

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

REPORT NUMBER 111 OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD

April 11, 2002

To the Governing Council,
University of Toronto.

Your Board reports that it held a meeting on Thursday, April 11, 2002 at 4:15 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall. An attendance list is attached to this report. In this report, items 3 and 6 to 21 are recommended to Governing Council for approval, item 5 is presented for Executive Committee confirmation and the remaining items are reported for information.

1. Report of the Previous Meeting

The report of the previous meeting, dated January 24, 2002, was approved.

2. Report Number 97 of the Agenda Committee

The report was received for information.

3. Budget Report, 2002-03

(arising from Report Number 78 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Gotlieb noted that the Planning and Budget Committee had considered the Budget Report, 2002-03 at its meeting on April 1. There had been a very good discussion and the Budget Report had received overwhelming support. (Note: This report can be found at <http://www.utoronto.ca/govcncl/bac/details/pb/2001-02/pbr20020401.pdf>)

Professor Sedra gave a PowerPoint presentation of the budget, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "A". In summary, Professor Sedra noted that the budget was fiscally prudent, the risk being limited to an assumption of \$3.2 million increase in grant/fee revenue. Expenditures were realistic but conservatively projected and a small surplus was projected for 2003-04. The accumulated deficit at the end of 2003-04 would be contained within Governing Council policy limits. The academic divisions would receive graduate student aid added to their base budgets. There would be enrolment growth funding, growth in the Canada Research Chairs program, accelerated allocations from the Academic Priorities Fund (APF) and a 25 % share in the federal grant for indirect costs of research. There would be a base budget 2.75% reduction in 2002-03 to divisional budgets to reduce the operating deficit but there would be no OTO clawbacks in this budget. In total, academic divisions would receive an increase to their total budgets of \$82.6 million less the APF reallocation reduction and the deficit reduction for a net increase of \$62.3 million.

The President suggested that the focus on the budget should be the addition of over \$60 million to divisional budgets and the long-term health of the University. He was pleased that the graduate student aid package guarantee would be completed by 2003 and that there would be \$13 million in new graduate student aid funds in the base budget at that point. This was an incredible advance in helping to make the University one of the top public research universities in the world. It was already having an impact on graduate enrolment with applications and acceptances rising dramatically. He commented that no one liked the 2.75% reduction but it was being implemented in a much improved budget situation.

3. Budget Report, 2002-03 (cont'd)

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the Budget Report, 2002-03, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "B", be approved.

4. Professor Shirley Neuman, Vice-President and Provost - elect

The President took great pleasure in announcing that the Governing Council had, that morning, approved the appointment of Professor Shirley Neuman for a seven-year term as the new Vice-President and Provost, effective July 1, 2002. Professor Neuman was currently Dean of the College of Literature, Science and the Arts at the University of Michigan. She had been educated at the University of Alberta and eventually become a full professor in women's studies and English. From Alberta, she moved to the University of British Columbia and then to Michigan. She was a distinguished academic and an accomplished administrator and the President expressed his delight at having her take a leadership role in achieving the University's vision of becoming one of the world's top public research universities.

Professor Neuman said that she had spent the day meeting with various groups and with Professor Sedra and his office. She was particularly appreciative of the work that Professor Sedra had accomplished with respect to academic planning and in integrating that planning with the budget process. She was impressed with how much farther ahead this University was in that regard and was deeply grateful for the opportunity to build on that foundation. She noted that people take on new challenges, not in terms of brain gain or brain drain, but because they believe that they could do good work and learn a lot in the process. The University was in a period of great ambition and she believed achieving the vision of a world-class public research university was feasible. Noting that when she had attended university costs were cheaper, she was fully supportive of the President's financial aid initiative to enable all those with real ability to attend university regardless of their financial circumstances. She applauded the graduate student aid program and predicted that student quality would skyrocket. This was a very fine University and she was proud and pleased to be a part of it. A university was the work and quality of its faculty and students in research and teaching and in the minds stimulated, shaped and formed. It was also very important to have a fine administrative staff to enable this work. She looked forward to working with the Academic Board.

5. University of Toronto at Scarborough: Joint Program with Centennial College in Journalism and New Media

(arising from Report Number 92 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs and Report Number 77 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Murty reported that The University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC) was proposing to offer joint four-year Honours degree programs in Journalism and in New Media with Centennial College. The Journalism program would be unique in the University and discussions with the University of Toronto at Mississauga about its program in Communication, Culture and Information Technology had revealed that the New Media program would be distinctive. Enrolment in both programs would be limited to 25 students each year.

