

## THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

### REPORT NUMBER 183 OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD

February 7, 2013

To the Governing Council,  
University of Toronto

Your Board reports that it held a meeting on Thursday, February 7, 2013 at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall at which the following were present:

Professor Ellen Hodnett, Chair  
Professor Hugh Gunz, Vice-Chair  
Professor Cheryl Misak, Vice-  
President and Provost  
Professor Scott Mabury, Vice-  
President, University  
Operations  
Mr. Larry Alford  
Professor Catherine Amara  
Professor Robert Baker  
Ms Katherine Ball  
Mr. James Bateman  
Professor Dwayne Benjamin  
Dr. Katherine Berg  
Ms Marilyn Booth  
Mr. Louis Charpentier  
Ms Celina Caesar-Chavannes  
Professor Terry Carleton  
Professor Brian Corman  
Professor Elizabeth Cowper  
Professor Christopher Damaren  
Professor Luc De Nil

Mr. Michael Dick  
Mr. Omar Gamel  
Professor Robert Gibbs  
Mr. Andrew Girgis  
Professor Avrum Gotlieb  
Professor Daniel Haas  
Professor Rick Halpern  
Professor Bart Harvey  
Mrs. Bonnie Horne  
Mr. Peter Hurley  
Professor Ira Jacobs  
Professor Alison Keith  
Professor Jim Lai  
Professor Ron Levi  
Professor John Magee  
Professor Douglas McDougall  
Ms Michelle Mitrovich  
Dr. Gary P. Mooney  
Professor Amy Mullin  
Professor Sioban Nelson  
Professor Emmanuel Nikiema

Dr. Graeme Norval  
Professor Elizabeth Peter  
Professor Russell Pysklywec  
Ms Judith Poë  
Ms Mainawati Rambali  
Professor Michael Ratcliffe  
Professor Jeffrey Rosenthal  
Ms Deanne Saunders  
Miss Maureen J. Somerville  
Professor Suzanne Stevenson  
Professor Markus Stock  
Mr. Andrew Szende  
Professor Vincent Tropepe  
Mr. Vijay Unnithan  
Mr. Abhishek Vaidyanathan  
Dr. Sarita Verma  
Professor Sandy Welsh  
Professor Charmaine Williams  
Professor Howard Yee

#### Regrets:

Dr. Francis Ahia  
Professor Donald Ainslie  
Professor Benjamin Alarie  
Professor Cristina Amon  
Professor Maydianne Andrade  
Professor Dwayne Barber  
Professor Jan Barnsley  
Professor Eric Bredo  
Ms Ching Lucy Chau  
Ms Yifan Chen  
Professor Gary Crawford  
Mr. Tyler Currie  
Professor Karen Davis  
Professor Charles Deber  
Professor Joseph Desloges  
Ms Hanan Domloge  
Mr. Michael Donnelly  
Professor David Dubins

Professor Wendy Duff  
Professor Anthony Duggan  
Professor Suzanne Erb  
Professor Angela Esterhammer  
Professor Zhong-Ping Feng  
Mr. John A. Fraser  
Mr. Peng Fu  
Professor Meric Gertler  
Professor Robert Harrison  
Professor Paul Kingston  
Mr. David Kleinman  
Professor Henry Mann  
Professor Roger L. Martin  
Ms Beth Martin  
Dr. Don McLean  
Professor Faye Mishna  
Professor Matthew Mitchell  
Professor Carol Moukheiber  
Professor David Naylor  
Professor Julia O'Sullivan

Professor Janet Paterson  
Professor Laca Pavel  
Professor Domenico Pietropaolo  
Professor Neil Rector  
Mr. Layton Reynolds  
Professor Yves Roberge  
Professor Seamus Ross  
Professor Lock Rowe  
Professor Mohini Sain  
Ms Ioana Sendroiu  
Professor Richard Sommer  
Ms Tisha Tan  
Dr. Roslyn Thomas-Long  
Ms Caitlin Tillman  
Professor Cameron Walter  
Professor Njoki Wane  
Dr. Shelly Weiss  
Professor Catharine Whiteside  
Professor Joseph Wong

