

**THE GOVERNING COUNCIL**  
**REPORT NUMBER 146 OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD**  
**November 15, 2006**

To the Governing Council,  
University of Toronto

Your Board reports that it held a meeting on Wednesday, November 15, 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 Vivek Goel, Vice-President and Provost  
Professor S. Zaky, Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget  
Professor Stewart Aitchison  
Professor Derek Allen  
Professor Cristina Amon  
Professor Christy Anderson  
Professor Jan Angus  
Professor George Baird  
Mr. Brian Beaton  
Professor David R. Begun

Professor Ragnar Buchweitz  
Professor Donald Brean  
Mr. Ryan Matthew Campbell  
Mr. Blake Chapman  
Mr. Ewen Weili Chen  
Dr. Christena Chruszez  
Mr. Tim Corson  
Mr. Kristofer T. Coward  
Mr. Ken Davy  
Professor Miriam Diamond  
Miss Saswati Deb  
Professor Guy Faulkner  
Dr. Shari Graham Fell  
Ms Bonnie Goldberg  
Professor Avrum Gotlieb  
Ms Pamela Gravestock  
Professor Hugh Gunz  
Professor Rick Halpern  
Professor Wayne K. Hindmarsh  
Professor Brad Inwood  
Professor Gregory Jump  
Mr. Mohammed Khan  
Mr. Umar Khan

Dr. Lesley Ann Lavack  
Professor Robert Levit  
Professor Lori Loeb  
Professor Diane Massam  
Mr. Geoffrey Matus  
Professor Douglas McDougall  
Professor John R. Miron  
Professor David Mock  
Ms Carole Moore  
Mr. Roger P. Parkinson  
Professor Susan Pfeiffer  
Professor Jolie Ringash  
Professor Andrea Sass-Kortsak  
Professor Anthony N. Sinclair  
Professor Pekka Sinervo  
Miss Maureen J. Somerville  
Professor Kim Strong  
Dr. Robert S. Turnbull  
Dr. Donald A. Wasylenki  
Professor Catharine Whiteside  
Mr. Patrick Wong  
Dr. Cindy Woodland

**Regrets:**

Professor Varouj Aivazian  
Professor Gage Averill  
Professor Sylvia Bashevkin  
Professor Clare Beghtol  
Professor Katherine Berg  
Dr. Terry Blake  
Ms Marilyn Booth  
Mr. Terry Buckland  
Professor Philip H. Byer  
Professor George Elliott Clarke  
Professor John Coleman  
Professor David Cook  
Prof Luc F. De Nil  
Dr. Raisa B. Deber  
Professor Dickson Eyoh  
Mr. John A. Fraser  
Ms. Linda B. Gardner  
Professor Jane Gaskell  
Professor William Gough

Mr. Billeh Hamud  
Mrs. Bonnie Horne  
Professor Yuki Mayumi Johnson  
Professor Charles Jones  
Dr. Wajahat Khan  
Professor Bruce Kidd  
Dr. Joel A. Kirsh  
Professor Hon C. Kwan  
Dr. Chris Koenig-Woodyard  
Dr. Gillian MacKay  
Professor Roger L. Martin  
Professor Thomas Mathien  
Professor Brenda Y. McCabe  
Professor Mark McGowan  
Ms Vera Melnyk  
Mr. Matto Miltenberger  
Professor Faye Mishna  
Professor Michael Molloy  
Professor Mayo Moran  
Professor Sioban Nelson

Professor Mariel O'Neill-Karch  
Professor Donna Orwin  
Professor Janet Paterson  
Ms Theresa Pazonis  
Professor Cheryl Regehr  
Professor Robert Reisz  
Professor Richard Reznick  
Mr. Paul Ruppert  
Professor Gareth Seaward  
Professor J.J. Berry Smith  
Professor Brian Cantwell Smith  
Professor Tattersall Smith  
Professor Ron Smyth  
Mr. Omar Solimon  
Professor Lorne Sossin  
Professor Lisa Steele  
Professor Suzanne Stevenson  
Professor Rinaldo Wayne  
Walcott

**Non-voting Assessors:**

Professor Angela Hildyard  
Professor Cheryl Misak

**Secretariat:**

Mr. Henry T. Mulhall  
Ms Cristina Oke, Secretary

**In Attendance:**

Mr. Neil Dobbs, Deputy Secretary of the Governing Council  
Professor Douglas Reeve, Department of Chemical Engineering and Applied Chemistry  
Ms Meredith Strong, Interim Special Assistant to the Vice-President, University Relations

In this report, items 5, 6, 7 and 8 are recommended to the Governing Council for approval and the remaining items are reported for information.