Professor Gotlieb noted that the costs associated with the programs would be met from the UTSC's allocation from the Enrolment Growth Fund resulting from the planned expansion.

5. University of Toronto at Scarborough: Joint Program with Centennial College in Journalism and New Media (cont'd)

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the proposals for new Joint Programs with Centennial College, as described in the University of Toronto at Scarborough submission for 2002-2003 to the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs dated December 6, 2001, be approved, effective for the academic year 2002-03.

Documentation is attached hereto as Appendix "C".

6. Academic Priorities Fund: Allocation - Faculty of Dentistry, Raising Our Sights Plan (arising from Report Number 77 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Gotlieb noted that this and the following five items fell within the Planning and Budget Committee's responsibility to recommend to the Academic Board on proposed allocations from general University funds, including the Academic Priorities Fund. All of the proposals had received the strong support of the Committee.

This allocation to the Faculty of Dentistry completed the Faculty's requests under the current round of academic planning.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT allocations from the Academic Priorities Fund of \$167,300 in base and \$125,000 OTO for the Faculty of Dentistry be approved.

Documentation is attached hereto as Appendix "D".

7. Academic Priorities Fund: Allocation - Faculty of Information Studies, Raising Our Sights Plan (arising from Report Number 77 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Gotlieb explained that this proposed allocation would provide base budget support for an administrative position to enhance technical and administrative services in the Faculty of Information Studies and one-time-only funding for one FTE faculty position to bridge to the retirement of one of its professorial staff.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT an allocation of \$60,000 in base and \$107,000 OTO for the Faculty of Information Studies from the Academic Priorities Fund be approved.

Documentation is attached hereto as Appendix "E".

8. Academic Priorities Fund: Allocation - Office of Teaching Advancement (arising from Report Number 77 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Gotlieb reported that this proposal would establish a base operating budget for the newly created Office of Teaching Advancement.

8. Academic Priorities Fund: Allocation - Office of Teaching Advancement (cont'd)

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT an allocation of \$182,948 in base funding from the Academic Priorities Fund for the Office of Teaching Advancement be approved.

Documentation is attached hereto as Appendix "F".

9. Academic Priorities Fund: University of Toronto at Mississauga
(arising from Report Number 77 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Gotlieb noted that the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM) was expected to expand significantly over the next few years. This proposed allocation, which was equivalent to its reallocation levy of 6%, as well as two other allocations which would be considered later in the meeting, were intended to assist UTM in managing the expansion.

A member noted that the plans for UTM were contingent on enrolment expansion and expected government support. He asked about the likelihood of that support. Professor Sedra indicated that UTM was going forward with phase I of its expansion plans based on the assumption that full student funding would materialize. UTM was already enrolling increased numbers of students. The President said that he had received strong verbal promises from the government.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT an allocation of \$1,952,000 in base funding from the Academic Priorities Fund for the University of Toronto at Mississauga be approved.

Documentation is attached as Appendix "G".

10. Academic Priorities Fund: Faculty of Arts and Science, University of Toronto at Mississauga and University of Toronto at Scarborough Commerce, Management and Business Programs and UTSC Computer Science Program
(arising from Report Number 77 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Gotlieb said that this proposed allocation was for quality enhancement in the computing science program at the University of Toronto at Scarborough and in the undergraduate commerce, management and business programs on all three campus.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the base allocations from the Academic Priorities Fund for quality improvements in the following undergraduate programs be approved:

- (a) \$682,684 to the Faculty of Arts and Science for expenditure on the Commerce Program,
- (b) \$567,394 to the University of Toronto at Mississauga for expenditure on the Commerce and Management Programs,
- (c) \$911,434 to the University of Toronto at Scarborough for expenditure on the Bachelor of Business Administration Program,

10. Academic Priorities Fund: Faculty of Arts and Science, University of Toronto at Mississauga and University of Toronto at Scarborough Commerce, Management and Business Programs and UTSC Computer Science Program (cont'd)

- (d) \$298,095 to the University of Toronto at Scarborough for expenditure on the Computing Science programs.

Documentation is attached as Appendix "H".