**Non-voting Assessors:**

Ms Gail Milgrom, Director,  
Campus and Facilities Planning

**In Attendance:**

Mr. Tad Brown, Counsel,  
Business Affairs and  
Advancement  
Mr. David Curtin, Director,  
Communications Services,  
Office of the President  
Dr. Jane Harrison, Director,  
Academic Programs and  
Policy, Office of the Vice-  
President and Provost  
Ms Laurie Harrison, Director,  
Online Learning Strategies,  
Information and Technology  
Services

Ms Helen Huang, Chief  
Administrative Officer, Ontario  
Institute for Studies in  
Education  
Professor Ulrich Krull, Vice-  
Principal Research, University  
of Toronto Mississauga  
Professor Ian Lee, Associate  
Dean, Juris Doctor Program,  
Faculty of Law  
Mr. Steve Moate, Senior Legal  
Counsel, Office of the  
President  
Professor Peter Pauley, Vice-  
Dean, Academic, Joseph L.  
Rotman School of  
Management

**Secretariat:**

Ms Mae-Yu Tan

Professor Janette Pelletier,  
Director, Dr. Eric Jackman  
Institute of Child Study  
Ms Archana Sridhar, Assistant  
Provost  
Ms Katherine Tam, Chief  
Administrative Officer,  
Faculty of Law  
Mr. David Walders, Acting  
Assistant Secretary of the  
Governing Council

**Chair's Remarks**

The Chair welcomed members and guests to the meeting. She announced that nominations for 17 teaching staff seats on the Board had been accepted in January, 2012 and 15 of those seats had been filled. The results are provided below.

Teaching Staff acclaimed to the Board for a three-year term from July 1, 2013 to June 30, 2016

Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering

- Professor Markus Bussmann (new member of the Board)

John H. Daniels Faculty of Architecture, Landscape, and Design

- Professor Aziza Chaouni (new)

Faculty of Arts and Science

- Professor Dwayne Benjamin (continuing member of the Board)
- Professor Maria Cuervo (new)
- Professor Robert Gibbs (continuing)
- Professor Ron Levi (continuing)
- Professor Nhung Tran (new)

Faculty of Kinesiology and Physical Education

- Professor Scott Thomas (new)

Joseph L. Rotman School of Management

- Professor Douglas Hyatt (new)

**Chair's Remarks** (cont'd)Faculty of Medicine

- Professor Dimitri Anastakis (new)
- Professor Charles Deber (continuing)
- Professor Richard Hegele (new)
- Professor Andrew Spence (new)

Factor-Inwentash Faculty of Social Work

- Professor Ramona Alaggia (new)

University of Toronto Scarborough

- Professor Sonia Sedivy (new)

Election Required:

- One Teaching Staff seat – University of Toronto Mississauga:

Two candidates from the Department of Biology:

- Professor Linda Kohn
- Professor Sasa Stefanovic

The Chair said that nominations for one teaching staff seat for the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE) would continue to be accepted until Friday, February 8<sup>th</sup> at 5:00 p.m. She thanked both incoming and continuing members for their contributions, as well as everyone who helped to raise awareness of the work of the Academic Board. 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.

The Chair proposed that Item 8, the Report of the Project Planning Committee for the Renovation of the Chemistry Undergraduate Teaching Laboratories at the University of Toronto Mississauga, and Item 9, the Report of the Project Planning Committee for the Renovation of the Physics Undergraduate Teaching Laboratories at the University of Toronto Mississauga, be moved from the consent agenda to the regular agenda. Some questions and comments about the agenda items had been submitted to the Secretary. There were no objections.

**1. Report of the Vice-President and Provost**

Professor Misak informed the Board that the proposed membership of a joint Review Committee for the University of Toronto - Toronto School of Theology Memorandum of Agreement would be considered by the Governing Council for approval at its meeting of February 28, 2013.

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

### Open UToronto

Professor Misak and Mr. Larry Alford, Chief Librarian, gave a presentation<sup>1</sup> on Open UToronto, focusing on open courses as well as open collections and open publishing. Members were encouraged to explore the Open UToronto website.<sup>2</sup> Among the key points highlighted during the presentation were the following.

