

## THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

### REPORT NUMBER 175 OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD

October 6, 2011

To the Governing Council,  
University of Toronto

Your Board reports that it held a meeting on Thursday, October 6, 2011 at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall at which the following were present:

Professor Ellen Hodnett, Chair	Professor Joseph Desloges	Professor Faye Mishna
Professor Hugh Gunz, Vice-Chair	Professor Miriam Diamond	Mr. Liam Mitchell
Professor David Naylor, President	Professor Zhong-Ping Feng	Professor Matthew Mitchell
Professor Cheryl Misak, Vice- President and Provost	Mr. Cary Ferguson	Professor David Mock
Professor Scott Mabury, Vice- Provost, Academic Operations	Professor Alan Galey	Professor Amy Mullin
Professor Cheryl Regehr, Vice- Provost Academic Programs	Ms Maria Pilar Galvez	Professor Julia O'Sullivan
Dr. Francis Ahia	Professor Meric Gertler	Professor Elizabeth Peter
Professor Donald Ainslie	Professor Robert Gibbs	Professor Domenico Pietropaolo
Professor Benjamin Alarie	Dr. Carol Golench	Ms Judith Poë
Ms Manal Al-Ayad	Professor Avrum Gotlieb	Dr. Neil Rector
Mr. Larry Alford	Professor Rick Halpern	Professor Yves Roberge
Professor Catherine Amara	Mrs. Bonnie Horne	Professor Jeffrey Rosenthal
Professor Cristina Amon	Mr. Peter Hurley	Professor Seamus Ross
Ms Katherine Ball	Mr. Adnan Hussain	Professor Andrea Sass-Kortsak
Professor Jan Barnsley	Professor Ira Jacobs	Mr. Kevin Siu
Professor Phil Byer	Professor Alison Keith	Professor Sandy Smith
Mr. Louis Charpentier	Ms Anne Kerubo	Miss Maureen J. Somerville
Ms Virginia Coons	Professor Paul Kingston	Professor Markus Stock
Professor Elizabeth Cowper	Mr. Nykolaj Kuryluk	Ms Caitlin Tillman
Mr. Michael Da Silva	Mr. Ben Liu	Mr. Chirag Variawa
Professor Christopher Damaren	Ms Cecilia Livingston	Dr. Sarita Verma
Professor Karen Davis	Professor Heather MacNeil	Dr. Shelly Weiss
Professor Charles Deber	Mr. Aly-Khan Madhavji	Professor Charmaine Williams
	Professor Henry Mann	Professor Joseph Wong
	Professor Douglas McDougall	Professor Howard Yee
	Professor Linda McGillis Hall	Mr. Tony Han Yin
	Professor Angelo Melino	Ms Grace Yuen
<b>Regrets:</b>		
Professor Derek Allen	Professor Luc De Nil	Professor Emmanuel Nikiema
Professor Christine Allen	Professor Darryl Edwards	Ms Yuchao Niu
Professor Maydianne Andrade	Professor Suzanne Erb	Dr. Graeme Norval
Professor Dwayne Barber	Mr. John A. Fraser	Professor Janet Paterson
Dr. Katherine Berg	Professor Robert Harrison	Ms Melinda Rogers
Ms Marilyn Booth	Dr. Chris Koenig-Woodyard	Professor Lock Rowe
Professor Terry Carleton	Professor Jim Lai	Ms Ava-Dayna Sefa
Professor Will Cluett	Professor Roger L. Martin	Ms Helen Slade
Professor David Cook	Professor Don McLean	Professor Richard Sommer
Professor Brian Corman	Ms Natalie Melton	Professor Suzanne Stevenson
Mr. Tyler Currie	Professor Mayo Moran	Dr. Roslyn Thomas-Long
	Professor Carol Moukheiber	Professor Njoki Wane
	Professor Michelle Murphy	Professor Sandy Welsh

**Non-voting Assessors:**

Professor Angela Hildyard, Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity  
 Mr. David Palmer, Vice-President, Advancement

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:**

Professor Robert Baker, Vice-Dean, Research and Graduate Programs, Faculty of Arts and Science, and member of the Governing Council  
 Professor Peter Lewis, Associate Vice-President, Research  
 Mr. Townsend Benard, Faculty of Physical Education and Health (FPEH)  
 Mr. Tad Brown, Counsel, Business Affairs and Advancement  
 Ms Anita Comella, Assistant Dean, FPEH

