subsequent governance approval. Professor Mabury stated that he did not intend to approve such an increase. UTM would address any infrastructure issues that were separate from the proposed project, and kitchen and server equipment and fitout would be funded by the UTM food service provider.

Mr. Julian Binks, Director, Planning and Estimating, Real Estate Operations, responded to the member's questions regarding LEED silver certification. He stated that, for some time, the University's new building projects had been designed and budgeted to meet LEED silver standards. Although the true premium cost of such standards was debatable, the quantity surveyor firm used by the University generally included a 3% premium. In response to the member's questions about the addition of a green roof, Professor Mabury noted that while green roofs were a requirement in the City of Toronto, that was not the case for the City of Mississauga. He reiterated that a tendering process was followed by the University and for that reason it was undesirable to disclose detailed budget projections. Mr. Paul Donoghue, Chief Administrative Officer, UTM, explained that design teams possessed the LEED expertise necessary to assess the appropriate features for a project from a design and cost perspective. The suitability of a green roof was considered on a case-by-case basis. He added that a green roof had been incorporated into the design of both the UTM athletic and instructional centres.

Professor Amy Mullin, Vice-Principal, Academic and Dean, UTM, emphasized the importance of the proposed capital project to the campus' future, particularly in light of plans for expanded enrolment at both the graduate and undergraduate level. The proposed reconstruction would allow for improved space and for departments to be housed together rather than dispersed across the campus. Better interactions between students and faculty would be another of the positive outcomes of the project.

⁶ http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/policies/policies_v2/capplan.htm

3. Capital Project: Project Planning Report for the University of Toronto Mississauga North Building Reconstruction, Phase A (cont'd)

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

1. THAT the Project Planning Report for the University of Toronto Mississauga, North Building Reconstruction, Phase A, dated December 16, 2011, a copy of which is attached hereto as [Appendix "C"](#), be approved in principle; and
2. THAT the project scope, covering 5,220 nasm, as identified in the Project Planning Report be approved in principle at a total project cost of \$56-Million with funding as follows:

Provincial Government	\$ 35.0M
Funds from borrowing	\$ 17.0M
UTM capital reserves	\$ 3.1M
<u>UTM Graduate Expansion Fund</u>	<u>\$ 0.9M</u>
Total	\$ 56.0M

4. Grading Practices Policies

The Chair stated that the proposed *Grading Practices Policies* had been considered by the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs (AP&P) on January 10, 2012. Under the revised Terms of Reference of the Academic Board, the Board was authorized to grant final approval of the proposal, which was purely academic in nature.

Professor Sass-Kortsak explained that currently there were two University-wide grading practices policies - one general policy that applied to all students and one specifically designed for graduate students. The proposed *University Assessment and Grading Practices Policy* was intended to cover both undergraduate and graduate assessment and evaluation; the proposed *Transcript Policy* addressed distinct issues with respect to transcript notations; and the proposed *Policy on Academic Continuity* dealt with academic disruption. The proposed policies were the outcome of extensive consultations, and a good discussion had occurred during the AP&P meeting. A summary of that discussion is contained in the Committee's report⁷.

⁷<http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/Assets/Governing+Council+Digital+Assets/Boards+and+Committees/Committee+on+Academic+Policy+and+Programs/2011-2012+Academic+Year/r0110.pdf>

4. *Grading Practices Policies* (cont'd)

Among the matters that arose in the Board's discussion were the following.

a) Grade Distribution

Noting that Section 3.4.2 of the *University Assessment and Grading Practices Policy* stated that the distribution of grades should not be predetermined by quotas, a member asked for clarification. Professor Cheryl Regehr, Vice-Provost, Academic Programs, explained that there was no University-wide requirement for distribution of grades. However, some divisions did provide guidelines outlining a reasonable distribution of grades in the division.

b) University Transcripts and Interpretation of Grades

A member commented that current undergraduate University transcripts contained valuable information such as class size and average grade that was not included on graduate transcripts. He asked whether there were plans to incorporate such data into the graduate transcripts. Noting that that suggestion had not been received during the consultation process, Professor Brian Corman, Dean, School of Graduate Studies, and Vice-Provost, Graduate Education, replied that class data likely were not included because they would not be statistically meaningful, given the typically small size of graduate courses.

Responding to another comment by the member, Professor Corman said that interpretation of grades was not included in University policy. Rather, it was appropriate for divisions to include such explanations in their guidelines established pursuant to the policy. Professor Misak said that the University was very interested in the issue of grade distribution in light of the high calibre of University of Toronto students, and she said that dialogue on the matter had been occurring for some time among divisions and was being led by her office. Careful consideration was required given that other institutions and organizations sometimes accepted grades on an applicant's transcript at face value and did not engage in the process of interpreting or comparing grades across universities. It was important that the quality of a University of Toronto degree was recognized and that the University's students were not disadvantaged in any way because of grading distributions.

Professor Meric Gertler, Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Science, confirmed that Deans were examining and discussing grading distribution guidelines in order to ensure that students were being assessed fairly. He commented that average grades within the Faculty had changed very little over the past three decades.

Professor Naylor remarked that the Board's discussion of the grading policy and guidelines was most welcome. He acknowledged that in the National Survey on Student Engagement undergraduate students from the University of Toronto reported receiving fewer final grades of 80% or higher than did students at peer institutions. Conversations with alumni whose children had chosen not to attend the University also had revealed surprisingly widespread awareness and concerns about lower grade distributions of students at the University. Furthermore, while many alumni and students were pleased with the University's reputation for academic rigour, it was not clear that one could simply equate lower grades with higher academic standards.

4. *Grading Practices Policies* (cont'd)

Professor Naylor emphasized that evaluation was ultimately a matter for individual professors, and he thanked the deans of Faculties with first-entry programs for providing more flexible guidelines. He added that it was difficult from the standpoint of both student recruitment and fairness to students if the University diverged dramatically from peer institutions in its grade distributions. Professor Naylor closed by acknowledging the challenge of ensuring fairness without diluting the University's standards and observed that there were no easy solutions to this dilemma.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

The proposed *University Assessment and Grading Practices Policy*, the proposed *University of Toronto Transcript Policy*, and the proposed *Policy on Academic Continuity*, copies of which are attached to Professor Regehr's memorandum of December 8, 2011, effective for the academic year 2012-13, replacing the *University Grading Practices Policy* approved by the Governing Council on March 25, 1993 and amended most recently by the Academic Board on April 9, 1998, and replacing the *Graduate Grading and Evaluation Practices Policy* approved by the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs on May 12, 2004.

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

CONSENT AGENDA

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the consent agenda be adopted.

5. **Approval of the Report of the Previous Meeting: Report Number 176 – November 17, 2011**

Report Number 176 of the meeting held on November 17, 2011 was approved.

6. **Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting**

There was no business arising from Report Number 176.

7. Items for Information

The following items for information were received by the Board.

- (a) Report Number 177 of the Agenda Committee – December 13, 2011
- (b) Report Number 178 of the Agenda Committee – January 17, 2012
- (c) Report Number 153 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs (January 10, 2012)
- (d) Report Number 147 of the Planning and Budget Committee (January 11, 2012)

8. Quarterly Report on Donations: August 1, 2011 – October 31, 2011

The Board received for information the Quarterly Report on Donations for the period of August 1, 2011 to October 31, 2011.

9. Date of the Next Meeting

The Chair stated that the next meeting of the Board was scheduled for Wednesday, March 14, 2012, at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber.

10. Other Business

There were no items of other business.

The meeting adjourned at 5:25 p.m.

Secretary
February 6, 2012

Chair