

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL
REPORT NUMBER 145 OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD

October 4, 2006

To the Governing Council,
University of Toronto

Your Board reports that it held a meeting on Wednesday, October 4, 2006 at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall at which the following were present:

Present:

Professor Michael R. Marrus
(Chair)
Professor Brian Corman (Vice-Chair)
Professor David Naylor,
President
Professor John Challis, Vice-President, Research and Associate Provost
Professor David Farrar, Deputy Provost and Vice-Provost, Students
Professor Vivek Goel, Vice-President and Provost
Professor S. Zaky, Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget
Professor Stewart Aitchison
Professor Varouj Aivazian
Professor Christy Anderson
Professor Jan Angus
Professor George Baird
Mr. Brian Beaton
Professor Clare Beghtol
Professor Katherine Berg
Dr. Terry Blake
Professor Ragnar Buchweitz
Mr. Terry Buckland

Professor Donald Brean
Professor Philip H. Byer
Ryan Matthew Campbell
Mr. Blake Chapman
Mr. Ewen Weili Chen
Dr. Christena Chruszez
Professor John Coleman
Professor David Cook
Mr. Tim Corson
Mr. Joe Cox
Professor Alistair Cumming
Mr. Ken Davy
Miss Saswati Deb
Dr. Raisa B. Deber
Ms Linda B. Gardner
Ms Bonnie Goldberg
Professor Avrum Gotlieb
Ms Pamela Gravestock
Professor Hugh Gunz
Professor Rick Halpern
Professor Wayne K. Hindmarsh
Mrs. Bonnie Horne
Professor Brad Inwood
Professor Gregory Jump
Mr. Mohammed Khan
Mr. Umar Khan
Professor Bruce Kidd
Dr. Chris Koenig-Woodyard
Professor Hon C. Kwan

Dr. Lesley Ann Lavack
Professor Robert Levit
Professor Diane Massam
Professor Thomas Mathien
Mr. Geoffrey Matus
Professor Douglas McDougall
Ms Vera Melnyk
Professor Faye Mishna
Professor David Mock
Ms Carole Moore
Professor Sioban Nelson
Ms Theresa Pazonis
Professor Susan Pfeiffer
Professor Cheryl Regehr
Professor Robert Reisz
Mr. Paul Ruppert
Professor Andrea Sass-Kortsak
Professor Pekka Sinervo
Professor Brian Cantwell Smith
Professor Tattersall Smith
Mr. Omar Solimon
Miss Maureen J. Somerville
Professor Lorne Sossin
Professor Lisa Steele
Professor Kim Strong
Dr. Donald A. Wasylenki
Mr. Patrick Wong
Dr. Cindy Woodland

Regrets:

Professor Derek Allen
Professor Cristina Amon
Professor Gage Averill
Professor Sylvia Bashevkin
Professor David R. Begun
Ms Marilyn Booth
Professor George Elliott Clarke
Mr. Kristofer T. Coward
Professor Miriam Diamond
Professor Luc F. De Nil
Professor Dickson Eyoh
Professor Guy Faulkner
Dr. Shari Graham Fell
Mr. John A. Fraser

Professor Jane Gaskell
Professor William Gough
Mr. Billeh Hamud
Professor Yuki Mayumi Johnson
Professor Charles Jones
Dr. Wajahat Khan
Dr. Joel A. Kirsh
Professor Larry Leith
Professor Lori Loeb
Dr. Gillian MacKay
Professor Roger L. Martin
Professor Brenda Y. McCabe
Professor Mark McGowan
Mr. Matto Mildenberger
Professor John R. Miron
Professor Michael Molloy

Professor Mayo Moran
Professor Mariel O'Neill-Karch
Professor Donna Orwin
Mr. Roger P. Parkinson
Professor Janet Paterson
Professor Richard Reznick
Professor Jolie Ringash
Professor Gareth Seaward
Professor Anthony N. Sinclair
Professor J.J. Berry Smith
Professor Ron Smyth
Professor Suzanne Stevenson
Dr. Robert S. Turnbull
Professor Rinaldo Wayne
Walcott
Professor Catharine Whiteside