Ms Sheree Drummond, Assistant Provost  
 Professor Charlie Keil, Director, Cinema Studies Institute, Faculty of Arts and Science  
 Professor Gretchen Kerr, Associate Dean, FPEH  
 Ms Rosanne Lopers-Sweetman, Chief Administrative Officer, FPEH  
 Ms Nora Gillespie, Legal Counsel, Office of the Vice-President and Provost, Office of the Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity

Ms Gillian Morrison, Assistant Vice-President, Divisional Relations and Campaign  
 Ms Cecilia Pye, FPEH  
 Ms Katarina Vulic, FPEH

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

**1. Chair's Remarks**

The Chair welcomed new and continuing members to the first meeting of the Academic Board for 2011-2012. She introduced Professor Hugh Gunz, the Vice-Chair of the Board; Professor Cheryl Misak, Vice-President and Provost and the Board's senior assessor; and other assessors who were in attendance. The Chair encouraged members to make an effort to get to know some of their colleagues who also served on the Board. Members were also encouraged to review the three Governance Principles documents – the *Principles of Good Governance*, the *Mandate of Governance*, and the *Expectations and Attributes of Governors and Key Principles of Ethical Conduct*, as well as the *Frequently Asked Questions* document which had been included with the agenda package.

Outlining her expectations of members' conduct, the Chair said that she expected Board meetings to be conducted in an atmosphere of respect, collegiality, and civility. She asked members to avoid procedural wrangling at meetings and to inform the Office of the Governing Council prior to each meeting as to whether or not they would be able to attend the meeting in order to ensure that quorum would be met. The Chair observed that meetings provided an opportunity for members to express their views on matters under consideration, and she urged members to participate freely in discussions of the Board.

## **2. Report of the Previous Meeting:** Report Number 174 - June 1, 2011

Report Number 174 of the meeting held on June 1, 2011 was approved.

## **3. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting**

There was no business arising from the Report of the June 1, 2011 meeting.

## **4. Report of the Vice-President and Provost**

Professor Misak said that the University would embark on an extensive process over the next six months to evaluate how well it was following through on President Naylor's *Towards 2030: Planning for a Third Century of Excellence at the University of Toronto*. That document was directive in many instances, and it was now appropriate to determine the progress that had been made since 2009. Professor Misak planned to bring forward to the Board topics for input and discussion over the course of the year. Matters such as research excellence, educational mission, faculty renewal, staffing levels, the budget model, institutional organization, and academic planning would be considered. Following broad community involvement, the intent was to produce *Towards 2030: The View from 2012* to be brought forward in cycle three to the Governing Council for approval in principle.

The Powerpoint slides used during Professor Misak's presentation to the Board are attached hereto as [Appendix "A"](#).

There were no questions.

## **5. 2010-2011 Academic Board Evaluation Survey**

The Chair said that members had been asked to complete an evaluation survey at the final Board meeting of the 2010-11 year. It was the second year that such a survey had been conducted, and there had been an increase in the response rate from 30% in 2009-10 to 38% in 2010-11.

The Chair provided a few observations from the results. In general, respondents had expressed overall satisfaction with the amount of time allotted for the introduction and discussion of the Board's main areas of responsibility. However, 30% of the respondents had felt there had been insufficient time allocated for the discussion of items related to research. Similarly, 25% had felt there had not been enough time spent on other responsibilities such as academic units, divisional constitutions, individual appointments, and teaching guidelines. Members had supported the continuation of educational components of meetings. But some had suggested that, due to time constraints meetings, such presentation should be held outside of Board meetings. Respondents had been satisfied with the written material provided to the Board. However, a few had noted that a great deal of documentation was provided for items and they had suggested that greater use of summaries be made.

The Chair said that, as had been the case the previous year, many members had reported that the opportunity to learn more about the University had been the most valuable aspect of Board

## **5. 2010-2011 Academic Board Evaluation Survey (cont'd)**

meetings. The Chair then commented on feedback from some members who had observed that proposals brought forward for approval were always passed by the Board. The Chair explained that that was actually an indication that governance was functioning well, and Board members should not feel that they were failing to do their job because matters were approved. Proposals were brought forward to the central administration after much work and consultation had occurred within the originating academic divisions. They were then vetted further by central administrators, by the planning groups of the Board's standing committees, by the committees themselves, and by the Agenda Committee. By the time the proposal was submitted to the Board, it was expected to be of such calibre that it should not be necessary to send it back for further revision or consideration.

