THE GOVERNING COUNCIL
REPORT NUMBER 147 OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD
January 11, 2007

To the Governing Council,
University of Toronto

Your Board reports that it held a meeting on Thursday, January 11, 2007 at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall at which the following were present:

Professor Michael R. Marrus (Chair)
Professor Brian Corman (Vice-Chair)
Professor David Naylor, President
Professor John Challis, Vice-President, Research and Associate Provost
Professor David Farrar, Deputy Provost and Vice-Provost, Students
Professor Vivek Goel, Vice-President and Provost
Professor S. Zaky, Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget
Professor Stewart Aitchison
Professor Christy Anderson
Professor Gage Averill
Professor George Baird
Professor Clare Beghtol
Professor David R. Begun
Dr. Terry Blake
Professor Ragnar Buchweitz
Mr. Ewen Weili Chen

Dr. Christena Chruszez
Professor John Coleman
Mr. Tim Corson
Mr. Joe Cox
Mr. Ken Davy
Miss Saswati Deb
Professor Miriam Diamond
Professor Guy Faulkner
Dr. Shari Graham Fell
Ms. Linda B. Gardner
Professor Jane Gaskell
Ms Bonnie Goldberg
Professor Rick Halpern
Professor Wayne K. Hindmarsh
Professor Brad Inwood
Professor Charles Jones
Mr. Mohammed Khan
Mr. Umar Khan
Professor Hon C. Kwan
Dr. Lesley Ann Lavack
Professor Robert Levit
Professor Thomas Mathien
Mr. Geoffrey Matus
Professor Brenda Y. McCabe
Professor Douglas McDougall

Ms Vera Melnyk
Professor Mark McGowan
Mr. Matto Mildenberger
Professor David Mock
Ms Carole Moore
Professor Mariel O'Neill-Karch
Professor Donna Orwin
Mr. Roger P. Parkinson
Professor Janet Paterson
Professor Susan Pfeiffer
Professor Jolie Ringash
Mr. Paul Ruppert
Professor Andrea Sass-Kortsak
Professor Pekka Sinervo
Professor J.J. Berry Smith
Professor Brian Cantwell Smith
Miss Maureen J. Somerville
Professor Suzanne Stevenson
Dr. Robert S. Turnbull
Professor Catharine Whiteside
Dr. Cindy Woodland
Dr. Chris Koenig-Woodyard

Regrets:

Professor Varouj Aivazian
Professor Derek Allen
Professor Cristina Amon
Professor Jan Angus
Professor Sylvia Bashevkin
Mr. Brian Beaton
Professor Reina Bendayan
Professor Katherine Berg
Ms Marilyn Booth
Professor Donald Brean
Mr. Terry Buckland
Ryan Matthew Campbell
Professor George Elliott Clarke
Professor David Cook
Mr. John A. Fraser
Mr. Kristofer T. Coward
Professor Alister Cumming
Prof Luc F. De Nil
Dr. Raisa B. Deber

Professor Dickson Eyoh
Professor Avrum Gotlieb
Professor William Gough
Ms Pamela Gravestock
Professor Hugh Gunz
Mr. Billeh Hamud
Mrs. Bonnie Horne
Professor Yuki Mayumi Johnson
Professor Gregory Jump
Dr. Wajahat Khan
Professor Bruce Kidd
Dr. Joel A. Kirsh
Professor Lori Loeb
Dr. Gillian MacKay
Professor Roger L. Martin
Professor Diane Massam
Professor John R. Miron
Professor Faye Mishna
Professor Michael Molloy

Professor Mayo Moran
Professor Sioban Nelson
Ms Theresa Pazionis
Professor Cheryl Regehr
Professor Robert Reisz
Professor Richard Reznick
Professor Gareth Seaward
Professor Anthony N. Sinclair
Professor Tattersall Smith
Professor Ron Smyth
Mr. Omar Solimon
Professor Lorne Sossin
Professor Lisa Steele
Professor Kim Strong
Professor Rinaldo Wayne Walcott
Dr. Donald A. Wasylenki
Mr. Patrick Wong

Non-voting Assessors: **Secretariat:**
Professor Angela Hildyard   Ms Cristina Oke
Professor Edith M. Hillan
Professor Cheryl Misak
Ms Catherine Riggall
Ms Elizabeth Sisam

