

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL
REPORT NUMBER 148 OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD
February 15, 2007

To the Governing Council,
University of Toronto

Your Board reports that it held a meeting on Thursday, February 15, 2007 at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall at which the following were present:

Professor Michael R. Marrus (Chair)	Dr. Christena Chruszez	Mr. Roger P. Parkinson
Professor Brian Corman, Vice-Chair	Professor David Cook	Professor Susan Pfeiffer
Professor John Challis, Vice-President, Research and Associate Provost	Mr. Kristofer T. Coward	Professor Richard Reznick
Professor Vivek Goel, Vice-President and Provost	Mr. Ken Davy	Mr. Paul Ruppert
Professor S. Zaky, Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget	Miss Saswati Deb	Professor Andrea Sass-Kortsak
Professor Stewart Aitchison	Dr. Raisa B. Deber	Professor Anthony N. Sinclair
Professor Varouj Aivazian	Professor Miriam Diamond	Professor Pekka Sinervo
Professor Derek Allen	Ms. Linda B. Gardner	Professor Tattersall Smith
Professor Christy Anderson	Professor Jane Gaskell	Professor J.J. Berry Smith
Professor Gage Averill	Ms Bonnie Goldberg	Professor Brian Cantwell Smith
Mr. Brian Beaton	Ms Pamela Gravestock	Miss Maureen J. Somerville
Professor Katherine Berg	Mr. Billeh Hamud	Professor Suzanne Stevenson
Professor Ragnar Buchweitz	Mr. Umar Khan	Dr. Robert S. Turnbull
Mr. Ryan Matthew Campbell	Professor Bruce Kidd	Dr. Donald A. Wasylenki
Mr. Ewen Weili Chen	Dr. Lesley Ann Lavack	Dr. Cindy Woodland
	Professor Thomas Mathien	
	Mr. Geoffrey Matus	Mr. Louis R. Charpentier, Secretary of the Governing Council
	Professor David Mock	
	Professor Michael Molloy	
	Ms Carole Moore	
	Professor Mayo Moran	
	Professor Sioban Nelson	
	Professor Mariel O'Neill-Karch	

Regrets:

Professor Cristina Amon	Professor Hugh Gunz	Ms Vera Melnyk
Professor Jan Angus	Professor Rick Halpern	Mr. Matto Mildenberger
Professor George Baird	Mrs. Bonnie Horne	Professor John R. Miron
Professor Sylvia Bashevkin	Professor Brad Inwood	Professor Faye Mishna
Professor Clare Beghtol	Professor Yuki Mayumi Johnson	Professor Mayo Moran
Professor David R. Begun	Professor Charles Jones	Professor Donna Orwin
Professor Reina Bendayan	Professor Gregory Jump	Professor Janet Paterson
Dr. Terry Blake	Mr. Mohammed Khan	Ms Theresa Pazonis
Ms Marilyn Booth	Dr. Wajahat Khan	Professor Cheryl Regehr
Professor Donald Brean	Dr. Joel A. Kirsh	Professor Robert Reisz
Mr. Terry Buckland	Dr. Chris Koenig-Woodyard	Professor Jolie Ringash
Professor George Elliott Clarke	Professor Hon C. Kwan	Professor Gareth Seaward
Professor John Coleman		Professor Ron Smyth

Regrets (cont'd):

Mr. Tim Corson	Professor Robert Levit	Mr. Omar Solimon
Professor Alister Cumming	Professor Lori Loeb	Professor Lorne Sossin
Professor Luc F. DeNil	Dr. Gillian MacKay	Professor Lisa Steele
Professor Dickson Eyoh	Professor Roger L. Martin	Professor Kim Strong
Professor Guy Faulkner	Professor Diane Massam	Professor Rinaldo Wayne
Professor David Farrar	Professor Brenda Y.	Walcott
Dr. Shari Graham Fell	McCabe	Professor Catharine
Mr. John A. Fraser	Professor Douglas	Whiteside
Professor Avrum Gotlieb	McDougall	Mr. Patrick Wong
Professor William Gough	Professor Mark McGowan	

Non-voting Assessors:

Professor Angela Hildyard
 Professor Cheryl Misak
 Ms Catherine Riggall
 Ms Elizabeth Sisam

Secretariat:

Ms Cristina Oke
 Ms Mae-Yu Tan

In Attendance:

Professor Janice Boddy, Chair, Department of Anthropology
 Ms Sheree Drummond, Assistant Provost
 Ms Kate Hilton, Assistant Dean, Alumni and Development, Faculty of Law
 Professor Charlie Keil, Director, Cinema Studies Program, Faculty of Arts and Science
 Professor Scott Mabury, Chair, Department of Chemistry

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

1. Approval of Report Number 147 of the Meeting held on January 11, 2007

The Chair noted that some corrections in the attendance list had been brought to the attention of the Secretary. Report Number 147 of the meeting held on January 11, 2007 was approved.

2. Business Arising Out of the Report

There was no business arising from the previous meeting.

3. Report Number 135 of the Agenda Committee (February 6, 2007)

The Chair drew the attention of members to the Agenda Committee's approval of several academic administrative appointments.