The Chair emphasized that the role of Board members was to provide oversight of the processes that had been followed. As well, Board members provided valuable input that was at times incorporated into proposals forwarded to higher levels of governance. While it was not feasible to report back to the Board on the outcome of each item on which members provided feedback, advice provided by members during Board meetings was shared with the Executive Committee and the Governing Council through the Chair's reports and the Board minutes. Those observations were taken very seriously. The Chair stated that the Board did not simply provide a "rubber-stamp" of approval and she reiterated her invitation to members to participate during discussions. In closing, the Chair said that the feedback had been heartening and she thanked those members who had made time to complete the survey and provide their thoughtful comments.

## **6. Campaign Plans and Priorities**

The Chair informed members that the proposal for the Campaign plans and priorities had been considered by the Planning and Budget Committee (P&B) at its meeting of September 21, 2011. If recommended by the Academic Board, the proposal would be considered for approval by the Governing Council on October 27, 2011.

Professor Misak gave some introductory remarks, noting that the University had been able to retain its strength despite the recent challenging economic situation and the limited per-student funding provided by the Ontario Government, which funding had remained unchanged in inflation-adjusted terms over the last seventeen years. This remarkable feat was due in part to the largesse of the University's friends and benefactors. The University was now poised to launch an unprecedented \$2-billion campaign. The campaign would enable the University to carry out those functions that had been identified by faculty, students, and academic units as essential to the flourishing of its mission. The Board was being asked to recommend to the Governing Council for approval the priorities of the campaign. The priorities, which had been identified by the academic divisions as part of their academic planning processes, included a strong focus on funding for students and for faculty positions and as well as a number of capital and infrastructure renewal projects.

## 6. Campaign Plans and Priorities (cont'd)

Mr. David Palmer, Vice-President, Advancement, provided an overview of the proposed campaign plans and priorities. The Powerpoint slides which were used during his presentation to the Board are attached hereto as [Appendix "B"](#).

Following Mr. Palmer's presentation, Dr. Gotlieb highlighted the discussion that had occurred at the P&B meeting<sup>1</sup>. It had been emphasized that student aid remained a priority across all divisions. There was no central amount planned for student aid fundraising; rather each division set its own target. By far, student aid funds were raised most successfully at the divisional level. As well, the P&B had been informed that the campaign would not have an adverse impact on the efforts of student groups to raise funds. The Office of Advancement would continue to assist student groups with sponsorship-type relationships with prospective benefactors. In fact, the visibility of the Campaign could potentially have a positive impact on the fundraising efforts of student groups.

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

### a) Donor Influence on University Functions

A member asked to what extent private donations influenced the type of research conducted by the University. In response, Professor Misak stated that donors did not direct the University to carry out research in particular areas. Rather, the University identified academic priorities and then accepted funds in support of those priorities. All priorities, which were set by the divisions, were approved by the Office of the Vice-President and Provost. Mr. Palmer added that the University would not hesitate to decline a donation if it was intended for a purpose other than an approved academic priority. Of course, efforts would be made to persuade the prospective donor to direct funds to one of the identified University priorities.

### b) Stages of the Campaign

In response to members' questions about the preliminary "quiet" phase of the campaign, Mr. Palmer explained that, on the advice of the Campaign Steering Committee, it had been decided that the starting date for the campaign would be established as the beginning of the fiscal year of 2005-2006, coincident with the appointment of Professor David Naylor as President of the University. That would allow gifts made since that time to be included in the campaign, an option that had appealed to donors consulted about the matter. During the quiet phase of the campaign, the University had reached out to its closest friends for support, and the campaign would launch with almost half of its \$2-billion private sector goal secured. With the public launch of the campaign, planned for November 20, 2011, members of the public and the broad alumni constituency would be invited to contribute and to make an investment in the University. Gifts of all sizes would be solicited through strong marketing programs.

It was anticipated that the campaign would last approximately ten years, mirroring the length of the University's previous campaign. It was possible that the end date might be extended beyond 2015-2016, depending on the fundraising success. Factors such as the speed with which various

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://assets.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/BoardsCommittees/pb/r0921.pdf>

## 6. Campaign Plans and Priorities (cont'd)

milestones were reached and the appetite of the University leadership to continue with the campaign would influence whether or not the end date was extended. That careful decision would be made much later on towards the conclusion of the campaign.