Secretariat:

Mr. Henry T. Mulhall
Ms Cristina Oke, Secretary

Non-voting Assessors:

Professor Angela Hildyard, Vice-
President, Human Resources
and Equity
Professor Edith M. Hillan, Vice-
Provost, Academic
Professor Cheryl Misak, Acting
Vice-President and Principal,
University of Toronto at
Mississauga
Ms Catherine Riggall, Vice-
President, Business Affairs
Ms Elizabeth Sisam, Assistant
Vice-President, Campus and
Facilities Planning
Ms Judith Wolfson, Vice-
President, University Relations
Mr. Louis Charpentier, Secretary
of the Governing Council

In Attendance:

Dr. Chris Cunningham, Special Advisor to the President
Mr. Neil Dobbs, Deputy Secretary of the Governing Council
Ms Nora Gillespie, Legal Counsel
Ms Connie Guberman, Status of Women Officer
Professor David Klausner, Vice-Dean, Interdisciplinary Studies, Faculty of Arts and Science
Ms Helen Lasthiotakis, Director, Policy and Planning, Office of the Vice-President and Provost
Professor Peter Pauly, Vice-Dean, Rotman School of Management
Professor Mark Stabile, Interim Director, School for Public Policy and Governance

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

1. Welcome

The Chair welcomed new and continuing members to the first meeting of the Academic Board for 2006-2007. He introduced Professor Brian Corman, the Vice-Chair of the Board; Professor David Naylor, President of the University; and Professor Vivek Goel, Vice-President and Provost and the Board's senior administrative assessor.

1. Welcome (cont'd)

Remarks by the President

The Chair invited President Naylor to address the Board. The President thanked members for serving on the Academic Board. He emphasized the integral role of the Board in the governance of the University of Toronto. The Board was equivalent to the senate at other universities. It included members from a number of constituencies, with the majority of members being from the professoriate, provided a forum for discussion on academic matters, and made decisions that shaped the future of the academic mission of the University. The President concluded his remarks by acknowledging the contributions Professor Marrus had made in his earlier term as Chair of the Board ¹, and by thanking Professor Marrus for agreeing to serve as Chair in the coming year.

Introductions

The Chair invited Professor Goel to introduce the voting assessors to the Board: Professor John Challis, Professor David Farrar; and Professor Safwat Zaky, and the non-voting assessors who were in attendance: Professor Angela Hildyard, Professor Edith Hillan, Professor Cheryl Misak, Ms Catherine Riggall, Ms Elizabeth Sisam and Ms Judith Wolfson.

The Chair introduced the staff from the Office of the Governing Council who provided support to the Board and its members: Mr. Henry Mulhall and Ms. Cristina Oke.

The Chair then introduced the Chairs and Vice-Chairs of the Standing Committees who were in attendance: Professor Andrea Sass-Kortsak, Chair of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs; Professor Douglas McDougall, Vice-Chair of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs; Professor Avrum Gotlieb, Chair of the Planning and Budget Committee; and Ms Bonnie Goldberg, Chair of the Academic Appeals Committee.

Orientation

The Chair reminded members that background material about the Board had been included in the agenda package for the meeting, and he encouraged them to become familiar with that material. He highlighted the following points about the Board and its work.

Governance Structure

The Academic Board was the highest academic decision-making body at the University under the authority of the Governing Council, and was the largest of the Governing Council's Boards and Committees, with 121 members. As the President had noted earlier, the majority of members of the Board were from the professoriate.

Role of Standing Committees of the Board

Most of the business of the Board came from its Standing Committees, particularly the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs, and the Planning and Budget Committee. The Chair of the Committee presented the recommendation to the Board, highlighting the key points of the discussion at the Committee meeting.