4. Report from the Vice-President and Provost

(a) Sustainability Symposium

Professor Goel informed members of the full-day symposium entitled *Moving Canada Towards Sustainability*¹ that would take place on Wednesday, February 21, 2007. Scholars from all three of the University of Toronto campuses would participate in the forum to discuss global environmental issues. The latest science, research findings and issues related to global climate change, energy challenges, and environment and health would be presented in an effort to provide direction to governments, industry, policy-makers and the public. The symposium would involve a number of panel presentations and would include a luncheon keynote address by Mayor David Miller. The former American Vice President, Al Gore, would deliver a lecture at Convocation Hall in the evening.

(b) Student Experience Fund

Professor Goel noted that funds had been allocated for a number of initiatives during the first round of the Student Experience Fund (SEF). The initiatives had included enhancements of student study space and upgrades to student activity space, and the initiatives had been reported for information to the Planning and Budget Committee (P&B) in October, 2006. The second round of the SEF process was nearing its conclusion; once finalized, the list of allocations would be submitted to P&B. To learn more about the implementation of the various initiatives, Professor Goel encouraged Board members to read the regular *Spotlight on Students* feature in *The Bulletin* newspaper.

(c) Blackboard Learning Management System

Professor Goel commented that the implementation of the Student Portal was a significant exercise. The Blackboard consultants had informed the University that the project to deploy the Learning Management System (LMS) across the three campuses of an institution of such magnitude was among the largest it had undertaken. The Blackboard Academic Suite was being used for approximately 1,100 courses in 2006-2007; it was noted that the figure was slightly ahead of the target that had been set for that phase of the project. However, there remained many implementation issues that needed to be resolved. For example, one objective was to create a single authentication and login process that would simplify use by students, providing them with access to multiple functions such as web mail, the portal or library services. Over time, new features and capabilities for the LMS would emerge. An active Blackboard Users Group was providing a forum for instructors to informally share ideas and techniques, learn new skills and have questions answered.

(d) Academic Integrity

Professor Goel reported that *Macleans* magazine had featured a cover article in its February 9th issue entitled “*The great university cheating scandal*”. The focus of the article had been on the concern about academic integrity at universities. The magazine had reported on a University of Guelph study that had been conducted a few years earlier.

¹ <http://www.utoronto.ca/environment/symposium.shtml>

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

(d) Academic Integrity (cont'd)

While the study was based on a survey instrument from Duke University, it had limitations, such as a low response rate.

Professor Goel stated that the authors of the study had intended to use the findings to highlight the issue, rather than to provide a definitive assessment of the occurrence of cheating within Canada. Although the *Maclean's* article had suggested that universities were not doing enough to address the issue of cheating, Professor Goel noted that the University had always taken the issue seriously. Matters of academic integrity had been discussed by the Academic Board as a matter of course.

Professor Goel noted that only a small number of academic discipline cases were heard at the highest level, namely by the University Tribunal. The bulk of cases of academic offences were dealt with at the departmental or divisional level. Initiatives were in place, for example through the Office of Teaching Advancement and the Office of Student Academic Conduct (Faculty of Arts and Science), that were designed to ensure that training and education would be available on this issue.

(e) Controversial Events

Professor Goel indicated that some controversial events would be occurring on campus over the next few weeks. "Israel Apartheid Week", organized by the Arab Students Collective, was taking place from February 12 – 17, and "Freedom and Democracy Week", organized by Betar Tagar, would occur at the beginning of March. A Principals, Deans, Academic Directors and Chairs (PDAD&C) memo regarding controversial events on campus and freedom of speech had been issued and was available on the Office of the Vice President and Provost's website.²

(f) Vision 2030

Professor Goel stated that the President had initiated the Vision 2030 exercise, in which the long-term direction of the University would be addressed. The University community would be encouraged to think towards a horizon much longer than the traditional five-year planning cycle and to raise relevant questions. This exercise was intended to examine the larger questions such as how the three campuses would evolve, especially with respect to the planned graduate expansion, and how the University would position itself in the changing post-secondary system in the Greater Toronto Area. It would be more broad than the cyclical academic planning process. Professor Goel commented that the Capital Plan had been based on existing enrolment data with projections only to 2011. As such, the outcome of the Vision 2030 exercise could have a significant impact on Capital Plans in the future.

² <http://www.provost.utoronto.ca/English/controversialevents.html>

5. Accountability Reports for Governance

The Chair informed members that two accountability reports were being presented for information, the *Performance Indicators for Governance: Measuring UP*, and the *Annual Report of the Vice-President, Research and Associate Provost*.

(a) *Performance Indicators for Governance: Measuring UP*

Professor Goel commented that in past years the Performance Indicators Report had been reported to the Academic Board for information. This was the first time that a presentation on performance indicators had been made to the Academic Board. The report had already been presented for information to Governing Council, and the *Annual Report of the Vice-President, Research and Associate Provost* had been presented to the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs.