11. Academic Priorities Fund: Allocation - Miscellaneous Raising Our Sights Plans (arising from Report Number 77 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Gotlieb explained that the allocations in this proposal continued the support to *Raising Our Sights* plans and were intended to meet needs in areas where circumstances had changed, information was missing or overlooked, and instances where funding sources were not identified, and to continue until the end of the planning period protection of the Transitional Year Program against budget cuts.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDED

1. THAT the following allocations from the Academic Priorities Fund be approved:
 - a) A base allocation of \$70,800 to the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto (OISE/UT) to match increased SSHRC fellowships;
 - b) A one-time-only allocation of \$99,000 to the Asian Institute subject to approval of its establishment;
 - c) A base allocation of \$480,191 for salary and benefits in unfunded academic/librarian positions described in the memo of March 7, 2002.
2. THAT base allocations from the Academic Priorities Fund in 2002-03 and 2003-04 to protect the Transitional Year Program from budget cuts be approved.

Documentation is attached as Appendix "I".

12. Enrolment Growth Fund: Allocations 2001-02 (arising from Report Number 77 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Gotlieb said that the following recommendation proposed allocations from the Enrolment Growth Fund to academic divisions to assist them in meeting the demands of enrolment expansion in 2001-02.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the following allocations be approved from the Enrolment Growth Fund to the divisions to accommodate the 2001-02 enrolment expansion.

- (a) one-time-only funding in 2001-02 of:
- | | |
|-----------------------------|-------------|
| Library | \$500,000 |
| Faculty of Arts and Science | \$3,446,881 |

12. Enrolment Growth Fund: Allocations 2001-02 (cont'd)

University of Toronto at Scarborough	\$1,081,164
Faculty of Pharmacy	\$329,251
Faculty of Nursing	\$164,929
Faculty of Applied Science & Engineering	\$705,311

(b) base funding in 2002-03 of:

Library	\$500,000
Faculty of Arts and Science	\$3,381,534
University of Toronto at Mississauga	\$669,728
University of Toronto at Scarborough	\$1,364,175
Faculty of Pharmacy	\$493,876
Faculty of Nursing	\$247,393
Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering	\$881,576

Documentation for this item is attached hereto as Appendix "J".

13. Capital Project: University of Toronto at Scarborough - Management Building - Revised Project Planning Report

(arising from Report Number 77 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Gotlieb noted that the Planning and Budget Committee had responsibility for recommending approval in principle of project planning reports for capital projects over \$2 million. This and the next two items fell within this responsibility and each related to a report on a project that was previously approved in principle but because of unusual circumstances each had undergone a significant revision in scope or design, and needed reconsideration.

He said that the need to reconsider this item had evolved from the absence of a decision to date on provincial government capital funding for capital expansion at the suburban campuses. In light of that, UTSC had re-examined its needs and had decided to approach its capital expansion in two phases. The construction of a revised Management Building in Phase I would proceed and the Classroom/Arts Building would be delayed to Phase II. The new Management Building would combine many of the pressing elements of both buildings with an expected completion date for use in the 2004-05 academic year.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

1. THAT the revised Project Planning Report for the UTSC Management Building, a copy of the executive summary of which is attached hereto as Appendix "K", be approved in principle.
2. THAT the revised project scope of 2436 nasm in total on a site adjacent to the existing Humanities Wing be approved at an estimated cost of \$15.53 million (2003 dollars) excluding campus improvements.
3. THAT the funding sources to construct the Management Building and advance the project will be allocated as follows:
 - (i) Allocation of \$14.37 million from the Phase I enrolment growth income that will be available to UTSC, and
 - (ii) External contributions by donors and others support through UTSC in the amount of \$1.16 million.

14. Capital Project: Sidney Smith Infill - Revised Project Planning Report
(arising from Report Number 77 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Gotlieb recalled that the Sidney Smith Infill project was first approved just over a year ago. Issues had arisen with respect to building design and significant underestimates for construction due to existing structural conditions of the building and its compliance to current building codes. The scope of the project had not changed but the cost had increased to the point that it now required resubmission. Alternatives were being explored, but approval was requested to allow the project to proceed if a viable alternative was not found quickly to resolve the critical space needs of the Faculty of Arts and Science.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

1. THAT the revised Sidney Smith Infill project, a copy of the executive summary of which is attached hereto as Appendix "L", be approved in principle,
2. THAT the revised Sidney Smith Infill project be undertaken at a cost of \$3,075,000, and
3. THAT the funding sources for this project be approved as follows:
 - (i) An allocation of \$875,000 from the Faculty of Arts and Science
 - (ii) The allocation of \$1,289,000 from the University Investment Infrastructure Fund previously approved be increased by \$711,000 to a total allocation of \$2,000,000 and
 - (iii) An allocation of \$200,000 from the funds available to the Accommodation and Facilities Directorate.