- The University valued greatly the face-to-face learning and interactions that occurred within its classrooms and its endeavors with new technologies were meant to enhance, rather than replace, that interaction.
  - The University had offered a number of online courses for some time and, more recently, open courseware was being used in some “inverted” and “blended” courses. In the latter, students could watch lectures online at their convenience and then benefit from other in-class learning activities.
- The University had been invited to join Coursera in offering massive open online courses (MOOCs) at an early stage in the development of that platform.
  - The five coursettes delivered free of charge by the University through Coursera had attracted over 200,000 students.
- In offering MOOCs, the University had been able to provide a valuable service world-wide to many students, some of whom might otherwise not have had access to such courses. At the same time, opportunities for extending the University’s reach and recognition, expanding blended models of University course delivery, and potential future revenues were possible.
- Some faculty had been very keen to participate in the delivery of MOOCs and, thus far, the University had invested a small amount of central funding to assist them in the development of the coursettes.
- A great range of open collections had been developed at the University, containing a vast amount of material from the University. The outstanding resources had been assembled by Ms Laurie Harrison, Director, Online Learning Strategies; Dr. Avi Hyman, Director of Academic and Collaborative Technologies; and several librarians at the University.
- Issues such as high costs of University journal subscriptions, ensuring student access to learning materials, and expanding scholarly communication were being contemplated across the University.
  - A possible solution to these and other issues might be the widespread use of open publishing and open access to information.

---

<sup>1</sup> A copy of the presentation slides are appended as [Attachment “A”](#).

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.utoronto.ca/about-uoft/openutoronto.htm>

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

### Open UToronto (cont'd)

- To that end, the OISE Faculty Council had approved a policy on open access that encouraged faculty to make their research “readily and openly accessible, mobilizing knowledge in a strategic manner.”<sup>3</sup>
- The University’s *T-Space* was an example of one open access research repository that had grown over the years to house thousands of documents. Remarkably, *T-Space* materials had been accessed via various search engines in approximately one million downloads.

At Professor Misak’s invitation, Professor Charmaine Williams, Associate Dean, Academic, Factor-Inwentash Faculty of Social Work, and member of the Board, spoke of her experience in offering a MOOC entitled *The Social Context of Mental Health and Illness*.<sup>4</sup> The opportunity to provide public education about mental illness had been most rewarding. Professor Williams observed that a number of the students in her course had embraced the chance to try a university-level course, and the students had been very supportive of each other. While she had dedicated a great deal of time to the course, Professor Williams had received much support from staff within the University.

Among the matters raised during the Board’s discussion were the following.

#### a) Range of Course Offerings

A member expressed her support of the MOOCs offered by the University and stated that she was pleased to see that the completion rate of approximately 10% of the students was at the top end of such measures. The member asked whether the University had considered offering post-graduate MOOCs, taking into consideration possible revenue streams that might be generated. Professor Misak replied that many divisions within the University were already engaged in online course delivery.

---

<sup>3</sup> [http://www.oise.utoronto.ca/research/UserFiles/File/OA\\_Policy.pdf](http://www.oise.utoronto.ca/research/UserFiles/File/OA_Policy.pdf)

<sup>4</sup> <https://www.coursera.org/course/mentalhealth>

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

### Open UToronto (cont'd)

#### b) Open Access Journals

In response to a comment by the Chair, Mr. Alford confirmed that a number of American universities had approved policies requiring faculty first to submit scholarly work to an open access journal prior to making a submission to a traditional journal. There were issues to consider in such a strategy, such as the reputation of the journal and the implications for the researcher. Apart from the financial implications, open publishing could make research results accessible worldwide to everyone with internet access. Mr. Alford noted that the Canadian Research Knowledge Network negotiated licencing agreements on behalf of Canadian universities. Steps were being taken to undo the bundling policy of some journals, however it was a complex issue that would take time to resolve.