It was important to know how the University was performing in terms of its aspirations, and the performance indicators provided one means of assessment. Other important methods of quality assessment were used, such as external peer review of grants, books, articles, and other publications; assessment of teaching through classroom visits and evaluations by students; and reviews of programs, faculties and divisions which usually occurred every five years. As part of this process, each year a compendium of faculty and department reviews was submitted to the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs.

Student Experience

Professor Goel reported that the University's student-faculty ratio was relatively high in comparison with other Canadian, research-intensive universities. The level of academic challenge was another benchmark that had been measured. The University's scores for two years (2004 and 2006) had been compared with that of the 2006 aggregate of its Canadian peers for both first-year and senior-year students. The results showed that the University of Toronto's performance had been similar to that of its Canadian peers. With respect to overall enriching educational experiences, both in and out of the classroom, the University had performed somewhat less well than its Canadian peers. It was expected that recent initiatives to provide improved student space, such as the Varsity Centre and the Multifaith Centre, would begin to address student needs in this area.

On the measure of a supportive campus environment, the University had also performed less well than its peers. The University's 2006 scores for both first-year and senior-year students had decreased slightly from those in 2004. It was noted that several new initiatives to enhance the student experience had been undertaken since 2004, but that it would take some time for the effects of these initiatives to become apparent in the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) measures. Items that had focused on group learning and interaction with other students, faculty and teaching assistants had been used to assess student perceptions of opportunities for active and collaborative learning. The University's 2006 scores for both first-year and senior-year students were lower than its peers on that measure.

University of Toronto students, both first-year and senior-year, were more likely than students at other Canadian universities to evaluate their educational experience at university as being fair or poor, though 68.7% of senior years and 70.7% of first years evaluated their experience as good or excellent. University of Toronto students' self-

5. Accountability Reports for Governance (cont'd)

(a) *Performance Indicators for Governance: Measuring UP* (cont'd)

reported perceptions of their grades were less favourable than other Canadian students; they were more likely to predict that their marks would be in the “C” and “B” range.

Retention and Entering Grades

The first-year retention rate at the University in 2005 had been compared with those of other American, public institutions with varying admission standards. It had been found that the University's retention rate was as good as or better than all categories of institutions including those that were highly selective in their admissions standards. The University's entering grade distribution for first-entry programs had been quite stable over time; there had been only slight changes between Fall 2003 and Fall 2005.

Graduate Student Experiences

The Graduate and Professional Student Survey (GPSS) results from 2005 had shown that although students had rated the quality of their academic experiences and their graduate program at the University as being better than that of Canadian peers, student life experiences had been rated as lower. The University had performed well on measures of doctoral dissertation awards granted between 1992-2005, achieving a greater percentage share than Canadian peers. Several initiatives to begin to address student life needs had been implemented after the 2003 GPSS.

Community Outreach

Professor Goel stated that community outreach was an important University goal and activity. One of the projects supported by the Academic Initiatives Fund had been the establishment of the Centre for Community Partnership in 2005. The Centre facilitated University-Community activities and a variety of projects, providing relevant training for students engaging in community activities. It had been found that community-based curricular (teaching) and co-curricular (service) opportunities for students coordinated through the Centre had increased over the previous year.

Equity and Diversity

Equity and diversity were an important part of the University plan, and those factors had been examined. The University's proportion of first-year and senior-year students of visible minority backgrounds was almost double that of peer institutions in Ontario.

Revenue per Student

Professor Goel commented that revenue continued to pose a challenge for the University. Comparisons with Association of American Universities peers had been conducted of the total of all revenue (in American funds) per full-time equivalent student. It had been shown that the University's funding was less than half of the median of peer American public, research-intensive institutions. Despite the substantial disparity in funding, the University had been able to maintain its commitment to providing financial aid to students. A significantly lower percentage of the University's first-year and senior-year students, in comparison with Ontario peers, had reported financial pressures or work obligations as having posed the greatest obstacle to their academic progress.

Professor Goel concluded by noting that there had been a continual evolution of the performance indicators report over the years. The University would continue to make

5. Accountability Reports for Governance (cont'd)

(a) *Performance Indicators for Governance: Measuring UP* (cont'd)

efforts to improve on its reporting measures. In addition, more analysis would be required of the NSSE data as there was a clear need for the University to take account of the survey results.

(b) *Annual Report of the Vice-President, Research and Associate Provost*

Professor Challis presented the highlights of the *Annual Report of the Vice-President, Research and Associate Provost for 2005-06*.

Funding

The total amount of research funds awarded to the University of Toronto and affiliated hospitals in the fiscal year 2004-05 had been \$699 million. Approximately 50% of the total research funding had been awarded to colleagues at affiliated teaching hospitals. Funding from the tri-councils [the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR), the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC), and the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council (NSERC)] had comprised 31% of the total research awards.

Distribution of Grants and Funds

The distributions of the number of grants and of funds awarded as a function of faculty age produced different patterns from one federal research council to the other. For example, for SSHRC, the number of grants was almost evenly distributed across age groups ranging from 35 – 65. In contrast, the funds awarded remained moderate between the 30-34 and 50-54 age ranges, then increased dramatically in the next two age ranges.