¹ Professor Marrus served as Chair of the Academic Board from July 1, 1990 until June 30, 1996.

1. Welcome (cont'd)

Matters Coming Directly to the Academic Board

The Academic Board was the entry-level body for certain items, including divisional constitutions, policies on the nature of academic employment, policies and procedures with respect to academic discipline, name changes of academic units, and agreements with certain affiliated or federated institutions.

Conduct of Members of the Board

Members of the Board were expected to act with civility and to add value to consideration of the matters before it. Meetings of the Board would be conducted in an atmosphere of respect and collegiality.

Members were encouraged to contribute to an atmosphere of “no surprises” by informing the Secretary, or the Chair, well before the meeting if they intended to:

- ask for more information before making a decision,
- move to refer a matter back to a Committee or to the administration,
- amend a motion or make suggestions for the correction of minutes.

Such notification would allow procedural and substantive advice to be given in a timely fashion. It might also be possible to provide the information requested in time for the meeting.

The Chair stated his commitment to fairness for all members, allowing thorough and open discussion on issues, and conducting the meetings briskly within the scheduled two hours.

Procedures Specific to the Academic Board

Members were asked to record their attendance at the meeting on the Sign-in sheets that were available at the door.

When speaking at the Board, members were requested to stand and give their names.

2. Approval of Report Number 144 of the Meeting held on June 1, 2006

Report Number 144 of the meeting held on June 1, 2006 was approved.

3. Business Arising Out of the Report

There was no business arising from the Report.

4. Reports of the Agenda Committee

Members received for information the following reports of the Agenda Committee:

- Report Number 129 (June 26, 2006)
- Report Number 130 (July 27, 2006)
- Report Number 131 (September 26, 2006)

5. Report from the Vice-President and Provost

Professor Goel reported on a number of matters.

(a) *Stepping UP*

Professor Goel reminded members that the Academic Board was responsible for approving the Academic Plan, and he noted that the University was half-way through the academic planning period described in *Stepping UP*. Reports on several of the initiatives articulated in the plan would be coming to governance in 2006-07.

(i) **Enhancing the Student Experience**

Professor Goel noted that enhancing the student experience had been the identified as the top priority in *Stepping UP*, as well as by the President in his installation address. Much work was being done in this area at each of the three campuses of the University. The Student Experience Fund had been created as part of the 2006-07 budget to support projects that enhanced the undergraduate student experience, and the initiatives that were being funded would be reported in the next governance cycle.

(ii) **Symposium on Teaching and Learning**

Professor Goel informed members that a symposium on teaching and learning would be held at the end of October 2006. This event would provide an opportunity for members from across the University community engaged in directing teaching programs to meet one another and share information on best practices and innovations.

(iii) **Organization and Delivery of Services**

Professor Goel reported that the organization and delivery of services to students was being reviewed by the administration. A review of the use of information technology had resulted in the creation of a student portal and the introduction of a learning management system. The goal was for students to use a single sign-in to access various systems. Courses, departments and Faculties often used different systems, and students had been required to have a separate user name and password for each system.

The learning management system, the core of the portal, was being introduced on a pilot project basis in 2006-07, with 10,000 licenses in use. The number of licenses would increase to 30,000 in 2007-08 and to 60,000 in 2008-09. The University of Toronto was the largest institution attempting to use this system. The goal of the University was to provide a single sign-in for faculty, staff and students.

(b) **Capital Projects**

Professor Goel described the progress of three capital projects.

(i) **Varsity Centre for Physical Activity and Health**

The first phase of the Varsity Centre project was nearing completion. Plans for subsequent phases of the project would be coming through governance in 2006-07.

5. Report from the Vice-President and Provost (cont'd)**(b) Capital Projects (cont'd)****(ii) Multi-faith Centre**

The Multi-faith Centre was expected to open in the coming year.