In Attendance:
Ms Sharon Bewell, Registrar and Administrative Coordinator of the Graduate Programs
    and Student Services, Faculty of Social Work
Ms Nora Gillespie, Legal Counsel, Office of the Vice-President and Provost
Professor George Hanken, Undergraduate Co-ordinator, Department of Fine Art, Faculty of Arts and
    Science
Professor Charlie Keil, Director, Cinema Studies Program, Faculty of Arts and Science
Professor David Klausner, Vice-Dean, Interdisciplinary Affairs, Faculty of Arts and Science
Professor Sheila Neysmith, Director of PhD Program, Faculty of Social Work
Professor Peter Pauly, Vice-Dean, Research and Academic Resources, Rotman School of Management
Ms Rosanne Lopers- Sweetman, Director, Special Projects, Office of the Vice-President and Provost
Ms Estefania Toledo, Member of the Governing Council
Ms Mary-Ellen Yeomans, Assistant Dean, Administration and Chief Administrative Officer, Rotman School
    of Management

In this report, items 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13 are recommended to the Governing
Council for approval, items 14, 15 and 16 are for confirmation by the Executive
Committee, and the remaining items are reported for information.

The Chair wished members a Happy New Year and reminded them to stand and to
introduce themselves when speaking.

Add to Agenda

With the permission of members, a Report of the Striking Committee was added to the
agenda as item 22.

1.   Approval of Report Number 146 of the Meeting held on November 15, 2006

Report Number 146 of the meeting held on November 15, 2006 was approved.

2.   Business Arising Out of the Report

The Chair noted that, prior to the meeting, a member had raised a question of clarification
arising from page 7, paragraph 3 of Report 146 of the Academic Board, concerning a
statement made by Dean Sinervo that thirty percent of doctoral students were
international students. The member had asked whether 30% referred to the percentage of
international doctoral students across the University, or only in the Faculty of Arts &
Science.

Professor Goel explained that the thirty percent referred to international students enrolled
in Arts and Science graduate programs across the three campuses. The percentage of
international doctoral students enrolled at the University was approximately 16%, while
the percentage of international students enrolled at the University as a whole was
approximately 19%.

3. Report Numbers 133 and 134 of the Agenda Committee (December 4 and 12, 2006)

Professor Goel drew the attention of members to the Agenda Committee's aapproval of the appointment of Professor Vaccarino as Principal of the University of Toronto at Scarborough, and noted the significance of the appointment.

4. Report from the Vice-President and Provost

(a) Development of 2007-08 Operating Budget

Professor Goel commented that a major task being undertaken at this time was the preparation of the 2007-08 operating budget for the University. He noted that there were items related to the grants for the 2006-07 budget year that had not been finalized, including allocations from the provincial government that had not yet been made. The President and the Vice-President, University Relations, were making every effort to seek clarity for these allocations.

Professor Goel explained that the 2007-08 budget would be the first to be prepared using the new budget model. An information session on the new budget model would be held in late February for members of the Planning and Budget Committee and the Business Board. Members of the Academic Board and the Governing Council would also be invited to attend the information session.

(b) University Art Centre

Professor Goel announced that the Review of the University Art Centre and the President's administrative response had been released on January 11, 2007. [1]   The Arts Council continued to work on a number of initiatives, including the University's participation in the proposed Nuit Blanche in 2007.

(c) Round Table on the Environment [2]

Professor Goel reported that the Round Table on the Environment had met in December for the first time. He noted that the University had extensive expertise in the area of the environment and that many environmental initiatives had been developed by the University. The prominence of the environment on the national agenda provided opportunities for the University to contribute to public policy.

(d) Controversial Events

Professor Goel indicated that a number of events that some members of the University might find controversial would be held in the coming months. A document that outlined the University's principles for dealing with such matters would be available shortly.   The University was being well-served by the improvements in internal and external communication.

(e) Academic Initiatives Fund

Professor Goel stated that requests for support from the Academic Initiatives Fund (AIF) were being reviewed. Thirty-two proposals totalling $22 million had been received from thirteen University divisions for this round of allocations. Recommendations concerning the allocations would be presented to the Planning and Budget Committee meeting on March 6, 2007.

---

[1] http://www.provost.utoronto.ca/English/University-of-Toronto-Art-Centre-Review.html

[2] http://www.provost.utoronto.ca/English/EnvironmentRoundTable.html

38253

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

(f) Leadership in Faculty Teaching

Professor Goel informed members that the Ontario government had opened nominations for the new Leadership in Faculty Teaching (LIFT) Award to recognize teaching excellence at Ontario's colleges and universities. The nominations for the LIFT Award had opened on January 8 and would close February 28, 2007. Up to 100 awards would be given to faculty who influenced, motivated and inspired students and demonstrated leadership in teaching methods for the diverse student body in Ontario. Winners would receive $20,000 over two years to encourage continued excellence in the classroom setting.