Canada Research Chairs

There were 267 Canada Research Chairs at the University, the largest number of any university. Of the Chairs, 59% had been appointed from within the University, and 36% had been recruited from outside of Canada.

Publications and Citations

For the period 2001-05, the University of Toronto ranked second only to Harvard University in the number of publications among the AAU members and the group of 13 leading Canadian research-intensive universities (the G13). It ranked first among public universities and the Canadian G13 universities. The University of Toronto, including its affiliates, ranked sixth in the number of citations among the AAU and G13 universities and third among the public universities.

The Thomson ISI survey of citations had identified about 250 highly cited researchers in 21 disciplines at Canadian universities. Of those, 33 were University of Toronto researchers. That was a remarkable outcome and an important measure that the University would continue to monitor.

Honours

An important measure of research output was the honours conferred on members of the University's faculty. The report cited a long list of recipients of international and Canadian awards.

5. Accountability Reports for Governance (cont'd)

(b) *Annual Report of the Vice-President, Research and Associate Provost* (cont'd)

Innovation and Commercialization

Revenue from research grants from industrial sources and from research contracts in 2004-05 represented 9.3% of the University's total revenue, a slight decline in the proportion in the previous year. That still represented \$65.7 million, which was both a large amount of money and an increase in dollar terms from the \$52.5 million the previous year. That said, Professor Challis was confident that the amount and proportion could be improved.

The Chair commented that the reports presented were of great importance to the University, and informed members that they were welcome to have individual discussions with Professors Goel and Challis to share any comments or questions.

6. Capital Plan, 2006-2011

The Chair stated that Professor Goel and Ms Riggall would give an integrated presentation of the proposed new Capital Plan, the Real Estate Strategy, and the Borrowing Strategy.

Professor Goel observed that it was important to begin with the academic plan of the University when developing the Capital Plan and priorities over time. This was the first time that the Capital Plan had been presented in conjunction with a real estate strategy of the University and an update to the borrowing strategy. In recent years, the borrowing capacity had become a parameter for focus in capital decisions, but it was important to consider the whole context. The University was distinguishing between operating and capital budgets, with the view to ensuring that the needs of the students were met.

The Capital Plan was not a short fixed list of projects, as it was ten years ago. Rather, it was a dynamic list of projects the University was considering planning towards. That approach was designed to allow the University to better respond to changing needs and circumstances.

Among the factors to be considered in the context of capital plans were the following:

- Academic plans
- Council of Ontario Universities (COU) space standards
- Existing real estate holdings – deferred maintenance
- Municipal zoning
- Heritage requirements
- Funding sources
- Financing capacity
- Ability to respond to opportunities

University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM)

The UTM campus had undergone rapid development in the past years. Although it would seem that there was land available, only two major building sites remained that were zoned for development. Much of the Credit River Valley land could not be developed since there were conservation requirements which must be met. Additional

6. Capital Plan, 2006-2011 (cont'd)

flexibility existed, for example, the potential use of parking lots for future development was possible, but would require rezoning and replacement of parking through construction of garages. As well, due to the manner in which the original buildings had been designed, infill might also be possible. For example, the proposed Medical Academy would be built out from the original South Building. However, the campus would reach capacity in the not so distant future.

University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC)

Some building sites did exist on the UTSC campus, but were constrained due to the tight building sites and conservation issues. There was some room for growth, and infill and build-up could be explored, but the campus would also reach capacity soon.

St. George Campus

Some potential new development sites existed; otherwise, there were only a few options remaining. As master plans were reviewed, there were some opportunities to seek rezoning to increase the density to be consistent with the City of Toronto's master plans for the surrounding area.

The Capital Plan, 2006-2011

Based on current enrolment projections, it was expected that over the next twenty years the University would fill out and develop most of the available sites across all three campuses. It was noted that there were currently shortages of space with current enrolment. The changing nature of academic activities would drive the need for more interactive space. Even without further enrolment growth, a need would still exist to accommodate faculty and staff. It was important to plan in terms of a long-term period, as present real estate decisions would affect future generations.

The Capital Plan identified major capital projects at various stages of consideration. Principals and Deans had been invited to identify their needs for capital projects to advance their divisions' academic plans. The costs of the projects included in the plan were often of a rough order of magnitude because many had not yet reached the state of having project planning reports. The total estimated cost of the projects in the plan was \$700 million, but that amount could ultimately vary substantially. Each project would be considered on an individual basis when submitted to the Planning and Budget Committee.

Over the last five years, there had been a shift in the pattern of capital work. Previously, there had been a focus on meeting the needs of the double cohort by constructing new student residences, particularly at UTM and UTSC, and constructing new academic facilities. The focus was now on graduate expansion and enhancing the student experience. Many planned projects related to student space, such as athletic facilities and libraries. There was a shift from new buildings to optimizing the use of existing facilities through capital renewal and repurposing. Renovations were often as costly as new construction, due to technical complexities in meeting code, accessibility and environmental requirements. The University would also continue to seize the opportunity to harmonize deferred maintenance needs with the provision of facilities for new academic priorities.