### c) Government Funding

A member inquired whether a successful \$2-billion campaign might lead to diminished support for the University from the government. Professor Misak replied that the opposite was in fact often the case. The government was sometimes willing to contribute to projects if an institution demonstrated an ability to raise private funds. There was little risk that the government would reduce funding to the University upon conclusion of a successful campaign. Professor Naylor added that he recalled only one instance in the past when there had been some offset of public support following successful institutional fundraising. A cap had been placed on matches provided by the Government for student support funds raised by universities in order to allow the same opportunities to all. In Professor Naylor's view, the University of Toronto was unlikely to be constrained in such a way by the Government.

### d) Donor Options

Mr. Palmer elaborated on an innovative donor option that would be made available in the near future. Donors to the University would be able to direct monies to an Enhanced Payout Fund, intended to last over a span of between ten to twenty years and with an enhanced annual payout of 7.5% of the original capital. Unlike an endowment, where the capital was preserved in perpetuity, a gift in the Enhanced Payout Fund would likely be depleted over the span of ten to twenty years, or perhaps even longer, depending on the investment climate. This new option, which did not currently exist elsewhere, might be appealing to donors who wished to see a larger annual impact from their donations over a generational period. For similar reasons, some deans might consider it a beneficial option.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

### YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the Campaign Priorities Summary, as described in the letter from the Provost to the Chair of the Planning and Budget Committee dated September 2, 2011, and contained in Appendix "C" hereto, be approved as the planning framework for the University's fundraising campaign.

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

## **7. Capital Project: Project Planning Report for the Varsity Centre 2011 Goldring Centre for High Performance Sport**

The Chair informed members that the proposal for the Varsity Centre 2011 Goldring Centre for High Performance Sport capital project had been considered by the P&B at its meeting of September 2, 2011. The proposal had also been considered by the University Affairs Board on September 27th for concurrence with the Academic Board's prospective recommendation for approval. If recommended by the Academic Board, the proposal would be considered for approval by the Governing Council on October 27th.

Dr. Gotlieb introduced the proposal for a major revitalization of the athletics facilities at the University. The proposed facility, which would be located on Site 12 on the west side of Devonshire Place south of Bloor Street, would comprise 6,700 net assignable square metres. The lower level would feature a 2,000-seat combined basketball and volleyball facility. Upper floors of the facility would accommodate a Strength and Conditioning Centre, exercise and sport science research labs, the University's sport medicine clinic, and related offices and meeting rooms. The total estimated cost for the Goldring Centre, including a portion of shared site servicing and a central elevator/stair core, to be constructed concurrently with the Goldring Centre as the first phase for a future Tower, was \$60.8-million. The total estimated cost for the remaining work of the first phase of the Tower including the foundation, shared site servicing, and a central elevator/stair core was \$9.0 million. Funding for the project would be obtained through private donations and a contribution of \$22.5-million from the Ontario Government. It was anticipated that the Goldring Centre would be fully operational by January 2015 and would complete the multi-phased re-development of the Varsity site that had begun in 2005.

At the invitation of the Chair, Professor Ira Jacobs, Dean of the Faculty of Physical Education and Health, addressed the Board. He expressed his excitement at the prospect of the proposed capital project, which would allow for an enhanced experience for students and would provide much-needed space for a range of athletic activities and research facilities. Professor Jacobs acknowledged the foresight of the previous Dean, Professor Bruce Kidd, and others who had developed the vision for the Goldring Centre. Professor Jacobs observed that the University was in the fortunate position of having the financial resources to proceed with the project, provided that final approval was granted by the Governing Council. He emphasized the importance of providing opportunities for students to participate in physical activity and reinforced that there was a pent-up demand for such opportunities from students that could not currently be met because of physical space constraints. The Faculty had a mission to deliver both scholarly excellence in its academic programs as well as in the University-wide programming it provided for the entire University of Toronto community; the proposed Centre was critical for both.

Mr. Townsend Benard, a student in the Faculty of Physical Education and Health, and a student athlete, spoke on behalf of the students present in support of the proposed Centre. He noted that the proposed Centre would provide the facilities and improved sport medicine clinic needed by the Varsity athletes at the University, who numbered more than nine hundred. Such a Centre would attract world-level coaches and activity. The increased number of research laboratories would benefit both students and faculty, and the increased space would better accommodate the more than ten thousand students who participated in intramural sports at the University.