15. Capital Project: University of Toronto at Scarborough - Academic Resource Centre - Change of Scope - Project Planning Report
(arising from Report Number 77 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Gotlieb reported that following approval of a change of scope for this project in June, 2001 and the appointment of architects, difficulty had been identified with respect to the inability of the adjacent Bladen extension to accommodate the new construction. This proposal was, therefore, an update on increased scope of work and costs to complete the Academic Resource Centre at UTSC in light of the need to demolish the Bladen extension and incorporate lost space into the new project.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

1. THAT the March 2001 revisions to the Academic Resource Centre at the University of Toronto at Scarborough be approved in principle.
2. THAT project scope of 4571 net assignable square meters (nasm) of new space and 1286 nasm of renovated space at a cost of \$22,560,000 be approved, with the funding sources as follows:

SuperBuild Funds/Centennial Lease*	\$10.30 million
Allocation from the Phase I enrolment expansion at UTSC	11.99
Institutional Contribution, UTSC	1.20
Total	23.49
Encumbrance: *Due Diligence costs	(0.080)
Encumbrance: ATOP	(0.100)

15. Capital Project: University of Toronto at Scarborough - Academic Resource Centre - Change of Scope - Project Planning Report (cont'd)

Encumbrance: *Soil Remediation	(0.500)
Encumbrance: *Traffic Improvements	(0.250)
Funds available to support the Project	\$22.56 million

Documentation for this item is attached hereto as Appendix "M".

**16. Capital Project: University of Toronto at Mississauga, Phase I - Allocation for Capital Projects
Enrolment Growth Fund: Allocation**
(arising from Report Number 77 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Gotlieb commented that the Planning and Budget Committee had responsibility to recommend funding allocations in support of capital projects. This and the next item were requests for approval of an aggregate allocation to UTM and UTSC, subject to approval by Governing Council of the individual project planning reports in principle, and of the scope, site and other sources of funding for individual projects over \$2 million.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

Subject to Governing Council approval of any individual project costing over \$2-million and approval by the Accommodation and Facilities Directorate of individual projects costing less than \$2-million, and subject to quarterly reports by the Vice-Provost, Space and Facilities Planning, on the progress of the Phase I plan to expand the University of Toronto at Mississauga,

1. THAT funding of \$26.1 million plus interest from the Enrolment Growth Fund allocation(s) to the University of Toronto at Mississauga be approved for the following capital projects for the Phase I expansion of the University of Toronto at Mississauga, [the projects to be financed, with principal and interest repaid over time by the University of Toronto at Mississauga from its Enrolment Growth Fund allocations, deriving from enrolment expansion]:

Phase I: Communication, Culture and Information Technology
Phase I: Vertical Expansion of the Centre for Applied
Bioscience & Biotechnology [CABB]
Phase I: Kaneff Building Expansion
Phase I: Collegeway Stage 1
Phase I: Basement for the CABB
Phase I: North Building/ Classroom Renovation
Phase I: Collegeway Stage 2
Phase I: South Building Renovation
Phase I: Library Improvements

2. THAT authority be delegated to the Vice-President and Provost and the Principal of the University of Toronto at Mississauga to allocate this funding to individual projects costing less than \$2-million.

Documentation for this item is attached hereto as Appendix "N".

**17. Capital Project: University of Toronto at Scarborough, Phase I - Allocation for Capital Projects
Enrolment Growth Fund: Allocation**
(arising from Report Number 77 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

Subject to Governing Council approval of any individual project costing over \$2 million and approval by the Accommodation and Facilities Directorate of individual projects costing less than \$2 million, and subject to quarterly reports by the Vice-Provost, Space and Facilities Planning, on the progress of the Phase I plan to expand the University of Toronto at Scarborough,

1. THAT funding of \$28.98 million plus interest from the Enrolment Growth Fund allocation(s) to UTSC be approved for the following capital projects for the Phase I expansion of the University of Toronto at Scarborough, [the projects to be financed, with principal and interest to be repaid over time by the University of Toronto at Scarborough from its Enrolment Growth Fund allocations, deriving from its enrolment expansion]:

Phase I: Academic Resource Centre [ARC]
Phase I: Management Building
Phase I: Renovation to Arts and Science Facilities
Phase I: Infills for Offices and other Facilities
Phase I: Renovations: Delivery Services
Phase I: Roads, Landscaping and Bridge

2. THAT authority be delegated to the Vice-President and Provost and the Principal of the University of Toronto at Scarborough to allocate this funding to individual projects costing less than \$2-million.

Documentation for this item is attached hereto as Appendix "O".