6. Capital Plan, 2006-2011 (cont'd)

The Real-Estate Strategy

Ms Riggall provided an overview of the University's Real Estate Strategy. She stated that the University owned nearly 700 acres, with 75% of the property in the downtown Toronto area. The property was the site of approximately 200 buildings. The market value of the University's properties was about \$4-billion – far greater than the value of the endowment funds. The quality of the University's campuses and its buildings was an essential element of the student experience. Ms Riggall noted that the previous real estate strategy had been approved in 1995. The current strategy had focused on three questions:

- Does the University have enough land to meet needs identified in the capital plan and the academic plans?
- Is the University managing its real estate assets appropriately?
- Is the University leveraging the value of its real estate assets and maximizing the return on the assets?

The review had concluded that the University did not have sufficient land to meet its aspirations. To achieve the COU space standards and meet the growth projected to 2011, the University would require additional buildings: (a) on the St. George campus providing space equal to four times that of the Robarts Library, (b) on the UTM campus equal to that of five Hazel McCallion Academic Learning Centres, and (c) on the UTSC campus equal to that of six Arts and Administration Buildings. It was clear that additional land would be required for the further development of the St. George Campus. It was possible that the growth of the UTM and UTSC campuses could be accommodated by more intensive use of the current real-estate by adding height, but there were limits to growth on those campuses arising from their being surrounded by residential neighbourhoods and conservation areas. Overall, there was a long-term need for significant additional University property.

Ms Riggall indicated that she believed that the University could improve the strategic management of its real estate assets. While its land and buildings were its largest asset, they had not been managed with a strategic focus.

Services provided by the Real Estate Ancillary to other parts of the University had not been clearly identified and structured for efficiency. However, the new budget model would drive a change to have services to faculties provided outside the ancillary. That would allocate revenues and expenses to the appropriate unit. The Ancillary could then focus on managing the rental property holdings.

Ms Riggall stated that the Real Estate Strategy and its tactical implementation were of value to the whole University, and they should not be included in the responsibilities of the Ancillary. There was a need for more expertise to develop the Real Estate Strategy and to leverage the value of the assets. A real estate advisory board of expert volunteers was being established to work with a new officer to provide guidance on the structuring of real estate deals, negotiation tactics, and the development of relationships. To leverage further the value of its real estate, the University would develop and implement policies to divest surplus properties, to deal with offers of donations of property, and to lease and license property.

6. Capital Plan, 2006-2011 (cont'd)

Ms Riggall then addressed the question of the University's ability to pay for the estimated \$700-million cost of the new Capital Plan and for future acquisitions of land and buildings. The answer to that question required consideration of the Borrowing Strategy, which had been developed by Ms Brown and her colleagues in the Financial Services Department.

The Current Borrowing Strategy

Ms Riggall noted that the current borrowing strategy limited external debt to forty percent of the University's net assets averaged over five years, and the maximum internal borrowing capacity was limited to \$200 million of internal funds. Ideally, each capital project would include a significant equity contribution in order to make it more economically viable. Comparisons with peer institutions with respect to the University's external borrowing had been conducted using Moody's U.S. Public College and University Medians 2006. It had been determined that to date the University had borrowed externally less than its rating peers, but it had fewer resources to support debt issuance, and it had internal debt.

The borrowing strategy had been reviewed from a variety of perspectives, including the projected capacity over time, the ability to pay, and the controls on repayment. Some constraints that had guided the University's ability to repay debt were the requirement for regular principal and interest payments for each project at specified interest rates linked to market rates, and the requirement for an internal sinking fund that accumulated funds for the repayment of the debentures at maturity. It was noted that the sinking fund was not required by the University's lenders. While it would still be necessary to carry out fundraising to support capital projects, the current borrowing strategy continued to be financially prudent, and it was projected to provide sufficient capacity to meet the anticipated borrowing requirement for key priorities over the next several years. Therefore no change to the strategy was recommended. The strategy had been well received by the lending community.

Ms. Riggall stressed that all of the University's debt was set at fixed interest rates. The long-term rates were extremely low, resulting in a very low debt-service level. The current strategy was projected to make available between \$251 and \$349 million in additional borrowing capacity by 2010. The total debt levels could reach as high as \$1.071 billion by 2010 and still remain within the defined strategy. At fifty percent debt financing, the University could undertake an additional \$500 to \$700 million in capital projects, although managing the work of such projects could prove challenging. Enhancing the student experience and attracting the best and brightest faculty and students would require further investment in land and buildings. The University did have the capacity to make such investments, but it would have to continue to apply the discipline exhibited to date.

Planning & Budget Committee Discussion

Professor Diamond reported that the Planning & Budget Committee (P&B) had had a good discussion about the proposed Capital Plan. Points raised had included the desirability of enrolment growth, and questions about deferred maintenance. Professor Goel had explained that a decrease in enrolment could have significant implications for provincial funding; therefore a careful planning process was needed. The key message

6. Capital Plan, 2006-2011 (cont'd)

was that, even with a steady state enrolment, the University was short of the space needed.

