

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL
REPORT NUMBER 138 OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD

November 24, 2005

To the Governing Council
University of Toronto

Your Board reports that it held a meeting on Thursday, November 24, 2005 at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall. In this report, item 5 is recommended to the Governing Council, items 6 and 7 are recommended to the Executive Committee for confirmation, and the remaining items are reported for information.

Present:

Professor W. Raymond
Cummins, Chair
Professor Brian Corman, Vice-
Chair
Professor C. David Naylor,
President
Professor Vivek Goel, Vice-
President and Provost
Professor John Challis, Vice-
President, Research and
Associate Provost
Professor S. Zaky, Vice-
Provost, Planning and
Budget
Professor Rona Abramovitch
Mr. Navine K. Aggarwal
Professor Stewart Aitchison
Mrs. Mubarka Alam
Professor Jan Angus
Professor Gage Averill
Professor George Baird
Professor Clare Beghtol
Professor Katherine Berg
Professor Donald Brean
Professor Philip H. Byer
Mr. Blake Chapman
Mr. Ewen Weili Chen
Professor David Clandfield
Professor John Coleman
Professor David Cook

Absent:

Professor Derek Allen
Professor Sidney Aster
Professor James Barber
Professor Silvia Bashevkin
Professor David Begun
Dr. Terry Blake

Present: (cont'd)

Mr. Joe Cox
Miss Coralie D'Souza
Professor Miriam Diamond
Professor Marianne S.V.
Douglas
Professor Robin Elliott
Dr. Inez. Elliston
Professor Guy Faulkner
Dr. Shari Graham Fell
Professor Jonathan Freedman
Ms Linda B. Gardner
Professor Jane Gaskell
Ms Bonnie Goldberg
Mr. Christopher Goode
Professor Avrum Gotlieb
Professor Wayne Hindmarsh
Ms Bonnie Horne
Mr. Martin Hycza
Professor Yuki Mayumi
Johnson
Miss Livia Jozsa
Professor Ronald H. Kluger
Professor Hon C. Kwan
Ms Lesley Ann Lavack
Professor Robert Lewis
Professor Lori Loeb
Professor Brenda Y. McCabe
Ms Vera Melnyk
Mr. Matto Mildenerger

Absent: (cont'd)

Ms Susan C. McDonald
Professor Douglas McDougall
Professor Linda McGillis Hall
Professor Mark McGowan
Professor John R. Miron
Professor David Mock
Ms Carole Moore

Present: (cont'd)

Professor Cheryl Misak
Professor Mayo Moran
Professor Mariel O'Neill-Karch
Professor Susan Pfeiffer
Ms Van Chau Quach
Professor Cheryl Regehr
Professor Jolie Ringash
Mr. Paul Ruppert
Professor Andrea Sass-Kortsak
Professor John Scherk
Professor Brian Cantwell Smith
Professor J.J. Berry Smith
Miss Maureen J. Somerville
Professor Suzanne Stevenson
Mr. Mahadeo Sukhai
Ms B. Elizabeth Vosburgh
Professor Melissa S. Williams
Dr. Cindy Woodland

Non-voting Assessors:

Professor D. Farrar, Deputy
Provost and Vice-Provost,
Students
Professor A. Hildyard, Vice-
President, Human Resources
and Equity
Professor Edith Hillan, Vice-
Provost, Academic

Secretariat:

Mr. Neil Dobbs
Mr. Andrew Drummond
Ms Cristina Oke, Secretary

Absent: (cont'd)

Mr. Ryan Matthew Campbell
 Ms Maple Chong
 Professor George Elliott
 Clarke
 Professor Luc F. De Nil
 Professor Raisa B. Deber
 Professor Steven T. Fong
 Mr. John F. Fraser
 Professor Eric Freeman
 Professor Hugh Gunz
 Mr. Syed Yaser Habeeb
 Professor Jenny Jenkins
 Mr. Kijun Kim
 Dr. Joel A. Kirsh
 Professor Christina Kramer
 Professor Brian Langille
 Professor Larry Leith
 Professor Michael R. Marrus
 Professor Roger L. Martin
 Professor Diane Massam

Absent: (cont'd)