(g) Best Lecturer Competition [3]

Professor Goel encouraged members of the University community to participate in the TVO Best Lecturer election, which included six representatives from the University among the ten finalists. The finalists from the University of Toronto were:

- Professor Maydianne Andrade, Biology, University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC);
- Professor Ken Bartlett, History, Faculty of Arts and Science;
- Professor Marc Fournier, Psychology, UTSC;
- Professor Steve Joordens, Psychology, UTSC;
- Professor Bryan Karney, Civil Engineering, Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering;
- Professor Nick Mount, English, Faculty of Arts and Science.

5. *Statement on Research Partnerships*

The Chair advised members that this *Statement* had been considered by the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs (AP&P) at its December 6th meeting, as AP&P was responsible for policy on research and for monitoring the research activities of the University. The *Statement* required the approval of the Governing Council, on the recommendation of the Academic Board, and would be considered at the Council's February 1st meeting.

Professor Sass-Kortsak explained that this was the first of several proposals that would come forward from a review of all research policies conducted by Professor Challis and an advisory committee. The proposals had been reviewed by the Research Advisory Board and by Principals, Deans, Academic Directors and Chairs (PDAD&C).

The proposed *Statement on Research Partnerships* was a clear affirmation of the University's commitment to freedom of academic enquiry. There would be no limitations on research partnerships:
- that were conducted within legal limits;
- that conformed to University policies, including the *Policy on Ethical Conduct in Research* and the *Policy on Research Involving Human Subjects*, and
- that passed the usual reviews for such matters as the use of animals, and the use of biohazardous materials.

The *Statement* had received the full support of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs.

---

[3] http://www.tvo.org/TVOsites/WebObjects/TvoMicrosite.woa?bestlecturer

5.   *Statement on Research Partnerships* (cont'd)

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the proposed *Statement on Research Partnerships*, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "A", be approved.

6.   *Statement on Conflict of Interest and Conflict of Commitment* (cont'd)

The Chair advised members that this *Statement* had also been considered by the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs (AP&P) at its December 6th meeting, and required the approval of the Governing Council, on the recommendation of the Academic Board. The *Statement* would be considered at the Council's February 1st meeting.

Professor Sass-Kortsak explained that this was a statement of commitment to the principle of academic freedom that must, however, be exercised with appropriate regard for avoiding conflicts of interest. Potential conflicts had to be dealt with according to University policies. The proposed *Statement* had brought together in one place the University policies affecting conflicts of interest and commitment, and had reaffirmed those policies.

The *Statement* had won the full approval of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs.

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the proposed *Statement on Conflict of Interest and Conflict of Commitment*, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "B", be approved.

7.   *Policy on Information Technology*

The Chair advised members that this *Policy* had been considered by the Planning and Budget Committee (P&B) at its meeting on December 5, 2006, as P&B was responsible for policy on a broad range of planning issues and for the use of University resources. The *Policy* required the approval of the Governing Council on the recommendation of the Academic Board, and it would be considered at the meeting of the Governing Council scheduled for February 1, 2007.

Professor Diamond explained that the proposed *Policy on Information Technology* would replace two older policies: the *Policy on the Use and Development of Computing Facilities* and the *Computing Services Financial Policy and Accounting Practice in Respect of Major Computer Mainframe Acquisitions*.

The proposed new *Policy* was a high-level policy statement that did not address logistics and operational concerns. These topics would be addressed by the Information Technology (IT) committees and related working groups.

Professor Diamond commented that, during the discussion at the Planning and Budget Committee meeting, questions had been raised regarding possible "commercial use" of University IT. Professor Goel had explained that the main areas where IT might be used for commercial purposes were those overseen by the Vice-President, Business Affairs,

such as food services. In general, the relevant Vice-President would have to agree to such a use for University IT.

7. *Policy on Information Technology* (cont'd)

A member of the Board asked what body would provide oversight for the University's information technology. Professor Goel replied that the old policies did not address accountability issues. Under the new *Policy,* the administration would establish a committee structure to oversee information technologies and bring forward appropriate reports to governance.

>   On motion duly moved and seconded

>   YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

>   THAT the proposed Policy on Information Technology, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "C", be approved, replacing *the Policy on the Use and Development of Computing Facilities* (April 16, 1984) and the *Computing Services Financial Policy and Accounting Practice in Respect of Major Computer Mainframe Acquisitions* (December 21, 1978).