## 2. Report of the Review of Collaborative Programs, 2011-12

The Chair summarized the Board's responsibility as outlined in the *Policy for Approval and Review of Academic Programs and Units*<sup>5</sup> to discuss any specific academic issues raised by reviews of academic programs and units. Noting that this was the first time that a report of the review of the University's collaborative programs had been submitted since the implementation of the University of Toronto Quality Assurance Process, a member asked how many collaborative programs currently existed. Professor Brian Corman, Vice-Provost, Graduate Education and Dean of the School of Graduate Studies, replied that there were approximately 50 such programs, with proposals in development for some additional programs.

## 3. Capital Project: Report of the Project Planning Committee for the Faculty of Law Expansion

The Chair stated that the Board was being asked to consider proposals for four capital projects, each of which had been considered by the Planning and Budget Committee (P&B) on January 16, 2013. As outlined in the *Policy on Capital Planning and Capital Projects*, which had been revised in June, 2012, a capital project with a budget over \$10 million and all projects requiring borrowing must be approved by the Governing Council. Projects with a budget between \$3 and \$10 million did not require by the Governing Council approval. Rather, it was expected that such projects would be placed on the Academic Board's consent agenda and, if approved by the Board, would be confirmed by the Executive Committee.

The first capital project that would be considered by the Board, the Faculty of Law Expansion, had a proposed budget over \$10 million and financing would be needed. Therefore, if the proposal was recommended by the Board, it would require approval by the Governing Council on February 28, 2013. Execution of the project had been considered by the Business Board on January 28, 2013 and, subject to the Academic Board's recommendation and Governing Council approval, had been approved.

---

<sup>5</sup> [http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/policies/AcaProgs\\_Units\\_pdf.htm](http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/policies/AcaProgs_Units_pdf.htm)

### **3. Capital Project: Report of the Project Planning Committee for the Faculty of Law Expansion (cont'd)**

Professor Gotlieb, Chair of P&B, introduced the Faculty of Law Expansion Capital Project. The proposed project would include renovation in the Bora Laskin Library building, minimal renovation in the Flavelle House, and 2, 740 net assignable square metres (nasm) of newly constructed facilities. The estimated total project cost was \$54-million to be funded through Campaign pledges, Provostial central funds, Graduate Expansion Funds, the Faculty of Law, and borrowing. Early construction was targeted to begin in June 2013 with substantial completion of the project planned for June 2015. A summary of the discussion that had occurred at the P&B meeting is contained in the Committee's report.<sup>6</sup>

At the invitation of the Chair, Professor Ian Lee, Associate Dean, JD Program, of the Faculty of Law addressed the Board. He stated the importance of the capital project to the Faculty, noting that there was a vital need for improved space, and he thanked the Board for its consideration of the proposal.

The Chair thanked a member for having submitted his questions about the proposal in advance of the meeting. The member then outlined his questions with respect to a projected occupancy cost that would be 50% higher than that of existing buildings, whether a cistern would be used, and the heat source for the pathway heat tracing. In response, Professor Mabury explained that the current Faculty of Law buildings were very old, and they lacked air conditioning and proper ventilation. For this reason, while the new space would be very efficient, it would be more energy intensive than the Flavelle House and Falconer Hall. Professor Mabury stated that a cistern would not be installed; such a feature was very expensive and was not required for Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Silver rating, the standard to which the Faculty of Law project was being designed. Heat tracing was also very expensive; it was planned that steam via a glycol exchanger would be used only in areas where it was required, such as fire exits and accessible ramps.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

#### **YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS**

- a) THAT the Project Planning Report for the Faculty of Law Expansion, dated December 11, 2012, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "A" be approved in principle; and
- b) THAT the project scope to accommodate the Faculty of Law in 8, 180 nasm of existing facilities, renovated space and newly constructed space, as identified in the Project Planning Report be approved in principle at a total project cost of \$54 million to be funded as follows:

---

<sup>6</sup><http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/Assets/Governing+Council+Digital+Assets/Boards+and+Committees/Planning+and+Budget+Committee/2012-2013+Academic+Year/r0116.pdf>