18. University Infrastructure Investment Fund: Allocation - Office of Teaching Advancement and Resource Centre for Academic Technology
(arising from Report Number 77 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Gotlieb recalled that earlier in the meeting, the Board had approved an allocation for a base budget for the newly established Office of Teaching Advancement. This was a proposal to provide funding for the renovations that were necessary to space on the fourth floor of the Robarts Library to accommodate the Office.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT an allocation of \$460,000 from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund towards the complete cost of the establishing the Office of Teaching Advancement and the upgrading of the Resource Centre for Academic Technology facilities be approved.

Documentation for this item is attached hereto as Appendix "P".

19. University Infrastructure Investment Fund: Allocation - Governing Council Chamber and Board Room, Refurbishment and Renovation
(arising from Report Number 77 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Gotlieb noted that the Council Chamber and Board Room had not undergone repair or refurbishment probably since their construction in 1926. A cursory look around would reveal that curtains need replacement and chairs, re-upholstering. In addition to much needed repairs, it was proposed to install air conditioning and to complete technologically upgrades to the rooms that now were heavily used year round, and frequently served as the public face of the University. The proposal was strongly supported at the Planning and Budget Committee with the assurance that the heritage aspects of the rooms would be preserved.

A member questioned the cost of this project and she asked whether it had been well investigated. Mr. Charpentier responded that the relatively high costs related to installing air conditioning and making technological improvements while protecting the heritage aspects of the rooms.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT an allocation of \$1,593,000 from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund for the complete cost of the restoration, refurbishment and renovation of the Council Chamber and the Board Room in Simcoe Hall be approved.

Documentation for this item is attached hereto as Appendix "Q".

20. University Infrastructure Investment Fund: Allocation - Alumni Hall, University of St. Michael's College
(arising from Report Number 77 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Gotlieb said that this proposed allocation from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund was to convert Alumni Hall to a dedicated classroom in accordance with the wishes of the University of St. Michael's College and the Faculty of Arts and Science.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT an allocation of \$300,000 from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund toward the renovation of Alumni Hall in the University of St. Michael's College so as to provide a significant teaching facility for programs within the Faculty of Arts and Science be approved.

Documentation for this item is attached hereto as Appendix "R".

21. School of Graduate Studies: Establishment of the Risk Management Institute
(arising from Report Number 77 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Gotlieb noted that the Planning and Budget Committee considered resource implications and recommended on the establishment and disestablishment of academic units. This is a proposal to establish a Risk Management Institute.

21. School of Graduate Studies: Establishment of the Risk Management Institute (cont'd)

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the establishment of the Risk Management Institute, within Division III of the School of Graduate Studies, be approved, effective immediately.

Documentation for this item is attached hereto as Appendix "S".

22. Items for Information

- (a) Report of the Vice-President and Provost
 - (i) Enrolment Issues

Professor Sedra indicated that the University was experiencing a healthy increase in the number of applicants. The number of high school graduates listing the University as their first choice had risen by 20%. There was the same trend in the "non-OAC" applicants. In the upcoming year, the University would be able to enrol only 66 more students than the current year in which there had been a large increase in enrolment due to the government's promise of full funding. The good news was that the University was very attractive to students. At the graduate level, there was a significant increase in the number of acceptances compared to a year ago at this time. (Admission statistics for the School of Graduate Studies are attached hereto as Appendix "T".) The graduate student support package had helped the University in the world wide competition for the best students.

Professor Sedra reported that the government had expressed an interest in the universities' increasing their intake numbers and had asked for new bids. The University has responded that this would be part of phase III but that it would be highly unwise to increase enrolment beyond currently planned levels without government capital support.

Professor Sedra noted that the plans for enrolment expansion would be considered by the Planning and Budget Committee at its next meeting on April 16. The document provided some background and referred to the enrolment framework which had been approved by Governing Council in April 2000. The document presented the current plans of modest increases on the St. George campus with the bulk of the expansion at UTM and UTSC in two phases. However, until the suburban campuses were ready to accept the expanded enrolment, there would be a bulge on the St. George campus. Full expansion at UTM and UTSC was conditional on receipt of government funding for capital infrastructure necessary to accommodate the extra students.

A member, a departmental graduate co-ordinator, reported that only one graduate student had declined the offer to come to the University. The bad news was that their enrolment has been capped by the availability of funding to provide the guaranteed support package. He commented that the move to a four-year undergraduate program only in the Faculty of Arts and Science on the St. George campus has not adversely affected the numbers of students applying for admission; in fact, it was working well and he urged UTM and UTSC to consider such a move.