A Committee member had suggested that some divisions had not undergone strong planning exercises to provide projections to 2011. Professor Goel had replied that the Capital Plan set out the major Capital Projects to which the University had assigned priority for a specified period of time. The list would evolve as divisions updated plans.

At the Committee meeting, in response to a question concerning deferred maintenance, Professor Goel had noted that significant investments had been made over the past few years. The strategy was to ensure that the level of deferred maintenance remained steady and was not increasing.

Board Discussion

A member of the Board complimented Professor Goel and his colleagues on the high quality of the Capital Plan, and stated that he agreed with all of the points that had been raised. The member questioned whether the University had considered the option of reducing student enrolment as one solution to a number of the problems that had been raised. If that step were taken, what proportion of the \$700 million cost of the new Capital Plan would still be required? Would graduate enrolment levels still need to be increased? How would the student-faculty ratio be affected? What effect would decreased enrolment have on the University's space standards?

Professor Goel replied that very few projects on the Capital Projects List were tied to enrolment. Many of the projects dealt with the renewal of older buildings, because buildings typically lasted about forty years until they required major maintenance needs. Professor Goel acknowledged that if there was a decrease in enrolment without a decrease in revenue this could improve the student-faculty ratio, and could lead to a reduction in class sizes, thus allowing for greater interaction in class. However, it was important to note that not all of the University's space was tied directly to student classroom needs, so a decrease in student enrolment would not significantly change the space needs. If student-faculty ratios were reduced then the same number of faculty and staff would continue to exist, and it would still be necessary to accommodate them as well as research facilities; therefore campus development would still be needed.

Professor Sinervo added that although there was a plan to decrease undergraduate enrolment by 2,000 students in the Faculty of Arts and Science, it would be a challenge to implement the plan while simultaneously increasing the quality of student space.

A member asked whether a five-year space allocation model would be effective, given the similar period of the budget model and the Capital Plan. Professor Goel explained that the current space allocation model was congruent with the Capital Plan.

A member asked whether the current proportion of student space within the University had changed significantly from twenty years ago. The Chair indicated that the information would be obtained and provided to the member at a later date.

A member asked whether the administration had considered seeking endowments to assist with long-term building maintenance costs, as was the practice at some American

6. Capital Plan, 2006-2011 (cont'd)

institutions. Presently, private giving did not cover the full cost of new buildings so additional endowments for this purpose would be difficult to raise. Professor Goel responded that the matter of deferred maintenance was being addressed. Four years ago, an annual investment had been made from the operating budget in addition to the approximately \$5 million received from the Province. The strategy was to ensure that the level of deferred maintenance remained steady and was not increasing, whereas previously it had been accumulating. Ideally, the level of deferred maintenance would be decreased, but for now it would continue to be monitored. Professor Goel pointed out that some new projects were building into their business plans the accrual of funds for the eventual replacement of the building. This was the case, for example, with the Varsity Centre.

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the updated Capital Projects List as described in Appendix 5 of the *Capital Plan, 2006-2011*, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "A", be approved.

7. Capital Project: Interim Project Planning Report: Faculty of Law

The Chair informed members that the item had been considered by the Planning and Budget Committee on January 30th. It would require approval by the Governing Council on March 29th, on the recommendation of the Academic Board.

Professor Diamond reported that in April 2005, the area identified as site 12, one of the permitted development sites in the University Master Plan, had been assigned on an interim basis to the Faculty of Law. In 2006, the Dean's Advisory Committee had recommended that the Faculty should plan to expand facilities instead at the present site – 78 and 84 Queen's Park Crescent. Both 78 and 84 Queen's Park Crescent were included in the motion, as the proposed plan would require rezoning by the City.

Expansion on the current site was required due to the needs of approved and planned programs relating to the Faculty of Law's academic mission. One significant benefit of the proposed expansion would be augmented student space. The Faculty of Music had also identified space that it needed to meet the requirements of the Faculty's academic plan. To fully maximize institutional use in the precinct, the needs of both faculties, as well as others in the precinct, would be included in a comprehensive plan. The Dean of the Faculty of Law had engaged in dialogue with the Dean of the Faculty of Music, and a parallel planning process would occur.

At the Planning and Budget Committee meeting, Professor Goel had emphasized that the report was an interim one, and details concerning the space, site, zoning, and final costs would be clarified prior to the submission of the final project planning report.

During the Committee's discussion, a question had been raised about the Faculty of Law's space program, which exceeded the Council of Ontario Universities (COU) benchmarks. Ms Sisam had explained that the large size of the teaching complement at

7. Capital Project: Interim Project Planning Report: Faculty of Law (cont'd)

the Faculty of Law as well as the constraints of a heritage building meant that some aspects of the space program were larger.

The Chair invited Professor Mayo Moran, Dean of the Faculty of Law, to comment. Professor Moran thanked Ms Sisam for the assistance that she and her team had provided in moving the proposed expansion project forward quickly. She noted that the lack of adequate classroom space was of particular concern, and that one significant benefit of the proposed expansion would be the ability to deliver more desirable courses.