Professor Sioban Nelson
 Professor Janet Paterson
 Mr. Andrew Pinto
 Mr. John Rawle
 Professor James A. Reilly
 Professor Robert Reisz
 Professor Richard Reznick
 Dr. Jay Rosenfield
 Professor Gareth Seaward
 Professor Anthony N. Sinclair
 Professor Pekka Sinervo
 Professor Tattersall Smith
 Professor Ron Smyth
 Professor Lisa Steele
 Professor Tas Venetsanopoulos
 Professor Rinaldo Wayne
 Walcott
 Professor Catharine Whiteside

In Attendance:

Ms Yvette Ali, Director of
 Professional and International
 Programs, Woodsworth
 College
 Dr. Douglas Bors, Chair,
 Constitutional Committee,
 University of Toronto at
 Scarborough
 Ms Sheree Drummond, Assistant
 Provost
 Dr. Chris Cunningham, Special
 Advisor to the President
 Ms Helen Lasthiotakis, Director,
 Policy and Planning, Office of
 the Vice-President and Provost
 Mr. Henry Mulhall, Special
 Projects Officer, Office of the
 Governing Council
 Ms Estafania Toleda, Vice-
 President, University Affairs,
 Students' Administrative
 Council

1. Report of the Previous Meeting

The report of the previous meeting, held on October 6, 2005, was approved.

2. Business Arising Out of the Report

The Chair recalled that, at the previous meeting of the Academic Board, members had been informed that the questions raised at the June meeting of the Board concerning reports of the Academic Appeals Committee would be addressed at the November meeting.

A document prepared by the Provost's Office to address the questions raised had been circulated electronically on November 22, and copies had been available at the door.¹

3. Report Number 122 of the Agenda Committee (November 8, 2005)

The Chair drew the attention of members to two items included in the Report.

a) Review of Academic Programs and Units

The Chair noted that Professor Smith had described the revised process used by the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs to consider the Reviews, and that the Agenda Committee had formally endorsed this revised process.

¹ Secretary's Note: the document is available at <http://www.utoronto.ca/govcncl/bac/details/ab/2005-06/aba20051124-02.pdf>

3. Report Number 122 of the Agenda Committee (November 8, 2005) (cont'd)**b) Approval Process for Academic Administrative Appointments**

The Chair noted that a proposal for a revised approval process for academic administrative appointments would be presented by Professor Corman under 'Other Business'.

4. Report from the Vice-President and Provost

Professor Goel reported on the following matters.

(a) Budget

The Government of Ontario's *Reaching Higher* Budget had contained plans for substantial new investments in post-secondary education. While some specific information was now available, there remained a substantial number of outstanding questions. The presentation of the 2006-07 budget report would occur after these issues had been addressed. The President and his colleagues in the Council of Ontario Universities were making their best efforts to ensure that the outstanding questions were answered within the Government's current fiscal year to enable the institutions to proceed with their own budget decisions.

(b) Tuition Fees

The Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities, the Honourable Chris Bentley, was continuing his consultations with stakeholders concerning how to deal with the end of the Province's freeze on tuition fees. The University anticipated a decision early in the new calendar year.

(c) Capital Program

Professor Goel noted that members would be aware of the decision of the Royal Ontario Museum not to proceed with a high-rise condominium tower on the site of the current McLaughlin Planetarium. The University hoped to be able to discuss with the Museum an appropriate development for that site and a plan for the precinct that might also address some of the needs of the Faculty of Law and the Faculty of Music.

The University was also continuing work on its capital plan and on other capital projects. Forthcoming decisions about graduate-student enrolment expansion would be a key element in capital planning. Given space limitations especially on the St. George Campus, it would be essential to ensure the maximum use of each development site.

(d) Academic Initiatives Fund.

Professor Goel said that the Academic Initiatives Fund remained the University's most important tool for fostering *Stepping UP* priorities. The deadline for submissions for the third round of funding was December 9, and he anticipated bringing recommendations to the Planning and Budget Committee in the winter term.

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

(e) Research Policies

Professor Goel and the Vice-President, Research and Associate Provost were establishing a committee to review the University's policies on research administration. Among the matters to be assessed would be: research partnerships, funding policies, processes of assessment of research projects for submission to external agencies, and conflicts of interest at the institutional level.