8. *Policy on Interdisciplinary Education and Research Planning*

The Chair explained that this *Policy* had also been considered by the Planning and Budget Committee (P&B) at its meeting on December 5th and required the approval of the Governing Council on the recommendation of the Academic Board. The Policy would be considered at the Council's February 1st meeting. If approved, the *Policy* would replace the recommendations of the 1984 Marsden Report.

Professor Diamond explained that the proposed policy was the result of the work of the Interdisciplinarity Committee in consultation with several University committees. The Policy reaffirmed the importance of excellent interdisciplinary and disciplinary teaching, learning and research at the University of Toronto.

The *Guidelines for Administrative Functions and Protocols of Extra-Departmental Units* (EDUs), which had been provided for information, would allow for the creation of units appropriate to the current needs of the University.

Professor Diamond reported that the Planning and Budget Committee had thoroughly discussed the proposed *Policy*. Points raised in the discussion had included:

- Clarification of the difference between EDU:A's and departments

  - Professor Goel had explained that departments generally offered a full range of undergraduate and graduate programs and research, whereas EDU:A's would offer specific programs where the number, quality, and research support of the faculty could foster an established program, and where the resources available to faculty and students could guarantee a "critical mass" of scholarship and admissions. An evolution towards an EDU:A was possible, although not every unit would do so.

- The advantage of an EDU:C versus an EDU:D

  - Professor Goel had explained that the creation of an EDU:A and B had to be approved by Governing Council, while the creation of an EDU:C and D could be approved at the divisional level. While an EDU:D could be approved by the relevant academic unit or department, an EDU:C required the approval of the divisional or faculty council.

8. ***Policy on Interdisciplinary Education and Research Planning*** (cont'd)

- EDUs and faculty appointments

  - An EDU:A had the authority to make faculty appointments, but a primary appointment could not be made to an EDU:B, C or D. The department or college where the faculty member first started his/her appointment would be the unit of primary appointment, and the head of the unit involved had to grant permission for any cross-appointment.

- Disestablishment of an EDU

  - The continuation of an EDU:A or B would be dependent on periodic review of the unit.

A member of the Board encouraged the University to take a broad view of interdisciplinarity and to recognize cross-cutting themes, including advances in digital technology and new methods of scholarly publishing.

> On motion duly moved and seconded
>
> YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS
>
> THAT the *Policy on Interdisciplinary Education and Research Planning,* a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "D", be approved, replacing the *Report of the Provostial Committee on Centres and Institutes,* approved by Governing Council in 1984.

9. Cinema Studies Institute: Establishment

The Chair noted that this item had been considered by the Planning and Budget Committee at its meeting on December 5th, as P&B considered plans and proposals for the establishment of academic units for recommendation to the Academic Board. The establishment of an academic unit required the approval of the Governing Council on the recommendation of the Academic Board.

Professor Diamond explained that the proposed establishment of the Cinema Studies Institute as an extra-departmental unit within Innis College had arisen from the *Stepping UP* planning of the Faculty of Arts and Science. It was an example of a unit that would bring together undergraduate and graduate activities with research opportunities, as well as an example of a college-based program that would remain housed in the College, even after the establishment of the Institute.

Professor Diamond indicated that a proposal for a Master of Arts program in Cinema Studies had been developed, and was being forwarded through the governance process for consideration.

At the invitation of the Chair, Professor Keil, Director of the Cinema Studies Program, commented that the creation of the institute was necessary for the establishment of the MA program. The Institute would provide more interaction with other students and increased research opportunities. In response to a question from a member of the Board, Professor Keil stated that 1,000 students were enrolled in courses in Cinema Studies.

9. Cinema Studies Institute: Establishment (cont'd)

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the Cinema Studies Institute be established within the Faculty of Arts and Science, and,

THAT the Cinema Studies Institute be established as an EDU:B unit, subject to the approval of the *Policy on Interdisciplinary Education and Research Planning.*

Documentation is attached hereto as Appendix "E".

10. Restructuring of Life Sciences at the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC)

The Chair reminded members that this was another item considered by the Planning and Budget Committee at its meeting on December 5th, as the Committee was responsible for considering plans and proposals for the establishment of academic units. The establishment of an academic unit required the approval of the Governing Council on the recommendation of the Academic Board.