(iii) Student Activity Space

The report of a Task Force on Student Activity Space, chaired by Professor Farrar, had identified the need for an additional concentrated node of activity space on the St. George campus. A project planning committee was being formed to consider the creation of a student commons on the St. George campus. The membership and Terms of Reference of the committee would be reported for information to the Planning and Budget Committee in October.

A member asked what the proposed additional space would add to current provisions. Professor Goel replied that the University supported a multi-node model for student activity space. Increased enrolment had resulted in increased demand for such space. Currently, Hart House was the only large dedicated node of student activity space on the St. George campus.

A member commented that undergraduate students had indicated their willingness to support the provision of additional student activity space. He noted that there was a need for increased on campus medical and psychiatric services for students, as there were lengthy wait times for such services. Professor Goel replied that he appreciated the support that had been expressed by students, and welcomed their contributions. He stated that a review of the delivery of services to students was currently underway, and that health services were included in that review. In response to a question from another member, Professor Goel stated that Accessibility Services were included in the review.

(c) Initiatives arising from *Stepping UP***(i) University of Toronto Arts Council ²**

Professor Goel explained that, in response to a recommendation included in *Stepping UP*, an advisory committee on the creative and performing arts had been established. Two associated working groups had also been established: one focused on academic program initiatives and one focused on co-curricular activities and opportunities. Discussions among units involved in the creative and performing arts had resulted in several exciting initiatives.

Professor Goel commented that, on the evening of September 30, 2006, the University had participated in *Nuit Blanche*, an all-night celebration of the arts in Toronto. The University had served as a major focus of activity connecting spaces organized by the City of Toronto.

² Information about the University of Toronto Arts Council is available at http://www.arts.utoronto.ca/About_the_Arts_Council.htm.

5. Report from the Vice-President and Provost (cont'd)**(c) Initiatives arising from *Stepping UP* (cont'd)****(ii) Round Table for the Environment**

Professor Goel noted that a Round Table for the Environment was being created to provide an opportunity for communication and coordination of the University's activities in this area.

(iii) Public Policy

Professor Goel referred to the Master of Public Policy (M.P.P.) degree that would be considered later in the agenda. He observed that a number of outreach initiatives were being planned by the School of Public Policy and Governance, which would be offering the proposed degree program. A recommendation to establish the School would be brought forward in the next governance cycle.

(iv) Urban Issues and Cities

Professor Goel advised members that a University Cities Centre was being established to raise the profile of and awareness for teaching and research on urban issues at the University.

(v) Information Knowledge

Professor Goel noted that Dean Brian Cantwell Smith and the Faculty of Information Studies were taking a leadership role in organizing activity related to information and communication technology within the University.

(vi) Interdisciplinarity Committee

Professor Goel reminded members of the work of the Interdisciplinarity Committee that he and Professor Challis co-chaired. A Statement on Interdisciplinary Education and Research would be coming to governance in the fall.

(d) Performance Indicators

Professor Goel informed members that the annual report on Performance Indicators was being developed. He proposed that, once the report had been finalized, he would, as part of his Report, present to the Board some of the performance indicators that would be of interest to the Board.

(e) Budget

Professor Goel recalled that an off-line information session on the new budget model had been provided to members of the Board in May 2006. The presentation of the budget in the spring 2007 based on the new budget model would lead to increased transparency and clarity to governance.

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

(f) Multi-Year Agreement

Professor Goel explained that each university in Ontario was required to sign a multi-year agreement with the Provincial Government. The agreement was tied to grant funding and included the enrolment targets and priority areas of the university. The priorities of the University of Toronto were based on those defined in *Stepping UP*. In response to the province's requirement for consultation within the university community on the multi-year agreement, there would be discussions at the next meetings of the Planning and Budget Committee and at the Academic Board.