(f) Teaching Excellence

Professor Goel recalled that the President had in his installation address announced steps to encourage and recognize excellent teaching – a key objective of the *Stepping UP* academic plan. A call for nominations for the President's Teaching Award and for membership of the University's Teaching Academy had been circulated. The President's Teaching Award would bring with it a \$50,000 allowance (\$10,000 a year for five years) to be used by the award-winner for scholarly and professional development. There would be about five inductions each year into the Teaching Academy, depending on the quality of nominations each year. Members of the Academy would provide advice on teaching development at the University, would be invited to give featured public lectures and convocation addresses, and would be invited to mentor other faculty members.

(g) Arts Council

The Provost had recently invited nominations for membership on the University's new Arts Council. That Council would generally promote the arts at the University, coordinate the programs in the arts across the three campuses, promote co-curricular activities in the arts, and promote the University's arts activities in the broader community. The Celebration of the Arts event on the day preceding the President's installation had proven to be a wonderful one, and Professor Goel hoped that it would become an annual event.

(h) Student Recruitment

Professor Goel recalled that the President had, in his installation address, announced his intention to inaugurate a new program of scholarships to attract the very best students to the University. Over the past decade, the University had quite rightly focused on need-based student support. While that had been an entirely appropriate policy, it had the effect of freezing merit-based scholarships based on academic and other criteria such as achievement in the arts, athletics and community service. Therefore, the value of the scholarships offered to excellent students had declined relative to that at other institutions. Given the University's focus on excellence, it was appropriate to balance funding for need- and merit-based student awards. Professor Goel would initiate consultations on the matter with Principals and Deans, students and the broader community.

5. Academic Appeals Committee

(a) Policy on Academic Appeals within Divisions

Professor Smith reported that the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs had had an extensive discussion of the proposed new Policy on Academic Appeals within Divisions, led ably by Professor Hillan and by Ms. Bonnie Goldberg, who had chaired the Academic Appeals Committee's Subcommittee to Review the Guidelines for Appeals within Divisions. The proposed policy represented an update from the current

5. Academic Appeals Committee (cont'd)

(a) Policy on Academic Appeals within Divisions (cont'd)

Guidelines. It was intended to address issues such as the advent of new technologies as well as the University's ongoing commitment to equity and diversity. The Policy was designed to renew minimum standards for the entire institution while maintaining divisional flexibility in operating local appeals processes.

Professor Smith said that in response to questions raised at the Committee, Ms. Goldberg had advised that it would not be appropriate to include in the Policy definitions of the terms diversity, equity and accommodation. It would be preferable to have a broad understanding of those terms rather than to restrict their applicability. Two divisions had not responded to the call for divisional consultations because, for specific reasons in each case, it had turned out not to be appropriate to do so. While it was intended that changes be implemented in September 2006, Professor Hillan had advised that improvement of practice at an earlier date would always be appropriate. In response to a question about the interaction of the academic appeals process and the policies and procedures pertaining to academic and/or non-academic misconduct, Ms. Goldberg said that outstanding issues of misconduct would have to be resolved prior to consideration of an academic appeal. Finally, a member had asked about the appropriateness of the requirement for students to have their medical examinations on the same day as claimed illnesses, given that some conditions could be detected by later tests. Ms. Goldberg had responded that the requirement was necessary because a few students attempted to abuse the system by having medical checkups after their sicknesses.

Professor Smith concluded that members of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs were very grateful for the excellent and extensive work of the Subcommittee to Review the Guidelines for Appeals with Divisions.

Among the matters that arose in discussion were the following:

(i) Definition of the terms “petition” and “appeal.” A member urged that the Provost's “Framework for the Divisional Appeals Processes,” intended to provide guidance for the divisions in implementing their processes pursuant to the proposed Guidelines, include clear definitions of the terms “petition” and “appeal.” Such definitions would not only improve the Framework, they would also greatly assist students in understanding the processes. Professor Goel agreed that there was some confusion in the use of the terms, which were sometimes used differently across the divisions. He would seek clarity by including definitions where available in the Framework. The member urged that the definitions make clear the limits of petitions and appeals with respect to the instructor's right to evaluate student performance and assign grades. The member had experience with petitions and appeals concerning the assignment of grades, which had been very time-consuming and costly. It was important that the instructor's expert judgment not be subject to being overruled by petition and appeal processes. Professor Goel replied that the proposed policy was one dealing with appeals. He would ensure that the Framework document included a definition of petitions.