Professor Diamond informed members that the proposed disestablishment of the Department of Life Sciences had been brought forward by the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC), with the intent to divide the existing unit into two departments – the Department of Psychology and the Department of Biological Sciences.   The proposal had the unanimous support of the faculty members in the Department of Life Sciences, and it had been approved by the UTSC Council.

Professor Diamond explained that the two programs currently existed at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, and the new departments would align with the tri-campus graduate structure. The interdisciplinary units that were currently housed within the Department of Life Sciences would continue their cross-collaboration. Some modest investments for the new departments would be needed in order to provide additional space and administrative staff, but the Dean of UTSC had committed to supplying the necessary funding.

Professor Buchweitz stated that this proposal reflected the ongoing restructuring and growth at UTSC.

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the Department of Life Sciences at the University of Toronto at Scarborough be disestablished coincident with the establishment of the new Department of Biological Sciences and the new Department of Psychology, effective July 1, 2007.

Documentation is attached hereto as Appendix "F".

11. Template for Full Affiliation Agreements between the University of Toronto and the Member Hospitals of the Toronto Academic Health Science Network (TAHSN)

The Chair explained that this item had been considered by the Planning and Budget Committee at its meeting on December 5ᵗʰ because the Committee was responsible for considering templates for agreements with external bodies. Such templates required the approval of the Governing Council on the recommendation of the Academic Board.

Professor Diamond informed members that the updated affiliation template agreement would provide greater clarity regarding the appropriate application of hospital and University policies, the resolution of disputes, and the status of faculty working on hospital sites.
The agreement would be customized and signed by each of the current full-member TAHSN hospitals.

Professor Diamond noted that, at the time of the Committee meeting, efforts were being made to persuade the community and full member TAHSN hospitals to agree to the same language around the issue of insurance and indemnification in the agreement. The Committee had approved the motion with the understanding that such revisions would not materially change the template. An agreement on the language had been reached, and the revised language was included in the template being considered by the Board.

At the Committee meeting, a question had been raised concerning the provision of protection for students under the agreement. Professor Whiteside had replied that hospitals would have the right to ask a student to desist from practice, if necessary, and that students would be covered by the University's *Code of Student Conduct*. The University had asked that any problematic student behaviour be communicated immediately so that proper procedures could be followed.

There had also been discussion concerning inventions and intellectual property. Professor Challis had indicated that the *Inventions Policy* was being revised to work more harmoniously with the hospitals. Professor Whiteside had provided clarification around section 3, Ownership, and she had explained that a faculty member who had received funding and had an appointment to a hospital would be required to follow the intellectual property policies of the hospital. If the faculty member were on campus, then the *Inventions Policy* would apply. In cases where faculty members had a joint function, guidelines were in place, and collegial negotiation would determine where the invention was made and where rights to it would reside. Negotiations would occur on a case-by-case basis.

At the Committee, a friendly amendment had been made to the motion to clarify that the agreement would be between the University and current full-member hospitals, as it was possible that the list of full member hospitals could be altered in the future.

Professor Whiteside, Dean of Medicine, thanked all the staff who had contributed to the development of the template agreement. She reported that a number of questions that had been raised by a member of the Board prior to the meeting, and she responded to these questions, as indicated below.

11. Template for Full Affiliation Agreements between the University of Toronto and the Member Hospitals of the Toronto Academic Health Science Network (cont'd)

1. Section III.3.1 did not mention undergraduate students working in research (as summer students through a university program, for instance, or in a research project course). Were they covered elsewhere?

- Students who were registered in a program were covered under the agreement. Students who were engaged in research over the summer as employees were covered by the hospital.

 2. Section IV provided jurisdictional information for sexual harassment cases, but not for physical and verbal harassment; it remained unclear to whom a hospital-affiliated faculty member or student would turn in such cases.

- Jurisdictional information concerning sexual harassment was articulated in the agreement because the *Policy and Procedures: Sexual Harassment* [4] is an approved University policy. Allegations of other types of harassment would be dealt with following usual practice.

 3. In a similar vein, the template did not specify who was responsible for student (and faculty member) health and safety, radiation, and biosafety in the hospital setting. This continued to be a source of confusion.

- Employees of the hospitals were covered by hospital rules. Students were responsible to their supervisors, and were required to take courses in health and safety.

 4. In section V.6, no mention was made of ethical use of animals. Should this be codified in the agreement?

- Section I.5 (iii) included policies that addressed the ethical use of animals in research. A consolidation of research policies was available on the website of the Faculty of Medicine.