### 3. **Capital Project: Report of the Project Planning Committee for the Faculty of Law Expansion** (cont'd)

Capital Campaign pledges to date (Note 1)	\$33.1 M
Capital Campaign: remaining fundraising target (Note 1)	\$2.9 M
Long-term borrowing	\$3.5 M
Provostial Central Funds	\$6.0 M
Provincial Graduate Expansion Funds	\$4.5 M
Faculty of Law Operating Funds	<u>4.0 M</u>
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$54.0 M</b>

Note 1: short term bridge financing to be arranged centrally

### 4. **Capital Project: Report of the Project Planning Committee for the Jackman Institute of Child Study Expansion**

The Chair stated that the proposal for the Dr. Eric Jackman Institute of Child Study Expansion also had an estimated total project cost greater than \$10 million. It too would require approval by the Governing Council on February 28th, if recommended by the Board. Execution of the project also had been considered by the Business Board on January 28th and had been approved subject to the Academic Board's recommendation and Governing Council approval.

Professor Gottlieb provided an overview of the Jackman Expansion Capital Project. The proposal for the expansion of the Jackman Institute of Child Study included renovation of existing space at 45 Walmer Road and a modest new building to be constructed across the back yard areas of 56 and 58 Spadina Road. With adequate facilities, research space would be made available throughout the Laboratory School and Master of Arts program, allowing researchers and their research teams to remain in close proximity whenever possible. The total cost of the project was estimated at \$16-million, with funding provided from Capital Campaign funds, Institute of Child Study operating funds, Provostial central funds, and OISE operating funds.

Professor Jan Pelletier, Director of the Dr. Eric Jackman Institute of Child Study, thanked the Board for its consideration of the proposed capital project and expressed appreciation on behalf of the Jackman community for the expansion opportunity.

No questions were raised by members of the Board.



#### 4. **Capital Project: Report of the Project Planning Committee for the Jackman Institute of Child Study Expansion** (cont'd)

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

##### YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

- a) THAT the Project Planning Report for the Dr. Eric Jackman Institute of Child Study (ICS) Expansion, dated December 17, 2012, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "B" be approved; and
- b) THAT the project scope to accommodate an expanded Jackman ICS totaling 3, 180 nasm including 1, 225 nasm new construction and additional renovated space, at 45 Walmer Road and on the combined sites of 56 and 58 Spadina Road at a total project cost of \$16 million, to be funded as follows, be approved in principle:

Capital Campaign funds received to date	\$4.7 M
Capital Campaign pledged to date (Note 1)	\$5.2 M
ICS Laboratory School Operating Funds (over 8 years, Note 1)	\$1.5 M
Provostial Central Funds	\$2.0 M
OISE Operating Funds	<u>\$2.6 M</u>
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$16.0 M</b>

Note 1: short term bridge financing to be arranged with OISE

#### 5. **University of Toronto Mississauga: Proposal for the Establishment of the Institute of Management and Innovation (IMI) as an Extra-Departmental Unit B**

The Chair stated that the proposal for the establishment of an Institute of Management and Innovation (IMI) as an Extra-Departmental Unit B at UTM had been considered by P&B on January 16<sup>th</sup>. She elaborated that, under the *Guidelines for Administrative Functions and Protocols of Extra-Departmental Units* (EDU), the creation of an EDU:A and B required approval by Governing Council, while approval of the creation of an EDU:C was delegated to Faculty Councils, and that of an EDU:D to the relevant academic unit. An EDU:B had a defined area of scholarship as a focus, students were admitted to its interdisciplinary programs, and interdisciplinary research was undertaken within the unit. However, teaching staff appointments were made in established departments with teaching staff cross-appointed to an EDU:B. If recommended by the Board, the IMI proposal would be considered for approval by the Governing Council on February 28th.

Professor Gotlieb outlined the proposal for a unit that would build on UTM's existing strengths. It would provide a framework for integrating the teaching of management with the discipline-, sector- or profession-specific teaching that made the program distinctive and explore synergies between programs in both academic delivery and administration. Included in the proposal was a substantial list of faculty who would hold non-budgetary cross-appointments to the proposed EDU. Wide consultation with cognate units concerning the proposal had occurred and the creation of the IMI was actively supported by a number of cognate departments and administrative units at UTM.