5. Academic Appeals Committee (cont'd)**(a) Policy on Academic Appeals within Divisions (cont'd)**

(ii) Commitment to equity and diversity in the appeals process. A member urged that the Provost's Framework provide examples of situations where special consideration was warranted for reason of the University's commitment to equity and diversity. Professor Goel thanked the member for the valuable suggestion. He would seek to include examples in the Framework and certainly in training for the officers who administered the student appeal process.

(iii) Informal resolution. A member observed that his service on the Governing Council's Committee on Academic Appeals had convinced him of the importance of consistency and institutional memory in dealing with academic appeals. He was concerned that the Guidelines' emphasis on informal resolution would lead to inconsistent treatment of students. He urged either a rethinking of the emphasis in the Guidelines or revision of the Provost's Framework to exhort divisions to ensure consistency in the application of their informal resolution processes. Professor Goel agreed that consistency was very important, and he stressed that informal resolution should not proceed on an *ad hoc* basis. If, however, it proved possible to resolve issues without a formal judicial process, doing so would be valuable. One area of concern was the use of a formal judicial process when an informal process might expeditiously clear up a matter, for example when new evidence became available before a formal hearing. Having said that, Professor Goel recognized the need for consistency in informal processes and he undertook to ensure that training stressed that fact. Ms Goldberg added that informal resolution was especially important in cases where there was a need for timely resolution, for example when an outcome was required for a student to complete her/his academic program or to gain admission to a new program.

(iv) Access to student records by student members of appeals committees. A member observed that the Policy on Access to Student Academic Records provided for access only to staff members in the course of their duties. Because students served on appeal committees, the Policy should provide for unchallenged access for those student members to relevant parts of appellants' academic records. Professor Goel replied that he understood that student members of appeal committees did in fact have access to appropriate information, and he would seek a legal opinion concerning that practice. Ms Goldberg added that student academic records contained much more information than that relevant to appeals. Students making appeals put forward appropriate evidence, and all committee members had access to appropriate aspects of the academic record. It was important that other information remain confidential to protect the student's right to privacy and to ensure that no prejudicial information was considered. Professor Goel noted that because the universities were now to be subject to the Ontario *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*, the University would in any event be reviewing its Policy on Access to Student Academic Records.

A member who had served on the Subcommittee to Review the Guidelines for Appeals within University Divisions stated that the Subcommittee had completed an exceptional amount of good work. She commended the leadership of Ms Goldberg and participation of all members of the Sub-committee, especially Professor Beghtol and Ms Nora Gillespie (counsel in the Office of the Provost and assessor to the Subcommittee), who had arranged for the Subcommittee to receive a great deal of advice from virtually all of the key individuals involved in the appeals process in the University.

5. Academic Appeals Committee (cont'd)

(a) Policy on Academic Appeals within Divisions (cont'd)

On motion duly made and seconded

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the Policy on Academic Appeals within Divisions, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix “A” be approved, effective September 1, 2006; and

THAT the Guidelines for Academic Appeals within Divisions be rescinded, effective September 1, 2006.

(b) Academic Appeals Committee: Terms of Reference

Ms Goldberg reported that in June 2005, the Striking Committee of the Academic Board recommended that the number of Chairs of the Academic Appeals Committee be increased. The Academic Appeals Committee now recommended that the Committee’s Terms of Reference be revised to provide for the appointment of at least five appointed Chairs. The need to increase the number of Chairs had become apparent in the previous spring, when an unusual backlog of cases had developed. The increased number of Chairs would enable to Committee to deal with a larger number of appeals, something that was important in improving the timeliness of the appeals process for students and therefore the quality of service to them.

On motion duly made and seconded

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the revised Terms of Reference of the Academic Appeals Committee, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix “B” be approved.

(c) Report Number 303 of the Academic Appeals Committee

The Board received Report Number 303 of the Academic Appeals Committee (October 3, 2005) for information.

6. Woodsworth College: Certificate Name Change

Professor Smith informed members that this was a routine name change to update a title. There had been virtually no discussion on this item at the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs.

There were no questions.

6. Woodsworth College: Certificate Name Change (cont'd)

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDED

That the Executive Committee Confirm

THAT the name of the Certificate in Teaching English as a Second Language (TESL) be changed to Certificate in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) effective September 1, 2006.