A member commented that the Academic Board had dealt with ease with the budget and a number of capital projects pertaining to enrolment expansion in great part due to the trust in the expertise of the planning secretariat and in particular in Professors Sedra, McCammond and Venter and Mr. England. The members of the Board showed their support for this comment.

22. Items for Information (cont'd)**(a) Report of the Vice-President and Provost (cont'd)**

A member noted that the increased numbers of graduate students exacerbated the competition between faculty members for students, placing an enormous responsibility on the shoulders of the graduate co-ordinators to make the decisions.

A member suggested that the increasing number of graduate students was in part due to the recruitment of new, high quality faculty members who have been successful in attracting research funding and to the presence of faculty holding Canada Research Chairs.

A member asked if the increase in numbers of the undergraduate applicants was spread across the three campuses. Professor McCammond said that the aggregate increase was 21% with 21% on St. George, 22% at UTM and 29% at UTSC among first choice applicants. (Application statistics for direct entry programs are attached hereto as Appendix "U".)

A member said that one of the best ideas in the last few years had been the guaranteed graduate student support package. He asked if there were plans to help students in professional programs. Professor Sedra reminded members of the University's guarantee that no student admitted would be unable to enter or complete the program due to lack of financial means. The University had spent \$30 million on this guarantee last year and 30% of tuition fee revenue above the fee level for the previous year must be used for student aid. In addition, the endowment for student aid was \$500 million. The University would continue to monitor accessibility through the annual report of the Vice-Provost, Students, to the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs. The tuition fee in the Faculty of Law, if approved, would rise from \$12,000 to \$14,000. Accessibility would be monitored in a thorough fashion and before any more increases were proposed, a report on accessibility would be delivered.

A member asked about the enrolment of international students. Professor McCammond indicated that the enrolment of international students had been increasing at both graduate and undergraduate level for the past four years. International applications were included in the "non-OAC" application statistics along with out of province students and that pool of applicants was up this year over last by 8-9%.

(ii) Appointments and Status Changes / Professor Emeritus

The appointments were presented for information.

(b) Employment Equity Report, 2000-01

Professors Sedra and Goel said that there would be no presentation of the report but that they would be pleased to respond to questions.

A member referred to Table 4 which showed the percentage of women assistant professors in the Science division declined from 31.9 % in 1997 to 16.7 % in 2001. She asked whether this was in terms of overall numbers or just new hires. Professor Goel said that it was an overall number. It was a matter of concern and he was working with the relevant units. He referred to two factors affecting these data - one was the rate at which women were hired and the other concerned a high exit rate. These women were very mobile and were successfully recruited away. Dean Amrhein noted that this was the School of Graduate Studies science division which included Engineering. Competition for female faculty was intense.

A member commented that there were two important issues that the University should pay attention to in issuing an annual report on employment equity and which were not adequately addressed in this year's report.

22. Items for Information (cont'd)**(b) Employment Equity Report, 2000-01 (cont'd)**

The first arose from the claim that diversity of people, rather than of ideas, was necessary for excellence in higher education and, further, without diversity the University could not have a significant impact on "our local and international environment" (page 1). It was important to recognize that this claim stemmed from an "identity politics" view of relations in society. According to this position, what was important was the color of people's skin rather than, to adapt Martin Luther King's phrase, the content of their ideas. If the claim of necessity was true, then the all-male Economics Department of University of Chicago (with its seven Nobel laureates and a well-known reputation for debate and the conflict of ideas) was not an excellent one, and had minimal impact on the "international environment".

The second overlooked issue was the role of "equity" in faculty hiring. One problem of principle was the conflict between equity and merit considerations in what was, in the end, a competition that only one candidate could win. There was now systematic evidence of 'reverse discrimination' against young white males in university hiring in Canada, with males having only about half the success rate of females. He hoped both that the next annual report would pay attention to these issues, and that the university community would debate them with more depth than it had done so in the past.

A member commented on the differences between hiring from a single pool or from many. In one large pool from which the very best was hired, biases could be introduced. The other option was to have many small pools with each pool having different characteristics. The more pools there were from which to hire the best, the more diverse and excellent the faculty would become.

A member understood the policy to be that the best person was hired. The value of a discussion of employment equity was to ensure that prejudice did not blind those hiring. The practice was to look widely, without any preconceived ideas. The member who spoke previously understood the policy to be that in the case of two equal candidates, the female would be hired in preference to the male.

Professor Goel responded that there was no policy which preferred female over male candidates. The idea was to generate the most diverse pool of candidates for each search. There was no policy on reverse discrimination. He agreed that diversity of ideas was the goal and that this was best achieved through ensuring diversity of people.