 5. Finally, should the new *Statements on Research Partnerships, Conflict of Interest and Conflict of Commitmen*t, *and Policy on Interdisciplinary Education and Research Planning* (once approved) be referenced in the template?

- The template included the requirement that the University inform the hospitals of new policies that had been approved.

Professor Goel acknowledged the lengthy process that had resulted in this template agreement, and highlighted the fact that the template committed hospitals to the principles of academic freedom.

A member of the Board who identified himself as a Past Chair of the Board of a hospital, commended those involved for the development of the template agreement, and emphasized the fact that the template was taken very seriously by the hospitals involved.

---

[4] http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/AssetFactory.aspx?did=4827

38253

11. Template for Full Affiliation Agreements between the University of Toronto and the Member Hospitals of the Toronto Academic Health Science Network (cont'd)

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

1. THAT the template for full affiliation agreements between the University of Toronto and the current full member hospitals of the Toronto Academic Health Science Network, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "G", be approved, effective immediately;

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

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

12. School of Graduate Studies: Proposal for Master of Music (M.Mus.) and Doctor of Musical Arts (D.M.A.) in Music Performance Program

The Chair informed members that this item had been considered by the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs (AP&P) at its meeting on December 6th, and by the Planning and Budget Committee (P&B) at its meeting on December 5th. He explained that AP&P considered the academic content and requirements of new academic programs as well as major changes within academic programs, and took the lead role in bringing a recommendation forward to the Academic Board. P&B considered the planning and resource implications of proposals to establish, disestablish or significantly structure academic programs, and stated its concurrence with the recommendation from AP&P to the Academic Board. New degree programs required the approval of the Governing Council on the recommendation of the Academic Board.

Professor Sass-Kortsak informed members that, following a lengthy process of planning and discussion, the Faculty of Music had proposed to restructure its graduate programs into two program groups**.** The Program of Music would focus on research and would lead to M.A. and Ph.D. degrees in the fields of Musicology, Ethnomusicology or Music Education. The Ph.D. program in Music Education would be discontinued as a separate program to become a field within the Ph.D. program. The degree in Music Education would become a Master of Arts degree, rather than a Master of Music degree.

The Program of Music Performance would lead to the Master of Music degree in the fields of Composition, Instrumental, Vocal, Conducting, Opera, Jazz, Collaborative Piano, Vocal Pedagogy or Piano Pedagogy, and a Doctor of Musical Arts degree in the fields of Composition or Performance. This would bring the structure of the Faculty's programs into line with other leading university programs in Music in North America.

Professor Diamond indicated the concurrence of the Planning and Budget Committee with the proposed restructuring.

Professor Averill, Dean of the Faculty of Music, explained that the changes were being made in preparation for the review by the Ontario Council for Graduate Studies (OCGS).

A member asked whether the proposed changes would result in additional revenue for the Faculty, or whether it would continue to receive financial support from the University. Professor Averill stated that new revenue-generating programs were being created by the Faculty, and the restructured programs that were being proposed were intended to expand the graduate enrolment of the Faculty. Professor Goel noted that the Basic Income Unit

**12. School of Graduate Studies: Proposal for Master of Music (M.Mus.) and
     Doctor of Musical Arts (D.M.A.) in Music Performance Program** (cont'd)

(BIU) for a student in the Faculty of Music was low relative to the resources required to
deliver the Faculty's program. Although the proposed programs would lead to increased
revenues, a transfer of University funds might still be necessary to support the programs
of the Faculty. The new budget model was intended to allow members to engage in
discussion of these broader issues, and to ensure academic priorities were supported. It
would not be appropriate to strive to simply match revenues and expenses for each unit.

A member commented that it would be dangerous to institute a funding model that
would, effectively penalize a department or division because of its difficulty in generating
revenue. Among other baleful effects, this would entail discrimination against the
humanities.

A member asked whether the field of ethnomusicology was new to the Faculty. Professor
Averill replied that the Faculty had offered courses in ethnomusicology for the past thirty
years.

> On motion duly moved and seconded
>
> YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS
>
> THAT the restructuring of graduate programs as outlined in the proposal from
> the Faculty of Music, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "H", be
> approved, effective September 2007, and
>
> THAT the proposal from the Faculty of Music to introduce a Master of Music
> (Mus.M,) and a Doctor of Musical Arts (D.M.A.) in the Music Performance
> Program be approved, effective September 2007.