Documentation is attached hereto as Appendix “C”.

7. Constitution: University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC)

Professor Goel reminded members that the Academic Board was responsible for approving divisional Constitutions. The Constitution of the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC) had been updated to reflect the current administrative and departmental structure. The By-Laws had been separated from the Constitution.

A member noted that the definition of graduate student included in the Constitution had been changed from students registered in the School of Graduate Studies (SGS) and supervised by a member of the faculty of UTSC, to students registered in SGS and identified by SGS as being at UTSC. He asked what process was in place for such identification. Professor Pfeiffer replied that students could self-identify in the Repository of Student Information (ROSI) as a member of UTSC. A member who had attended the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM) commented that students often did not realize the importance of self-identifying as a member of a particular campus, and that the number of students at UTM had always been underestimated. It was also noted that students could be identified by the campus to which their ancillary fees were directed.

Professor Goel commented that the definition in the revised Constitution allowed for a broad interpretation.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDED

That the Executive Committee Confirm

THAT the revised Constitution of the University of Toronto at Scarborough, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix “D”, be approved.

8. Graduate Enrolment Planning 2005-15: Discussion Paper

The Chair reminded members that the 50% increase in graduate enrolment sought by the provincial government by 2009 represented a significant opportunity for the University. The Discussion Paper described the context for graduate expansion and raised issues that must be addressed by the University.

8. Graduate Enrolment Planning 2005-15: Discussion Paper (cont'd)

The Chair explained that Professor Goel would present the key points of graduate enrolment planning to the Board. Following his presentation, Professor Gotlieb would summarize the discussion at the Planning and Budget Committee. Members would then be invited to raise questions, make comments and discuss graduate enrolment planning.

(a) Presentation

Professor Goel explained that consultations were being held with members of the University community including an open Town Hall meeting that was scheduled for December 7. Based on the input received from the consultations, a Framework document would be developed and brought to governance early in the winter.

Professor Goel noted that graduate education had always been a distinctive feature of the University of Toronto and a defining part of its vision. Graduate expansion could enhance undergraduate student experience by providing more teaching assistantships, increasing the number of research opportunities for undergraduate students, and providing opportunities for graduate students to act as residence dons and mentors.

The University's commitment to graduate education had been a recurring theme in its academic planning cycles: *Planning for 2000* (1994), *Raising Our Sights* (2000), *A Framework for Enrolment Expansion at the University of Toronto* (2000) and *Stepping UP* (2003). The University's submission to the Rae Review had also called for graduate enrolment expansion. All of the planning documents had been endorsed by governance. A number of external reports had also emphasized the need for increased graduate student enrolment in Ontario.

Professor Goel referred to the full-time undergraduate enrolment projections that had been made by Price Waterhouse Coopers in a study published in 2000. The study had based its projections on four components: demographic changes, increased participation, changing workplace requirements, and the effect of the double cohort. The projections had been lower than the actual full-time enrolment in Ontario universities between 2000-01 and 2004-05. The double cohort had accelerated the increases in enrolment, and had focused attention on building capacity.

Professor Goel informed members that, since 1973, the number of students at the University of Toronto had doubled, and a critical question was whether the University might be reaching maximum capacity. The University had been close to meeting its targets for enrolment growth. Enrolment in the doctoral stream had grown, but not as much as the University had wanted. The target graduate to undergraduate enrolment balance had not been maintained. The proportion of graduate students at the University of Toronto was significantly less than that of its research-intensive peers. Although the quality of students had been maintained through the undergraduate expansion, student/faculty ratios had been affected.

Professor Goel noted that it was necessary to examine the character of the institution and the impact of growth in different divisions. If the number of graduate students increased, more resources would be required for the funding guarantee and for research. A significant difference between graduate and undergraduate enrolment expansion was the need for one-on-one faculty interaction and financial support for graduate students. In addition, the impact on teaching and administrative staff had to be considered, as well as the impact on the student experience. Graduate enrolment expansion would also provide an opportunity for the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM) and the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC) to increase the presence and visibility of graduate students on those campuses.