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the Interim Project Planning Report for the Faculty of Law, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "B", be approved in principle to accommodate the activities and functions described for the expansion of the School's programs at its present location at 78 and 84 Queen's Park Crescent West.

8. Capital Project: Project Planning Report: Department of Anthropology, Hughes Building Phased Master Plan

The Chair informed members that the item had been considered by the Planning and Budget Committee on January 30th. It would require approval by the Governing Council on March 29th, on the recommendation of the Academic Board.

Professor Diamond reported that in July 2006, the Norman Hughes Building had been assigned to the Faculty of Arts and Science to accommodate the Department of Anthropology. Preliminary estimates for extensive renovations had exceeded the anticipated budget for the project. A program that involved less extensive work to the building had been identified, and a phased approach had been planned. In addition, the proposal recommended the repair rather than replacement of building systems.

Planned renovations and deferred maintenance projects would allow use of the building for at least the next twenty years. Two classrooms in the building would be renovated for assignment by the Office of Space Management, and shelled laboratory spaces on the upper floors would be renovated at a later stage. The total project cost was \$9.76 million.

At the Committee meeting, Ms. Sisam had noted that upon the release of the space in Sidney Smith Hall currently occupied by the Department of Anthropology, the space needs of other departments could be met.

Professor Sinervo stated that the Anthropology Department was currently dispersed over ten locations across the campus. In some locations, faculty, staff and students were forced to work in less than optimum conditions. Some university anthropological collections were inadequately housed, and greater student activity space and seminar space were required. The move to the Hughes Building would build on and strengthen the Department's ability to meet core departmental priorities identified in its academic plan.

8. Capital Project: Project Planning Report: Department of Anthropology, Hughes Building Phased Master Plan (cont'd)

A Board member commented that the proposed cost-saving renovations seemed somewhat short sighted. It might be more advantageous over the long term to make a greater investment in the Hughes building by conducting full renovations now. Professor Goel acknowledged that the member had raised an important point on which the administration had spent a great deal of time deliberating. He stated that an interim project planning report had been considered previously, and that issues of scale of the renovations had been discussed by the Planning and Budget Committee. The cost of upgrading all of the mechanical systems had been estimated at \$20 million or more. Professor Goel noted that the question had been raised as to whether an investment of that size was appropriate given the state of the building. In the future, the University might decide to erect a new building that could cost at least \$100 million.

Professor Goel explained that three options had been considered: 1) to carry out an inexpensive renovation, 2) to conduct a more extensive renovation that would build up to the full capacity, 3) build to the full capacity immediately. It had been decided that the proposed staged approach to the project would make the most efficient use of available resources. That approach was less expensive than having to lease an equivalent amount of space off-campus for that time period. Professor Sinervo concurred with Professor Goel's summary, and added that funds were not available for the more expensive options.

Professor Goel added that a similar issue would be faced with many more buildings on campus that had been constructed in the 1960's and 1970's.

A member asked whether the plumbing in the Hughes building would be upgraded. Ms Sisam stated that it would be.

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

1. THAT the Project Planning Report for the Relocation of the Department of Anthropology to the Norman Hughes Pharmacy Building, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "C", be approved in principle.
2. THAT the project scope having a total space allocation of 3660 nasm/6100 gsm space program at a cost of \$9.76 million in 2006 dollars, be approved with funding to be provided as follows:

Faculty of Arts & Science	\$7.59 million
Facilities and Services (FRP)	\$2.0 million
Office of Space Management	\$0.17 million

3. THAT all space currently occupied by the Department of Anthropology be released and made available for reallocation to other units.

One member asked that his opposition to the motion be recorded.

9. Capital Project: Project Planning Report: Lash Miller Chemical Laboratories Undergraduate Laboratories, Final Phase

The Chair explained that the item had been considered by the Planning and Budget Committee at its meeting on January 30th. It would require the approval of Governing Council on the recommendation of the Academic Board.

Professor Diamond informed members that the proposed Phase II project was the final renovation needed for the Lash Miller building. The Phase I renovation had been completed in Fall, 2003 and had included an investment in the mechanical capacity in preparation for Phase II. The current plan addressed space and design inefficiencies and deferred maintenance.

Professor Diamond noted that with the proposed renovations, the Department of Chemistry would be able to increase the number of students in the laboratories, and instruction in chemistry at the undergraduate level would be unified for the first time in over one hundred years, as Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering, Arts and Science, and Pharmacy student laboratories would all be taught in the same facility.

At the Committee meeting, a question concerning the outstanding funding request of \$3.5 million had been raised. Professor Sinervo had explained that proposals to the Academic Initiatives Funds (AIF) and the Student Experience Fund (SEF) had been submitted. While it could not be assumed that the requests would be granted, the Department was optimistic that they would be. If the funding proposals were unsuccessful, there would be a need to reconsider how the shortfall would be funded or the project would be delayed.