**5. University of Toronto Mississauga: Proposal for the Establishment of the Institute of Management and Innovation (IMI) as an Extra-Departmental Unit B (cont'd)**

Professor Amy Mullin, Vice-Principal, Academic, and Dean, UTM, commented that, in describing the IMI's mission in focusing on the role of innovation and management in the development of the sciences, it was intended that social science disciplines and innovation in social policy be included in the unit's broad mandate.

There were no questions.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

**YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS**

THAT the proposal to establish the Institute for Management and Innovation as an Extra-Departmental Unit:B at the University of Toronto Mississauga, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "C", be approved, effective July 1, 2013.

**6. Faculty of Law Academic Plan, 2012-17**

The Chair said that the Faculty of Law academic plan was the first one to be considered by the Academic Board since the terms of reference of the Board and its standing committees had been revised in 2011. Academic plans were first endorsed in principle at the divisional level, then considered by the Provost for approval, then considered by the Planning and Budget Committee and subsequently by the Academic Board for information and feedback.

Professor Gottlieb gave a summary of the Faculty of Law Academic Plan, noting that it highlighted eight important priorities over the planning period of 2012-2017. The priorities supported a commitment to continuing to enhance the Faculty's position as one of the top law schools internationally through an expanded student recruitment strategy emphasizing excellence and diversity, ongoing curricular development including the expansion of research opportunities, continued recruitment of extraordinary faculty, enhanced support for faculty research, and a commitment to transforming the Faculty's physical environment. The Planning and Budget Committee had been satisfied with the plan.

The Chair complimented the Faculty on the well-written plan, which made clear the consultative processes that had been undertaken, and noted that it was nice to see the plan and the Faculty's capital project proceeding in tandem. The Chair asked whether the Faculty would have to discontinue any aspect of its programs, given the ambitious plans that had been outlined. Professor Lee replied that the Faculty would undoubtedly have to make some difficult decisions, but in having identified opportunities, strengths and challenges, its academic plan provided a solid framework.

## **7. University of Toronto Mississauga Academic Plan, 2012-17**

Professor Gottlieb provided an overview of the UTM Academic Plan. The five-year plan presented a wide range of commitments and goals connected to UTM's twelve core values. In particular, it focused on expansion while improving UTM's faculty:student ratio; expanding and renovating campus facilities; building on already strong connections with the local community; increasing support for research; and encouraging pedagogical innovation and experiential learning including increased student engagement in research.

Professor Mullin reiterated her thanks to the UTM community and the Provost's Advisory Group for the feedback that had led to the development of the plan.

A member praised the plan and the Chair commented that it was positive to see how UTM's capital projects fit in the plan.

## **8. Capital Project: Report of the Project Planning Committee for the Renovation of the Chemistry Undergraduate Teaching Laboratories at the University of Toronto Mississauga**

The Chair reiterated that capital projects with a budget between \$3 and \$10 million were considered for approval by the Academic Board and then forwarded to the Executive Committee for confirmation.

Professor Gottlieb introduced the proposed capital project for renovation of the UTM Chemistry Undergraduate Teaching Laboratories. Previous renovations to the laboratories had been completed in summer 2012 and had transformed the student experience. The proposed renovation would combine the existing teaching laboratories and adjacent research area into one large teaching laboratory which would support both teaching and research purposes. The space to be renovated would be fully vacant in March 2013, and if approved, the renovation would occur in the spring and summer of 2013, with occupancy planned for September 2013. The estimated total project cost of \$4.0-million would be funded from the UTM Operating Fund. At the invitation of the Chair, a member outlined his concern regarding the inadequacies of ventilation in the labs noted in an external review of the Department of Chemical and Physical Sciences that had been conducted in February 2009. In response, Professor Mullin clarified that all environmental and health concerns had been addressed with subsequent renovation of the laboratories. Professor Misak agreed that the University must ensure that students and staff were not put at risk. She suggested that, in the future, when preparing reports, issues of concern related to earlier phases of proposed capital projects be clearly separated from subsequent phases of projects. Professor Mabury said that he would continue to follow up with Ms Susan Fern-MacDougall, Director of the Office of Environmental Health and Safety, with respect to a campus-wide chemical inventory.