8. Graduate Enrolment Planning 2005-15: Discussion Paper (cont'd)

(a) Presentation (cont'd)

Professor Goel reminded members that the provincial government allocation of \$220 million by 2009-10 for graduate expansion was an almost unprecedented opportunity for the University. Currently, the University of Toronto accounted for about one-third of the total graduate student enrolment in Ontario. To maintain that share, the University would have to increase the number of graduate students by 3,700 by 2009-10. Initial divisional plans had indicated that the University could accommodate much more than 3,700 additional students.

Professor Goel indicated that graduate enrolment planning had to start within the divisions. Academic plans had to be revisited to ensure that current faculty hiring plans matched any graduate enrolment expansion plans. Other resource considerations included supervisory capacity, research funding, graduate student funding, space and housing. The provincial government budget had included an allocation of \$550 million for capital projects to flow as an annual payment amortized for 20 years. The funds could be used for new space or for renovations. To date, the distribution formula across universities had not been decided.

Professor Goel concluded his presentation by highlighting four key points:

- The expansion was consistent with the University's academic objectives.
- Graduate enrolment expansion represented a significant opportunity for the University of Toronto.
- The University of Toronto was well-positioned to prepare and execute a graduate enrolment plan
- Planning would have to be driven at the local level.

(b) Summary of Planning and Budget Committee Report

Professor Gottlieb informed members that the Planning and Budget Committee had had a thorough discussion of Graduate Enrolment Planning at its meeting on November 1st. The discussion had focused on several broad themes:

- The distribution of enrolment expansion across disciplines;
- The appropriate balance between professional master's and doctoral stream programs;
- The need for increased funding for research and for graduate student support;
- The differences between graduate and undergraduate enrolment expansion;
- The impact of enrolment expansion on the student experience and on faculty and staff;
- The impact of the three-campus model on graduate education.

The following six principles for graduate enrolment expansion had been suggested by a member of the Committee:

1. Graduate enrolment expansion must advance the University's research agenda, and have an appropriate mix of professional masters and doctoral stream programs.
2. The quality of students admitted must be maintained or enhanced.

8. Graduate Enrolment Planning 2005-15: Discussion Paper (cont'd)**(b) Summary of Planning and Budget Committee Report (cont'd)**

3. Graduate enrolment expansion must support undergraduate expansion, for example, fund additional teaching assistantships.
4. Graduate enrolment expansion must pay for itself, and not be subsidized by operating funds.
5. Graduate enrolment expansion must not increase faculty load beyond acceptable and sustainable levels.
6. The graduate student funding guarantee should be reviewed with a view to adding an option other than 'having funding' and not having funding'.

The discussion had concluded with suggestions from members about information that they thought would be useful in the final *Framework* document.

(c) Discussion

In discussion, the following points were raised by members of the Academic Board.

- The University should recruit graduate students from all over the world, and not focus on its own students. It was noted that out-of-province students were affected negatively by the Ontario Student Assistance Plan (OSAP). Funding for international students would not be provided by the provincial government. The University would seek a mix of international and domestic graduate students.
- Was the balance between undergraduate and graduate enrolment, based on 1997-98 full-time equivalent (FTE) enrolment, still appropriate? An increase of 3000 graduate students would return the balance between graduate and undergraduate enrolment to the 1997-98 levels. Professor Goel noted that the percentage of graduate enrolment at many peer institutions was more than 20%, while at the University of Toronto, the percentage in 2004-05 had been 18.1%. For funding purposes, it was appropriate to return to the previous balance. However, it was also necessary to seriously consider the appropriate balance between undergraduate and graduate enrolment in the future. Professor Naylor added that the larger question was the optimum size for the University that would allow it to maintain the quality of the student experience.
- In order to plan for graduate enrolment expansion, local units needed to know the funding that would be available to them. Professor Goel noted that page 10 of the Discussion Paper included estimated net funding to the divisions of \$14,000 for a Master's student and \$24,000 for a Ph.D. student. Such funds would be provided to the division. Divisions would have flexibility on how to use these resources in an optimal way to advance their graduate programs.
- The availability of library resources and information technology infrastructure to support graduate enrolment expansion should be considered.
- The balance between professional master's and doctoral stream programs was an important consideration in graduate enrolment expansion. The administration of graduate programs in the three-campus framework was also an important consideration in planning for graduate enrolment expansion.