## **7. Capital Project: Project Planning Report for the Varsity Centre 2011 Goldring Centre for High Performance Sport (cont'd)**

During the discussion of the Board, some members remarked on the possibility of increased fees for students arising from operating costs for the Centre, but they acknowledged the need for and the benefits of augmented athletic facilities on campus. Professor Jacobs stated that the intent was to accurately assess the operational costs after one full year of operations once the building was opened, but that financial modeling based on current projections might result in a proposed student fee increase that ranged from \$4 to \$26 per term per student. He explained that the preferred model was the one currently employed with the athletic facilities, where there was a minimum student usage of 75% of the time, with rental revenue providing the remaining 25% of the operating costs. He added that concerns about student support of the operating costs of the building had not been raised at the recent meeting of the University Affairs Board, and he expressed his hope that students' awareness of the benefits of physical activity would continue to increase with time. In response to a question, Professor Jacobs clarified that currently the students registered in academic programs offered by the Faculty of Physical Education and Health represented only a small minority of those who utilized the athletic facilities.

In response to a question from a member about the consequences of not achieving the fundraising targets to support the construction of the building, Professor Jacobs stated that, during the preparation of the Project Planning Report, a contingency plan for possible space reduction of the Centre had been considered and could be revisited if the financial viability of the current proposal was not endorsed. Professor Misak added that, in the event that the University was unable to obtain donations for the remaining amount of funds needed for the Centre, other options would have to be identified. However, she was optimistic that fundraising efforts would be successful. Professor Naylor commented that he and other members of the University had expended significant effort in order to successfully raise approximately two-thirds of the funds for the Centre.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

### **YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS**

- (i) THAT the Project Planning Report for the Goldring Centre for High Performance Sport at the St. George campus dated September 14, 2011, a copy of which is attached hereto as [Appendix "D"](#), be approved in principle to accommodate the activities and functions as described;
- (ii) THAT the project scope for the Goldring Centre for High Performance Sport, comprising approximately 6,700 net assignable square metres (nasm) (or 11,189 gross square metres (gsm)) plus a portion of shared site servicing provisions and a central elevator/stair core to be constructed concurrently with the Goldring Centre as the first phase of a future Tower, be approved at a provisional total project cost of \$60.8 million; and
- (iii) THAT the project scope for the remaining work of the first phase of the future Tower to include foundation and shared site servicing and central elevator/stair core be approved at a provisional total project cost of \$9.0 million.

## **8. Faculty of Medicine: Proposal to Establish the Institute of Health Policy, Management and Evaluation as an Extra-Departmental Unit:A (EDU:A)**

The Chair stated that the proposal to establish the Institute of Health Policy, Management and Evaluation as an Extra-Departmental Unit: A (EDU:A) had been considered by the P&B on September 21<sup>st</sup>. If recommended by the Academic Board, it would be forwarded to the Governing Council for approval on October 27th.

Dr. Gotlieb provided an overview of the proposal. He said that the main purpose of the proposal to change the status of the existing Department of Health Policy, Management and Evaluation (HPME) to an EDU:A and rename it the Institute of Health Policy, Management and Evaluation was to integrate the Institute with the Dalla Lana School of Public Health. This was an important step as the Dalla Lana School moved towards an independent structure from the Faculty of Medicine. The proposed unit met the criteria for an EDU:A – it had a well-established and defined area of scholarship and had attained a critical mass of interdisciplinary scholarship that allowed it to appoint teaching staff, admit students to a program of study, and engage in interdisciplinary research. The proposed Institute would continue to offer graduate programs and there would be no change for faculty appointments. As well, all revenues and costs associated with the Institute would continue to be part of the budget of the Faculty of Medicine. Consultations with stakeholders on and off campus had revealed strong support for the evolution of the Department into an Institute.

Dr. Gotlieb stated that during the P&B meeting, a member had asked whether it was unusual for a unit to proceed from a department to an extra-departmental unit: A status. Professor Catharine Whiteside had cited the example of the Institute of Biomaterials and Biomedical Engineering, which had a departmental status and was in partnership with the Faculties of Applied Science and Engineering, Medicine, and Dentistry, as a truly interdisciplinary unit. She added that the Department of HPME was nationally renowned in the field of health services and health management and the change in status to an Institute would allow it realize its aspirations of global recognition. The P&B had unanimously recommended approval of the proposal.