A member noted that page 1 referred to "people of different races". He was uncomfortable with this racialization of people as though all were not part of the human race. He suggested that this was a careless mistake which needed correction. Another member commented that this very point was currently the subject of some discussion. The new thought was to use the word race in quotes or to use "ascribed race."

(c) Items for Information in Reports Number 92 and 93 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs

There were no questions or comments.

(d) Items for Information in Reports Number 77 and 78 of the Planning and Budget Committee

There were no questions or comments.

22. Items for Information (cont'd)

- (e) Reports Number 262, 263 and 264 of the Academic Appeals Committee

A member complimented the Committee on the work it was doing.

- (f) University Tribunal: Individual Cases

A member noted, from one of the cases, the importance of acknowledging letters of support. When another institution had done this, the existence of the forged letters of support had come to light. He believed that the University should have a policy in this area. Professor Sedra took note of the member's suggestion.

A member expressed his thanks to the Tribunal and to the Academic Appeals Committee. He asked how often expulsion was recommended. Professor Goel explained that all recommendations for expulsion were considered by the Governing Council on the recommendation of the President. He said that there were two or three a year.

- (g) Quarterly Report on Donations, August - October, 2001

There were no questions or comments.

23. Date of Next Meeting

The Chair noted that the next regular meeting of the Board would be held on Tuesday May 7, 2002.

The Board moved *in camera*.

24. Academic Administrative Appointments

Professor Sedra withdrew one of the appointments that had been sent prematurely to the Board for consideration.

The following academic administrative appointments were approved:

FACULTY OF ARTS AND SCIENCE

Department of Classics

Professor Alexander R. Jones	Acting Chair from January 1, 2003 to June 30, 2003
------------------------------	--

Department of Italian Studies

Professor Domenico Pietropaolo	Chair from July 1, 2002 to June 30, 2007
--------------------------------	--

Department of Political Science

Professor David R. Cameron	Acting Chair from July 1, 2002 to June 30, 2003
----------------------------	---

Professor Robert C. Vipond	Chair from July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2006 (re-appointment)
----------------------------	---

24. Academic Administrative Appointments (cont'd)

SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

Professor Robert Almgren Director of the Master of Mathematical Finance Program from January 1, 2002 to December 31, 2006

Institute for Policy Analysis

Professor Frank Mathewson Director from January 1, 2003 to June 30, 2007 (re-appointment)

FACULTY OF MEDICINE

Professor Peter Lewis Vice-Dean, Research, from July 1, 2002 to June 30, 2007

Department of Biochemistry

Professor Reinhart Reithmeier Chair from July 1, 2002 to June 30, 2007

NEW COLLEGE

Professor Michael Dixon Vice-Principal from July 1, 2002 to June 30, 2004 (extension)

ONTARIO INSTITUTE FOR STUDIES IN EDUCATION / UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

Professor Cecilia Reynolds Acting Dean from May 1, 2002 to May 31, 2002

Professor Carol Rolheiser Acting Dean from June 1, 2002 to June 30, 2002

Professor Kenneth Leithwood Acting Dean from July 1, 2002 to July 31, 2002

FACULTY OF PHARMACY

Professor Denis Grant Associate Dean, Research, from January 1, 2002 to June 30, 2007

FACULTY OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND HEALTH

Professor Carol Rodgers Associate Dean, Graduate Education and Research, from July 1, 2002 to June 30, 2007

FACULTY OF SOCIAL WORK

Professor James Barber Dean from January 1, 2003 to June 30, 2009

24. Academic Administrative Appointments (cont'd)

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO AT MISSISSAUGA

Professor Ian Orchard

Principal from July 1, 2002 to June 30, 2010
(one year leave midway through term)

(Note: this appointment was approved by the Agenda Committee on behalf of the Academic Board following circulation of the documentation to the members of the Board and taking into account members' comments.)

Professor Sedra reported for information the appointment of Professor Mark McGowan as Principal of St. Michael's College, effective July 1, 2002 to June 30, 2007.

25. University Professors: Appointment

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

The appointment of Professor John B. Friedlander, Physical Sciences Division, University of Toronto at Scarborough, and Professor Wayne Sumner, Department of Philosophy, Faculty of Arts and Science, as University Professors, effective July 1, 2002.

The meeting adjourned 6:00 p.m.