The Chair invited Professor Scott Mabury, the Chair of the Department of Chemistry, to comment. Professor Mabury noted that the AIF and SEF funding requests had been based on the success of Phase I; the proposed renovations would enhance the student experience. With improvements to the undergraduate laboratories, the number of enrolments in courses had increased by 50%, and the number of students in the Chemistry Department had tripled. As a result of efficient designs, Phase II would substantially increase the amount of available space within the Department.

Professor Goel noted that recommendations for allocations from the AIF and SEF would be made by the time the project planning report was considered by Governing Council at the end of March. Although the process was somewhat out of sequence, it would still proceed through the governance cycle; if approved, Phase II could then be ready for September 2007. If the funding was not realized and alternate sources not identified, the project would be delayed by at least an academic year.

Some members praised the renovated facilities. One member noted that a section on the environmental impact of the construction had been included in the project planning report, and wondered if more detail could be provided. Professor Mabury replied that there would be decreased environmental impact resulting from the renovations, but at present it was not quantifiable.

A member from the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering stated that the Faculty was supportive of the Chemistry Department's proposal. The member asked whether every SEF proposal included improved student experience as an objective, and whether building renovations were eligible for SEF allocations. Professor Goel replied that the

9. Capital Project: Project Planning Report: Lash Miller Chemical Laboratories Undergraduate Laboratories, Final Phase (cont'd)

criteria for the SEF were quite broad, and that both academic and co-curricular initiatives could be considered. In the current SEF round, more infrastructure projects had been submitted, particularly in the Faculty of Arts and Science.

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

1. THAT the Project Planning Report for the Phase II Chemistry Undergraduate Practical Laboratory renovations, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "D", be approved in principle.
2. THAT the total project scope consisting of approximately 2,175 NASM with a Total Project Cost of \$5,000,000 be approved with the funding sources identified as:

FAS & Department of Chemistry (50%-50%)	\$1,080,000
Faculty of Engineering	\$ 350,000
Faculty of Pharmacy	\$ 70,000
Outstanding funding requests	\$3,500,000
 Total	 \$5,000,000

10. School of Graduate Studies: Master of Arts Program in Cinema Studies

The Chair informed members that the item had been considered by the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs on January 17th and by the Planning and Budget Committee on January 30th. It would require approval by the Governing Council on March 29th, on the recommendation of the Academic Board.

Professor Sass-Kortsak reported that the Governing Council, on the recommendation of the Board, had approved the establishment of the Cinema Studies Institute. The Committee on Academic Policy and Programs now recommended the companion piece: the establishment of an Master of Arts (M.A.) program to be based in the new Institute. An undergraduate Cinema Studies program had been offered at the University for over thirty years. The discipline had seen a major growth. Successive reviews had attested to the success of the program and had recommended the establishment of a graduate program. The proposal was for a one-year, course-based M.A. program. The Committee on Academic Policy and Programs had been assured that there was a strong core of faculty in the field, and that the structure of required and optional courses would result in an excellent program. The program would begin small and grow slowly. The Committee had supported the proposal without dissent.

Professor Diamond then informed members that the issue had also been considered by the Planning and Budget Committee and no questions had been raised.

The Chair invited Professor Charlie Keil, Director of the Cinema Studies Program, to comment. Professor Keil stated that 1,000 students were enrolled in courses in Cinema Studies, and 300 were enrolled in undergraduate Cinema Studies programs. The

10. School of Graduate Studies: Master of Arts Program in Cinema Studies
(cont'd)

proposed M.A. would include an internship program that would add to the student experience and also connect the students to the broader community within the city.

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the proposed Master of Arts (M.A.) Program in Cinema Studies, as described in Appendix "E" attached hereto, be established within the Faculty of Arts and Science, commencing September 2007.

11. Items for Information

The following documents were received for information by the Board:

- (a) **Reports of the Academic Appeals Committee**
- (b) **University Tribunal: Individual Cases**
- (c) **Report Number 127 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs (January 17, 2007)**

The Chair noted that the Master's program in International Trade and Forest Products had been discontinued.

- (d) **Report Number 116 of the Planning and Budget Committee (January 30, 2007)**

12. Date of Next Meeting – April 5, 2007

The Chair reminded members that the date of the next regular meeting was April 5, 2007.

13. Other Business

The Chair informed members that information about the Academic Board Elections could be obtained from the Board Secretary. Nominations had reopened for 8 seats for three-year terms effective July 1, 2007.

The Board moved *in camera*.

14. Report of the Tribunal Selection Committee

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT Ms Janet Minor be re-appointed Associate Chair of the University Tribunal for the period July 1, 2007 to June 30, 2010.

THAT Mr. Raj Anand, Ms. Rodica David, Q.C., Ms Julie Hannaford, Mr. John Keefe and Ms Laura Trachuk be re-appointed as Co-Chairs of the University Tribunal for the period July 1, 2007 to June 30, 2010.

THAT Ms Lisa Brownstone, Mr. Clifford Lax, Mr. Andrew Pinto and Ms Roslyn Tsao be appointed as Co-Chairs of the University Tribunal for the period July 1, 2007 to June 30, 2009.

The meeting adjourned at 5:40 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

March 2, 2007