Dr. Sarita Verma, Acting Dean of the Faculty of Medicine, expressed her delight at the proposal being considered by the Board. She reiterated that broad consultation had occurred during the development of the proposal and that the Department of HPME was on the leading edge in examining solutions for the health system, which faced major challenges. As the Department moved forward with its collaborations with both national and international partners, it was poised to become a leader in health policy and health policy research.

No questions were raised by members of the Board.

**8. Faculty of Medicine: Proposal to Establish the Institute of Health Policy, Management and Evaluation as an Extra-Departmental Unit A (EDU:A) (cont'd)**

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

**YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS**

THAT the status of the existing Department of Health Policy, Management and Evaluation in the Faculty of Medicine be changed to an Extra-Departmental Unit A (EDU:A) named the Institute of Health Policy, Management and Evaluation, effective immediately.

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

**9. Faculty of Arts and Science: Doctor of Philosophy Program in Cinema Studies**

The Chair informed members that the proposal for a Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) program in Cinema Studies had been considered by the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs (AP&P) at its meeting of September 20, 2011. If recommended by the Academic Board, it too would be considered for approval by the Governing Council on October 27th.

Professor Sass-Kortsak introduced the proposal from the Faculty of Arts and Science for a new, four-year, full-time Ph.D. program in Cinema Studies. She noted that the program built on the success of the undergraduate program and the Master's level program in the discipline. In accordance with the new quality assessment process, the proposal had been examined by external reviewers from New York University and the University of Michigan. They had commented that the program was rigorous and solid. It would enjoy a strong comparative advantage, based on the strength of the pre-doctoral programs and the strong reputation of the University's faculty in Cinema Studies. At the AP&P meeting, the Vice-Dean of Arts and Science had assured the Committee that the Faculty would be able to provide the student support required for the program. The Director of the Cinema Studies Institute had spoken of the value of the connections between the Institute and the Toronto International Film Festival (TIFF), including TIFF's significant archival holdings and the opportunities arising from a seminar program held with TIFF, which focused on conceptual aspects of cinema as well as more practical matters. Following its discussion, the AP&P had unanimously endorsed the proposal.

Professor Rob Baker, Vice-Dean, Research and Graduate Programs in the Faculty of Arts and Science, affirmed the timeliness of the proposal, pointing to the strength of the Cinema Studies Institute and the opportunities to engage with the film industry.

A member of the Board commented that, given the University's current financial situation, care should be taken in introducing new doctoral programs. He questioned whether sufficient cost-benefit analyses had been conducted to support the proposal. Professor Meric Gertler, Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Science, replied that the proposal had been thoroughly discussed and vetted in the Faculty and by Faculty Council. The Faculty had been convinced of the legitimacy of the program. The TIFF and its new facility were great assets that could be leveraged with the establishment of the proposed doctoral program. With respect to the provision of funding for

**9. Faculty of Arts and Science: Doctor of Philosophy Program in Cinema Studies**  
(cont'd)

graduate students, Professor Gertler stated that a third phase of graduate expansion was expected to be announced shortly by the Provincial Government. Funds provided through that program could be accessed to assist prospective doctoral students in the Cinema Studies program during their first four years of study. As well, a number of faculty had successfully obtained research funding from external sources, and they would be able to contribute to financial support for the doctoral students.

Professor Charlie Keil, Director of the Cinema Studies Institute, commented that a careful study of the undergraduate and graduate needs of the Cinema Studies programs had been conducted and he was certain that the programs could be offered using existing faculty members. There were a number of tenured faculty who had expressed a desire to contribute to a doctoral Cinema Studies program and to supervise students. There had been no request for additional faculty members for the Institute. Existing graduate courses offered by cognate departments would be available to students, and excellent resources such as an archive of original film and materials were ready to be discovered.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

**YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS**

THAT the Ph.D. Program in Cinema Studies, as described in the proposal from the Faculty of Arts and Science dated September 8, 2011, a copy of which is attached hereto as [Appendix "F"](#), be approved effective for the academic year 2012-13.

**10. Faculty of Physical Education and Health: Name Change**

The Chair stated that the proposal had been brought forward directly to the Board rather than on the recommendation of one of its standing committees. If approved, the proposal would require confirmation by the Executive Committee on October 19th.