**13. Capital Project: Interim Project Planning Committee Report: Expansion of the
     Rotman School of Management Facilities**

The Chair explained that the *Policy on Capital Planning and Capital Projects* required
that all Project Planning Committee Reports be considered by the Planning and Budget
Committee (P&B) for recommendation to the Academic Board. Both Interim and Final
Project Planning Committee Reports were approved by the Governing Council on the
recommendation of the Academic Board.

Procedural Clarification

The Chair advised members that, on the recommendation of the Office of the Governing
Council, a change had been made in the wording of the 'subject to' clause of the motion
that had been approved by the Planning and Budget Committee. The revised wording
had been included on the Board's agenda and in the draft report of the Planning and
Budget meeting.
The intent of the revised wording had been to provide greater clarity with respect to the
resolution and expected process.

The Chair invited the Secretary of the Governing Council to comment.

Mr. Charpentier stated that the original wording had indicated that the approval of the
Interim Project Planning Report was subject to approval by the Governing Council of a
completed Project Planning Report. A strict interpretation of this wording would have
meant that the approval in principle of the Interim Project Planning Report would not
take effect until the final report had been approved, which would have been opposite to
the intent of the motion.

38253

13. Capital Project: Interim Project Planning Committee Report: Expansion of the Rotman School of Management Facilities (cont'd)

Procedural Clarification (cont'd)

Although the change made by the Secretariat had been technically correct, concerns had been expressed about the revision. Mr. Charpentier therefore suggested that the Board consider the original motion that was included in the cover sheet for the item.

He noted for the record that the intent of the original motion was approval in principle of the Interim Project Planning Report to allow the Rotman School to pursue funding opportunities for its planned expansion on Site 11. A final Project Planning Report that included the site, the space program for the project, the total project cost and sources of funding had to be approved by the Governing Council, on the recommendation of the Academic Board based on advice from the Planning and Budget Committee. If the final Project Planning Report was not approved, the directions proposed in the Interim Report would not take effect.

Mr. Charpentier advised members that, in future, the Secretariat would work toward greater simplicity and consistency with respect to 'in principle' motions. Qualifiers, understandings, or caveats would be recorded in the minutes of the meeting, rather than being included in the motion.

He indicated that 'in principle' was meant to signal approval of the proposed directions outlined in the documentation, but also to allow appropriate flexibility in the implementation of the proposal. In most cases, approval in principle should be sufficient. Mr. Charpentier reminded members that, in most cases, if changes occurred in capital projects, further governance review and approval were required.

Introduction

Professor Diamond informed members that Rotman's Academic Plan 2004 had involved a significant increase in the scale and scope of all the School's activities. The plan was in line with the University's objective of expanding graduate enrolments and research focus. Space requirements identified in the draft space program for the Rotman School exceeded the envelope capacity of the preferred approved development site (Site 11). The current recommendation was for the assignment of the site to this project and for approval in principle for increased space. The total projected cost of the new building planned for Site 11 was approximately $100,000,000. The funding for this project would be assembled from a number of sources, including private sources that would be matched by the government.

Detailed planning with Student Affairs and the Faculty of Arts and Science would occur, and a relocation plan for current occupants of the site (CIUT, the Sex Education Centre and the Department of Classics) and associated costs would be provided in the final project planning report.

Discussion

At the invitation of the Chair, Professor Pauly explained that the number of programs and faculty members in the School had doubled since the school had moved into its current building in 1995. The current academic plan envisioned a further 50% expansion, including the creation of several important research centres.

A member asked whether the environmental issues had been considered by the Project Planning Committee, and whether the project would receive environment certification.

Ms Sisam replied that all Project Planning Committees addressed environmental concerns, but certification was not always possible.

13. Capital Project: Interim Project Planning Committee Report: Expansion of the Rotman School of Management Facilities (cont'd)

A member emphasized the need for strategic planning and creative vision in the development of the area that included site 11, the Robarts Library and the Bissell Building.

A member asked what would happen to the buildings that were currently located on site 11. Ms Sisam replied that City of Toronto heritage requirements required the retention of the building façades.

A member asked whether the proposed expansion would be sufficient for the School's plans. If further growth became necessary, where would the growth occur? Professor Goel replied that the recent review of the University's real estate strategy would be considered by the Business Board and presented to the Planning and Budget Committee in January. The University had projected sufficient capacity to achieve its enrolment plans over the next two or so decades. However, after completing the projects included in the next capital plan, not much space would remain across the three campuses. Professor Goel added that a long-term vision needed to be developed to address the question of how large the University should become.