(g) Academic Freedom and Freedom of Expression

Professor Goel observed that each year issues related to academic freedom and freedom of expression arose at the University. On occasion, some individuals expressed views that were considered to be offensive by others. Academic freedom was a core value of the University, and included the exchange of ideas and open discourse. The only limitations on Academic Freedom were those defined by law, such as legislation regarding discrimination, human rights, hate speech and character defamation. Organizers of events within the University community were required to provide opportunities for different points of view to be presented and were expected to run events in a manner respectful of all members of the community. To date, controversial events had been held at the University without disruption or adverse publicity.

The Chair thanked Professor Goel for his report, and noted the special interest of the Board in matters related to academic freedom.

6. *Ontarians with Disabilities Act: University of Toronto Accessibility Plan, 2006-07*

Professor Hildyard introduced the Accessibility Plan for 2006-07. The process of developing the Accessibility Plan had been highly inclusive. Each of the fifty-seven initiatives identified in the 2005-2006 Plan had been responded to and/or acted on in the past year. In the 2006-07 Plan, twenty-seven initiatives had been developed and had been grouped into four broad themes: Built Environment; Access to/Delivery of Academic Programs; Awareness/Education and Professional Development; and Accommodation/Services for Persons with Disabilities. This regrouping was intended to convey more adequately the coherent picture of the University's commitment to issues of accessibility.

In 2005-06, the University had received approximately \$1.8 million to meet accessibility needs, based on the count of students who had registered with Accessibility Services. However, the University had spent \$2.5 million in support of its three offices. In addition, every registrarial office in the University addressed the accessibility needs of students, while a variety of other offices in the University addressed needs related to accommodation for faculty and staff as well as students. In 2005-06, \$1.3 million had been spent on retrofitting facilities across the three campuses to improve accessibility.

Professor Gotlieb reminded members that the responsibilities of the Planning and Budget Committee included reviewing and recommending approval of reports to external agencies that outlined new policy positions.

6. *Ontarians with Disabilities Act: University of Toronto Accessibility Plan, 2006-07* (cont'd)

He reported that, in the discussion following the presentation of the 2006-07 *Accessibility Plan* to the Committee, it had been noted that, while divisions often had provided the support required by students with special needs, funds for such services had been provided to the central accessibility offices. Professor Hildyard had taken the comment under advisement.

Members of the Committee had been informed that information on accessibility services had been included in workshops that had been held over the summer by student groups and by Student Services. Members had also been informed about the pilot project of the Faculty of Medicine in which the Faculty had worked with the Accessibility Centre to make students aware of the services that were available and to encourage students to volunteer.

A member suggested that training on accessibility issues that was currently provided to faculty members on a voluntary basis be made compulsory for all faculty. He had personal knowledge of situations in which inappropriate remarks had been made to individuals concerning mental illness. The member noted that there was a lack of appropriate accommodation for certain conditions, and that students might not recognize that they had a mental health issue. He also commented on the long waiting lists for diagnosis of certain conditions, such as attention deficit disorder. Professor Hildyard replied that individuals were often uncertain about how best to address mental health issues. After thanking the member for sharing his experiences so candidly, Professor Goel remarked that making training compulsory did not always work for sensitive matters. The University was focusing on raising issues and awareness, and he would seek advice from Principals, Deans, Academic Directors, and Chairs (PDAD&C) on how to get the message to the University community.

A member expressed his support of the points raised by the previous speaker, and commented that the offices of accessibility services at the University were small, given the size of the campuses. Professor Goel referred to the membership of the Committees involved with the development of the Accessibility Plan, and stated that it was the responsibility of all members of the University Community to provide and support accessibility initiatives. The three accessibility services offices were only one aspect of the services provided at the University. Professor Hildyard added that staff in the registrarial offices in Faculties and Colleges also worked with students on accommodation issues.

A member observed that University policies sometimes made it difficult to follow best practice with respect to mental health issues. One example was the policy on time to degree for graduate students. The member asked whether a review of University policies was being planned. Professor Pfeiffer replied that, in the past year, the School of Graduate Studies had undertaken a review of practices at the graduate level, including the policy on time to degree.