**8. Capital Project: Report of the Project Planning Committee for the Renovation of the Chemistry Undergraduate Teaching Laboratories at the University of Toronto Mississauga (cont'd)**

It was duly moved and seconded

THAT subject to confirmation by the Executive Committee

- a) THAT the Project Planning Report for the Renovation of the Chemistry Teaching Laboratories at the University of Toronto Mississauga, dated November 2012, be approved; and
- b) THAT the project scope with a total project cost of \$3,956,738 be approved in principle.

It was duly moved and seconded

THAT the motion be amended to read:

THAT subject to confirmation by the Executive Committee

- a) THAT the Project Planning Report for the Renovation of the Chemistry Teaching Laboratories in the W.G. Davis Building at the University of Toronto Mississauga, dated November 2012, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "D", be approved; and
- b) THAT the project scope with a total project cost of \$4.0 million to be funded from the UTM Operating Fund be approved in principle.

The vote to amend the motion was taken.  
The motion carried.

The vote on the main motion was taken.  
The motion carried.

**9. Capital Project: Report of the Project Planning Committee for the Renovation of the Physics Undergraduate Teaching Laboratories at the University of Toronto Mississauga**

Professor Gottlieb summarized the proposal for the UTM Physics Undergraduate Teaching Laboratories renovation, which would significantly improve the quality and practicality of UTM's physics education. The estimated total project cost of \$3.1-million would be funded from the UTM Operating Fund.

Professor Mullin informed the Board that the proposed renovations were greatly needed. In response to a comment by a member, she stated that UTM was working with an engineering firm with respect to the renovation and the proposed use of space. Professor Mabury confirmed that UTM would obtain provincial Environmental Compliance Approval.

**9. Capital Project: Report of the Project Planning Committee for the Renovation of the Physics Undergraduate Teaching Laboratories at the University of Toronto Mississauga (cont'd)**

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT subject to confirmation by the Executive Committee

- a) THAT the Project Planning Report for the Renovation of the Physics Undergraduate Teaching Laboratories at the University of Toronto Mississauga, dated December, 2012, be approved; and
- b) THAT the project scope for the proposed renovation of the Physics Teaching Laboratories, Phase 6 of a multiphase project, with a total project cost of \$3,092,529, be approved in principle.

It was duly moved and seconded

THAT the motion be amended to read:

THAT subject to confirmation by the Executive Committee

- a) THAT the Project Planning Report for the Renovation of the Chemistry Teaching Laboratories in the W.G. Davis Building at the University of Toronto Mississauga, dated November 2012, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix “D”, be approved; and
- b) THAT the project scope with a total project cost of \$3.1 million to be funded from the UTM Operating Fund be approved in principle.

The vote to amend the motion was taken.  
The motion carried.

The vote on the main motion was taken.  
The motion carried.

**CONSENT AGENDA**

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the consent agenda be adopted.

**10. Approval of the Report of the Previous Meeting:** Report Number 182 – November 22, 2012

Report Number 182 of the meeting held on November 22, 2012 was approved.

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

There was no business arising from Report Number 182.

**12. Items for Information**

The following items for information were received by the Board.

- a) Report Number 187 of the Agenda Committee Meeting – December 18, 2012
- b) Report Number 188 of the Agenda Committee Meeting – January 29, 2013
- c) Report Number 159 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs – January 15, 2013
- d) Report Number 152 of the Planning and Budget Committee – January 16, 2013

---

**13. Date of the Next Meeting**

The Chair stated that the next meeting of the Board was scheduled for Thursday, March 21, 2013, at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber. At that meeting, an education session on the budget would be presented by Professor Misak and her team.

**14. Other Business**

There were no items of other business.

The Chair thanked members for their attendance and participation in the Board meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 5:50 p.m.

---

Secretary  
February 8, 2013

---

Chair