Professor Misak explained that the proposal was for a change in the name of the Faculty of Physical Education and Health (FPEH) to the "Faculty of Kinesiology and Physical Education." The intent of the proposal was to reflect more clearly the scholarship and teaching of the Faculty, and there had been an extensive consultation process. The FPEH Faculty Council had established an *ad hoc* Committee in September 2010 to recommend a new name for the Faculty that would more clearly communicate the spectrum of scholarly and academic activity, academic degrees awarded, and domains of expertise within the Faculty. The final report of the Committee had been submitted for consideration by the FPEH Faculty Council in the spring of

## 10. Faculty of Physical Education and Health: Name Change (cont'd)

2011, and the Committee's unanimous recommendation to change the Faculty name to the "Faculty of Kinesiology and Physical Education" had been approved by the FPEH Faculty Council on May 19, 2011. The Faculty was not proposing to change the name of any of its three undergraduate degree programs or its two graduate degree programs, and any financial resources required to implement the name change would be absorbed by the Faculty.

A member of the Board asked why it was being proposed that the term "health" be removed from the name. Professor Jacobs replied that the term "kinesiology" had evolved into one that was adopted broadly across North America. It encompassed a number of disciplines; health, particularly human movement as it related to human health, was only one component of kinesiology. Professor Jacobs noted that the scholars who had conducted an external review of the Faculty in June 2011 had recommended the name "Faculty of Kinesiology." However, members of the Faculty had preferred the broader name that included "Physical Education." While there had been very broad support among stakeholders for a name change, there had not been a clear consensus as to a preferred new name. Ultimately, the name "Faculty of Kinesiology and Physical Education" had been accepted by the FPEH Faculty Council.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

### YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the name of the "Faculty of Physical Education and Health" be changed to the "Faculty of Kinesiology and Physical Education," effective January 1, 2012.

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

## 11. Academic Board Terms of Reference

Invited by the Chair to address the Board, Mr. Louis Charpentier, Secretary of the Governing Council, provided a report for information on the proposed revisions to the Academic Board Terms of Reference that would be forwarded to the Governing Council for approval on October 27, 2011. Mr. Charpentier explained that the current proposal was the final step in updating the Terms of Reference to align them with recommendations that had arisen from the *Report of the Task Force on Governance*<sup>2</sup>. Two procedural options were being added to the terms of reference of all Boards and Committees. They would allow for more routine items to be placed on the "consent" portion of an agenda and for certain reports for information to be made available to members by electronic publication. One major amendment to the Terms of Reference clarified the Academic Board's responsibility for purely academic matters. Such authority, which had always existed but had not been practiced for many years, would eliminate the need for Executive Committee confirmation of certain Academic Board decisions. Another amendment assigned responsibility to the Board for the approval of guidelines for academic plans (followed by Executive Committee confirmation). Divisional academic plans, which would be considered

---

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/taskforce/reportTFOG.htm>

## **11. Academic Board Terms of Reference**

by the respective Councils prior to approval by the Vice-President and Provost, would be forwarded to the Board for information and feedback.

A member observed that it had previously been suggested to the Governing Council that divisional academic plans would require Academic Board approval. It appeared that would no longer be the case. Mr. Charpentier replied that divisional councils were bodies of the Governing Council and it was appropriate for approval of academic plans to rest at that level, with guidance being provided by the Vice-President and Provost.

## **12. Items for Information**

The following items for information were received by the Board.

- (a) Report on Approvals Under Summer Executive Authority
- (b) Calendar of Business for 2011-12
- (c) Appointments and Status Changes
- (d) Reports of the Agenda Committee Meetings
  - i) Report Number 173 - June 9, 2011
  - ii) Report Number 174 – June 28, 2011
  - iii) Report Number 175 – September 27, 2011
- (e) Report Number 145 of the Planning and Budget Committee - September 21, 2011

There were no questions arising from the reports.

## **13. Date of the Next Meeting**

The Chair stated that the next meeting of the Board was scheduled for Thursday, November 17, 2011, at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber.

## **14. Other Business**

The Chair noted that members were responsible for shredding any confidential documentation from their agenda packages. Alternatively, members were welcome to leave confidential material behind in the Council Chamber and the Secretariat would arrange for their disposal.

The Board moved *in camera*.

## **15. Quarterly Report on Donations - May 1, 2010 – July 31, 2010**

- a) February 1 – April 30, 2011
- b) May 1 – July 31, 2011

Members received the reports for information. There were no questions.

The Board returned to open session.

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

The meeting adjourned at 6:10 p.m.

---

Secretary  
October 12, 2011

---

Chair