A member asked whether the discussion was moot, since the Accessibility Plan had to be filed with the provincial government by September 30, 2006. Professor Hildyard replied that the Accessibility Plan had been discussed by the Planning and Budget Committee at its meeting on September 18, 2006, and the Plan had been posted on the University's website, as required by the province. Discussion of the Accessibility Plan at other levels of governance, such as the Academic Board, was important.

6. *Ontarians with Disabilities Act: University of Toronto Accessibility Plan, 2006-07*
(cont'd)

A member asked whether the need for accessibility was being over-estimated. Professor Goel replied that students had to register with the accessibility office to receive services. The provincial funding for accessibility was based upon the number of students who had registered for the services.

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the *Ontarians with Disabilities Act: University of Toronto Accessibility Plan, 2006-07*, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix 'A', be approved in principle.

7. School of Graduate Studies: Proposal for a Master of Finance (M.F.)

The Chair welcomed Professor Peter Pauly to the meeting for this item.

Professor Sass-Kortsak informed members that the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs (AP&P) had discussed the Master of Finance (M.F.) program at its meeting of September 20. Several questions had been raised by the Committee, all of which had been answered to the satisfaction of members.

The main theme of questioning had been whether there were clear differences between the proposed M.F. and other programs that allowed for the study of Finance, such as the Mathematical Finance program or the Master of Business Administration (MBA) in Finance. The Committee had been assured that the proposed program would have minimal overlap in content with other programs, and would have no overlap in targeted students. The program would be targeted towards individuals in their thirties or forties with careers in Finance who wanted to upgrade their knowledge and skills. The program would be offered during evenings and weekends, and would be designed to be as flexible as possible.

Other questions had concerned whether the Master of Finance designation was standard for this program, and whether an opportunity for skills upgrading would be provided for those students who did not meet the minimum standard required for the program.

Professor Gotlieb advised members that the Planning and Budget Committee had considered the planning and resource implications of the proposed program.

A member of the Committee had raised a question concerning the implications of the program on future enrolment growth and space requirements. Professor Goel had assured members that the Project Planning Committee would address such implications.

The proposed program had been supported by all members of the Committee.

A member asked whether courses in the program would be available to students who were not part of the cohort of the program. Invited to reply, Professor Pauly indicated that students would be allowed to enroll in the program's courses, space permitting and assuming they had the appropriate academic qualifications.

A member asked whether the program would be available to individuals who were re-entering University. Professor Pauly replied that students who met the undergraduate.

7. School of Graduate Studies: Proposal for a Master of Finance (M.F.) (cont'd)

minimum requirements and who had work experience would be considered for registration in the program

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the Master of Finance Program, leading to the degree of Master of Finance (M.F.) within the Rotman School of Management, commencing September, 2007, be approved.

Documentation is attached hereto as Appendix "B".

8. School of Graduate Studies: Proposal for a Master of Public Policy (M.P.P.)

The Chair welcomed Professor David Klausner, Professor Mark Stabile and Professor Carolyn Tuohy to the meeting for this item.

Professor Sass-Kortsak informed members that the program had been considered by the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs on September 20. The main point of discussion had concerned the administration and workings of the internship element of the program. The Committee had been assured that the School of Public Policy would administer the program. Internship spots would be available for everyone in the program. All governmental spots would be paid positions; however, international non-governmental organizations might not be able to offer paid internship positions. Since internships were the result of hiring processes, if two people wanted the same spot, the employer would choose. The program, however, would work to find a 'best fit' for its students.

Another question had concerned the risk of the School's receiving its cross-appointed Faculty from 'sending' Departments that might not match the School's planning. The Vice-Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Science had acknowledged that such a risk did exist, but it would be mitigated by extensive involvement by the Deans of the 'home' Faculties working together to ensure the School's success in the long term.