9. Items for Information

Members received for information the following reports:

- (a) Appointments and Status Changes
- (b) Report Number 117 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs (October 26, 2005)
- (c) Report Number 105 of the Planning and Budget Committee (November 1, 2005)
- (d) Report Number 304 of the Academic Appeals Committee

10. Date of Next Meeting – December 8, 2005

The Chair informed members that a number of academic administrative appointments would be considered at the December meeting, and encouraged all members to attend.

11. Other Business

a) Approval Process for Academic Administrative Appointments

Introduction

The Chair invited Professor Corman to present a proposal for a revised approval process for academic administrative appointments.

Professor Corman recalled that, over the past few years, several members of the Academic Board had raised concerns about the role of the Board in approving academic administrative appointments. Prior to last year, members had received a list of names, positions and departments, but no information had been provided about the search process or the successful candidate. In 2004-05, a template had been developed by the Office of the Vice-President and Provost to provide additional information about the successful candidate, and to confirm that the search process had been conducted in accordance with the *Policy on the Appointment of Academic Administrators*.

In order to address the concerns expressed by members of the Board over the years with respect to the Board's role, and to strengthen governance oversight, it was proposed that the approval of academic administrative appointments be delegated to a smaller body of the Academic Board, such as the Agenda Committee, and reported to the Board for information. The approval by a designated group of the Board would allow increased due diligence, as the group could receive additional information about the search process and the successful candidate, and provide a greater level of scrutiny than that which the full Board might provide. Such an approval process would also allow for more timely approvals, which are required by the demands of the current market.

Professor Corman explained that the proposed approval process would build on the expedited approval process for academic administrative appointments that had been approved in September 1998. It would also be similar to the approval of academic administrative appointments made under Summer Executive Authority by the Provost, the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Academic Board, and the student member of the Agenda Committee.

11. Other Business (cont'd)**a) Approval Process for Academic Administrative Appointments (cont'd)****Introduction (cont'd)**

Professor Corman advised members of the Board that the Agenda Committee supported consideration of a revised approval process.

Discussion

A member emphasized the importance of the Board receiving information about academic administrative appointments. Professor Corman replied that there would be no diminution of information provided to the Academic Board.

A member asked why the Agenda Committee was being suggested as an appropriate body for the delegation of the Board's authority with respect to the approval of academic administrative appointments. Professor Corman replied that the Agenda Committee acted as an Executive Committee for the Board and was therefore considered to be an appropriate body for this purpose.

Professor Goel commented that the proposal reflected a trend in governance practice which separated administration and governance and provided increased accountability. A small group could receive information in a level of detail that would not be feasible for circulation to the entire Board. Professor Goel indicated that the Chair of the Governing Council was working on similar enhancements with respect to accountability and oversight for the Senior Salary and Executive Committees.

A member suggested that a revised report be developed for the Board on academic administrative appointments that had been approved by a smaller group.

The Chair thanked members for their comments, and advised them that a detailed proposal would be prepared for consideration by the Agenda Committee at its next meeting.

The Board moved *in camera*.

12. Quarterly Report on Donations May 1, 2005 – July 31, 2005

The Chair reminded members that this report arose from the Provost's guidelines on donations, and was presented for information.

13. Academic Administrative Appointments

The following academic administrative appointments were approved.

FACULTY OF ARTS AND SCIENCE

Department of Physics
Professor Michael Luke

Interim Chair
January 1, 2006 to June 30, 2006
(Extension)

13. Academic Administrative Appointments (cont'd)

FACULTY OF MEDICINE

Department of Medical Biophysics

Professor David Rose

Interim Chair

November 1, 2005 to December 31, 2006
or until a new Chair is named

SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

Department of Linguistics

Professor Jack Chambers

Acting Graduate Chair

January 1, 2006 to May 31, 2006

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO AT MISSISSAUGA

Department of Biology

Professor Robert Reisz

Chair

January 1, 2006 to June 30, 2010

Department of English and Drama

Professor Leslie Thomson

Chair

July 1, 2006 to June 30, 2008

Department of Geography

Professor Amrita Daniere

Chair

July 1, 2006 to June 30, 2009

Department of Sociology

Professor Kelly Hannah-Moffat

Acting Chair

January 1, 2006 to June 30, 2006

Professor Charles Jones

Chair

July 1, 2006 to June 30, 2008

The meeting adjourned at 6:10 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

December 5, 2005