> On motion duly moved and seconded
>
> YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS
>
> Subject to approval by the Governing Council of a completed Project Planning Report,
>
> THAT the Interim Project Planning Report for the Rotman School of Management, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "I", be approved in principle to accommodate the activities and functions described for the expansion of the School's programs on 91-97 St. George Street (site 11).

14. Constitution: Faculty of Information Studies

The Chair reminded members that divisional constitutions came directly to the Academic Board for approval. Since the majority of members of the Academic Board are not members of the Governing Council, decisions made by the Board had to be confirmed by the Executive Committee.

Professor Goel explained that the reorganization of the School of Graduate Studies had resulted in the review, revision, and updating of divisional constitutions. A template had been developed to assist divisions in revising their constitutions. The Council of the Faculty of Information Studies had approved the revised constitution on November 21, 2006.

> On motion duly moved and seconded
>
> YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS
>
> THAT the Executive Committee confirm
>
> THAT the revised Constitution of the Faculty of Information Studies, approved on November 21, 2006, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "J", be approved.

15. Constitution: Faculty of Social Work

Professor Goel stated that the revisions in this Constitution were the result of the reorganization of the School of Graduate Studies. The revisions were consistent with the constitutional template that had been developed.

> On motion duly moved and seconded
>
> YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS
>
> THAT the Executive Committee confirm
>
> THAT the revised Constitution of the Faculty of Social Work, approved on December 5, 2006, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "K", be approved.

16. Faculty of Arts and Science: Departmental Name Change

The Chair informed members that name changes of academic units came directly to the Board for approval, and were confirmed by the Executive Committee.

Professor Goel indicated that the name change had been developed in consultation with members of the Department and had been approved by the Faculty Council on December 4, 2006.

> On motion duly moved and seconded
>
> YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS
>
> THAT the Executive Committee confirm
>
> THAT the name of the Faculty of Arts and Science Department of Fine Art and Graduate Department of the History of Art become the "Department of Art" and "Graduate Department of Art" respectively, effective immediately.

Documentation is attached hereto as Appendix "I".

17. Items for Information

> a. **Status Changes**

Members received a number of status changes for information. There were no questions.

> b. **Capital Plan: Report on Projects in Excess of $2 million**

Members received the report on Projects in Excess of $2 million for information. There were no questions.

38253

17. Items for Information (cont'd)

    c. **Report Number 126 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs (December 6, 2006)**

Professor Sass-Kortsak encouraged members of the Academic Board to take particular note of Appendix "F" to the Report of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs – the University's new *Framework to Address Allegations of Research Misconduct.* The *Framework* clarified the University's procedures to deal with allegations of research misconduct under its research policies and under the *Code of Behaviour in Academic Matters*. The Framework made it clear that the key point of contact with respect to allegations of research misconduct was the Vice-President, Research and Associate Provost.

    d. **Report Number 115 of the Planning and Budget Committee (December 5, 2006)**

The report had been distributed electronically prior to the meeting, and copies had been available at the door. There were no questions.

18.   Date of Next Meeting

The Chair reminded members that the next meeting was scheduled for February 15, 2007.

19.   Other Business

Academic Board Elections

The Chair reminded members that a list of elected teaching staff and librarian members of the Board and the date their term ended had been included in the agenda package. Nominations were open until 5:00 p.m. on January 26 for 17 seats on the Academic Board for three-year terms effective July 1, 2007.
- 5 seats in Arts and Science;
- 4 seats in Medicine;
- 1 seat in each of the following divisions:
  - Applied Science and Engineering;
  - Architecture, Landscape and Design;
  - Management;
  - OISE/UT;
  - Physical Education and Health;
  - Social Work;
  - UTM;
  - UTSC.

The Chair also noted that nominations were open for administrative staff, students and teaching staff members of the Governing Council.

Nomination forms for the Governing Council and Academic Board elections were available on the Governing Council website. The Chair encouraged members to support the election process by standing as a candidate, nominating colleagues, and voting.

The Board moved *in camera*.

20.   Report of the Tribunal Selection Committee

Members were advised that the report had been deferred until the February meeting, as not all those who had been nominated to the University Tribunal had agreed to accept the nomination to the position.

38253

21.   Report of Donations over $250,000, August 1 – October 31, 2006

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

22.   Report of the Striking Committee of the Academic Board

> On motion duly moved and seconded
>
> YOUR BOARD APPROVED
>
> THAT Professor Mariel O'Neill-Karch be appointed to the Agenda Committee for 2006-2007, effective immediately.
>
> The meeting adjourned at 5:40 p.m.

Secretary   Chair

January 24, 2007