Secretary
April 12, 2002

Chair

Present

Professor J. Carr, Chair
Professor D. Wells, Vice-Chair
Ms W. M. Cecil, Chairman, Governing Council
Dr. T. Simpson, Vice-Chair, Governing Council
Professor R. J. Birgeneau, President
Professor A. S. Sedra, Vice-President and Provost
Professor V. Goel, Vice-Provost, Faculty
Professor C. Tuohy, Vice-President - Policy Development and Associate Provost
Professor B. J. Adams
Professor D. Affonso
Professor C. Amrhein
Professor N. Bascia
Professor M. Beattie
Professor C. Beghtol
Professor J. M. Boyle
Mr. E. Brock
Professor R. Bryan
Professor N. Camerman
Mr. G. Chan
Mr. A. Chapnick
Professor M. L. Chipman
Professor D. Clandfield
Professor J. J. Connon
Professor D. E. Cormack
Professor B. Corman
Professor W. R. Cummins
Professor F. Cunningham
Professor L. De Nil
Professor S. Desser
Professor J. Donaldson
Professor C. Dyer
Professor M. Eichler
Dr. I. Elliston
Dr. S. Graham Fell
Ms E. Fillion
Professor E. Fiume
Professor E. Freeman
Professor J. J. Furedy
Professor A. I. Gotlieb
Mr. B. Greenspan
Professor H. Gunz
Professor P. Halpern
Mr. A. Hamoui
Mr. D. Herbert
Professor W. Hindmarsh
Ms B. Horne
Professor S. H. Horton
Mr. J. Hunter

Mr. M. Hyreza
Ms M. J. Jackman
Professor A. Jorgensen
Professor B. Kidd
Professor R. Kluger
Professor C. La Vigna
Dr. M. Letarte
Ms K. Lewis
Professor S. G. Matthews
Professor R. H. McNutt
Ms V. Melnyk
Mr. D. Melville
Professor D. Mock
Mr. A. Morgan
Professor V. K. Murty
Professor M. O'Neill-Karch
Professor P. Pennefather
Professor R. W. Pruessen
Professor O. Pugliese
Professor C. Regehr
Professor K. Rice
Professor L. Richards
Professor B. Sampson
Mr. J. Satkunasingham
Ms C. M. Seymour
Professor A. Sheps
Professor B. Sherwood-Lollar
Ms J. Snow
Dr. K. Stangeby
Professor V. R. Timmer
Professor A. Venetsanopoulos
Professor L. Wilson-Pauwels

Non-Voting Member

Mr. L. R. Charpentier

Non-Voting Assessors

Professor A. Hildyard
Dr. S. Levy
Professor D. McCammond

Secretariat

Ms S. Girard, Secretary
Mrs. B. Stefureak

Absent

Mr. M. F. Ahmad
Professor G. Allen
Professor B. Baigrie
Professor C. Barnes
Dr. M. Barrie
Professor D. Beach
Professor B. Benhabib
Ms R. Bhavnani
Mr. J. Burnett
Professor D. Cook
Professor R. Daniels
Dr. R. B. Deber
Professor M. Diamond
Professor D. Edwards
Mr. J. A. Fraser
Professor M. Fullan
Professor R. M. Gallop
Dr. R. Geist
Ms B. Goldberg

Professor M. Gotlieb
Professor L. C. Howarth
Professor H. Munroe-Blum
Professor A. R. Jones
Professor G. Kerr
Professor R. L. Martin
Professor C. Misak (on sabbatical)
Professor E. Morgan
Professor D. Naylor
Professor P. Perron
Ms S. Reichert
Professor R. Reisz
Ms P. Ricci
Professor C. Rolheiser
Professor W. Shera
Professor J. J. B. Smith
Ms. S. Stringer
Professor P. Thompson
Mr. A. Vered
Professor D. Vincent

In Attendance:

Mr. C. Ramsaroop, Member-elect of Governing Council
Professor S. Newman, Vice-President and Provost-elect
Professor R. Abramovitch, Director, Transitional Year Program
Mr. J. Bisanti, Chief Capital Projects Officer
Mr. M. England, Assistant Vice-Provost, Strategic Planning
Dr. B. Fitzpatrick, Director of the Office of the President and Assistant Vice-President
Professor J. Foley, Chair, Program and Curriculum Committee, UTSC
Ms G. Gray, Director of University Events and Presidential Liaison (Advancement)
Ms M. McGee, Assistant Provost
Professor E. Relph, Associate Principal for Campus Development, UTSC
Ms E. Sadowski, President, Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students
Ms E. Sisam, Director of Campus and Facilities Planning
Ms K. Swift, University Registrar