Professor Gotlieb advised members that the Planning and Budget Committee had considered the planning and resource implications of the proposed program. Members had been concerned that the available resource information applied to the School as a whole, and not to the proposed program alone.

Although members had been supportive of the proposed program itself, they had raised procedural issues concerning the approval of the program before the School for Public Policy and Governance – the intended home of the program – had been formally established by governance. Professor Goel had explained to the Committee that it had been necessary to approve the program at this time in order to submit it to the Ontario Council for Graduate Studies (OCGS) to enable the program to register students in September 2007. The Provost had undertaken to withdraw the program if the establishment of the School for Public Policy and Governance was not approved by governance.

Professor Gotlieb noted that, after a thorough debate on procedural and budget issues, the proposed program had received the support of all members of the Committee.

8. School of Graduate Studies: Proposal for a Master of Public Policy (M.P.P.) (cont'd)

A member of the Board noted that Table 2 on pages 14 and 15 of the proposal showed that each faculty member would teach in all fields. Professor Stabile undertook to correct the table. The member asked whether courses would be available to students who were not registered in the program. Professor Stabile replied that some courses were regarded as core courses that were critical to building the cohort of students in the program. Other courses would be open to students who were not registered in the program.

The Chair observed that the proposed program was not the beginning of public policy at the University, but would add quality, focus and infrastructure to the breadth and strength of current public policy studies. Professor Stabile expressed his agreement with the Chair's statement, and added that the program would be competing with Master of Public Policy programs in the United States, and with Master of Public Administration (M.P.A.) programs in Canada. He noted that the public service in Ontario now relied disproportionately on graduates from the M.P.A. program at one other university for appointments as analysts,

Professor Goel commented that the issues that had been raised spoke to interdisciplinary work that had been one of the initiatives of *Stepping UP*. The University would ensure that more interdisciplinary and interdivisional programs were created.

A member remarked that the proposed program was the first to be brought forward in the transitional year of the new budget model, which was intended to more accurately reflect the costs of interdivisional teaching. The Dean of Arts and Science echoed the comments, and added that the proposal for the School of Public Policy and Governance had been passed by the Faculty Council on October 3, 2006.

Professor Goel explained that this was the first of a number of initiatives that were being brought forward to governance in a new way.

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the Master of Public Policy program leading to the degree of Master of Public Policy (M.P.P.) be established within the Faculty of Arts and Science, commencing September 2007.

Documentation is attached hereto as Appendix "C".

9. Constitution: Faculty of Forestry

Professor Goel reminded members that the Academic Board was responsible for approving divisional Constitutions. The revisions were designed to accommodate the new responsibilities and authority of the individual faculties resulting from the reorganization of the School of Graduate Studies (SGS). A range of best practices for governance had also been included. The Constitution had been approved by the Council of the Faculty of Forestry on June 28, 2006.

The Chair asked whether there was a template for Faculty Council constitutions and whether the proposed constitution conformed to the template. Professor Goel replied that a constitutional template had been developed and that the Faculty of Forestry constitution conformed to the template. A member commended staff in the Office of the Vice-President

9. Constitution: Faculty of Forestry (cont'd)

and Provost and the Office of the Governing Council for working with divisions in the revision of the Faculty Council constitutions.

A member asked who would appoint the members listed on page 3 of the Constitution. Dean Smith replied that conversations were held with individuals, and motions were sent to the Council for approval. The member asked whether *ex officio* members could be elected as Chair or Vice-Chair of the Faculty Council. The Secretary of the Governing Council had replied that it was outside normal governance practice for *ex officio* members to serve as Chair or Vice-Chair. The member asked whether proxy voting was allowed. The Secretary of the Governing Council had replied that proxies were not used in governance at the University of Toronto.

A member expressed his concern at the limited number of faculty members on the Council who were not academic administrators. Professor Goel remarked that each Faculty was unique, therefore there was no strict constitutional template. The percentage distribution of members on the Forestry Faculty Council was similar to that of other Faculty Councils. He also noted that the role of program coordinator was not considered to be an academic administrative appointment. In response to a question, Dean Smith stated that there were 15 full-time faculty members in the Faculty.

Dean Sinervo commented that he had reviewed the Faculty of Forestry constitution, and supported its approval.

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE CONFIRM

THAT the Constitution of the Faculty of Forestry of the University of Toronto, approved by the Faculty Council on June 28, 2006 be approved.

Documentation is attached hereto as Appendix "D".

10. Constitution: Faculty of Music

The Chair welcomed Professor Cam Walter to the meeting for this item.

Professor Goel remarked that the revisions were designed to accommodate the new responsibilities and authority resulting from the reorganization of SGS, and to adopt a range of best practices for governance. The Constitution had been approved by the Council of the Faculty of Music on May 30, 2006.

He noted that the By-laws of the Faculty had been included with the documentation but only the Constitution was being proposed for approval by the Board.

A member asked for clarification of the [D.M.A. to conform with above designations?] degree listed on page 2 of the program. Professor Walter had replied that the degree was currently going through a name change process.

10. Constitution: Faculty of Music (cont'd)

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE CONFIRM

THAT the Constitution of the Faculty of Music, University of Toronto, approved by the Faculty Council on May 30, 2006, be approved.

Documentation is attached hereto as Appendix "E".

11. Statement on Equity, Diversity and Excellence

The Chair reminded members that the *Statement* was for discussion only by the Board. Although the University Affairs Board was responsible for considering the *Statement* for approval, it was, in his view, appropriate for the Academic Board to discuss the *Statement* given its overall importance in academic matters and particularly given its references to academic excellence. The Chair invited Professor Hildyard to introduce the *Statement*.

Professor Hildyard commented that the *Statement* had been developed over a long period of time. She recognized the contribution of Ms Guberman in the development of the *Statement*. It was the first attempt to bring together references to equity, excellence and diversity. The *Statement* was derived from a variety of sources, including *Stepping UP* and the President's installation speech.

The following revisions were suggested by members:

- Revise the phrase "grounded in a core commitment" to "grounded in an institution-wide commitment" in the first sentence of the second paragraph in the section on *Equity and Human Rights*.
- Add reference to students in the last sentence of the first paragraph in the section on *Diversity and Inclusiveness*: "... and it is our aim to have students, teaching and administrative staffs that mirror the diversity of the pool ..."
- Add the phrase "and those who might become qualified through affirmative action" to the last sentence of the first paragraph in the section on *Diversity and Inclusiveness*.
- Add references to diversity and excellence to the first line of the first paragraph under the section on *Responsibility*: "the University will strive to make consideration of equity, excellence and diversity a part of the processes. "
- Include references to *Policy on Scheduling of Classes and Examinations and Other Accommodations for Religious Observances* and *Policy on Academic Appeals within Divisions* be added to the list of policies in the footnote on page 2 of the *Statement*.

12. Items for Information

The following items were received for information by the Board. There were no questions.

- (a) Status Changes and Appointments of Professors Emeriti
- (b) Draft Excerpt from Report Number 124 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs (September 20, 2006)
- (c) Report Number 113 of the Planning and Budget Committee (September 18, 2006)
- (d) Report on Degrees Awarded in the Calendar Year 2005
- (e) Calendar of Business 2006-07

13. Date of Next Meeting

The Chair reminded members that the date of the next meeting was November 15, 2006. As there was a convocation ceremony beginning at 6 p.m. that evening, the meeting would begin promptly at 4:10 pm.

14. Other Business**(a) Approvals under Summer Executive Authority**

The Chair noted for the record that there had been no approvals under Summer Executive Authority of matters within the terms of reference of the Board or its Standing Committees.

15. Quarterly Report on Donations: May 1, 2006 – July 31, 2006

The Board received the report for information. There were no questions.

The meeting adjourned at 6:05 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

November 4, 2006