**1. Approval of Report Number 145 of the Meeting held on October 4, 2006**

Report Number 145 of the meeting held on October 4, 2006 was approved.

**2. Business Arising Out of the Report**

The Chair informed members that the *Statement on Equity, Diversity and Excellence* that had been discussed by the Board at the October meeting had been amended following that discussion and would be considered for approval by the Governing Council in December. The URL for the document would be provided to members of the Academic Board for information.<sup>1</sup>

**3. Report Number 132 of the Agenda Committee (October 31, 2006)**

The Chair noted that the Report had been distributed electronically on November 14 and copies had been available at the door. He drew the attention of members to the discussion of the Review of Academic Programs and Units that was on pages 1 and 2 of the Report.

The Chair noted that the review process was a crucial component of accountability for the University. He encouraged members to read Report 123 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs, which was the report of the meeting at which the reviews were considered, and noted that the document summarizing the reviews was available on the Governing Council website, linked to the May 31<sup>st</sup> AP&P agenda.<sup>2</sup>

**4. Report from the Vice-President and Provost****(a) Reviews of Academic Programs and Units**

Professor Goel thanked members of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs (AP&P) for their inquiry into reviews of academic programs and units. While all members of AP&P read the summary of reviews, the complete reviews were read by groups of individual members, who reported to the Committee. He also acknowledged the contributions to the University's review process of divisional academic administrators, faculty and staff, and external visitors. This review process was a key means by which the University ensured the quality of its academic programs.

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.utoronto.ca/govcncl/bac/details/ua/2006-07/uaa20061107-03ii.pdf>

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.utoronto.ca/govcncl/bac/details/ap/2005-06/apa20060531-03.pdf>

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

##### **(b) University Rankings and Ratings and Performance Measures**

Professor Goel noted that a national newspaper (*Globe and Mail*) and magazine (*Maclean's*) had recently published articles ranking and rating Canadian universities using various measures. He encouraged members of the Board to read the President's *University Report Cards, Ratings, Rankings, and Performance Measures Statement* that had been posted on the University's web pages.<sup>3</sup>

Professor Goel explained that the University focused its efforts and attention on internal review processes and on the annual performance indicator report that was given to the Governing Council. The Academic Board would receive a report on relevant performance indicators in the new year. As well, the University was working with member institutions of the Council of Ontario Universities (COU) to develop a Common University Dataset for Ontario (CUD-O) that would use standardized definitions for a substantial array of key variables, and promote consistent analysis of each university's operations. It was the position of COU members that information about institutional performance should be available to the public, rather than provided to one for-profit publication. Professor Goel noted that the University provided approximately fifty annual reports to the Governing Council and its Boards and Committees, as well as approximately ninety-five annual reports to various government agencies.

A member commented that he had been embarrassed by the report regarding the poor quality of student experience that had been identified in the *Globe and Mail*, and asked how seriously the University was considering this report. Professor Goel replied that the University had developed a comprehensive strategy to address issues that had been raised regarding student experience. The results of the more methodologically sound National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), and the Graduate and Professional Student Survey (GPSS), were consistent with those reported in *the Globe and Mail*. The University had significant work to do in this area. In some instances, there appeared to be a disconnect between what the University thought it was offering to students and what students felt they were receiving. Part of this difference was due to poor communications, given that the University did not promote strongly enough its strengths and the opportunities that it provided to students.

President Naylor observed that the University appeared to be providing a more positive experience to graduate students than to undergraduate students. He noted that it would take several years before positive changes were reflected in NSSE data.

The President reiterated that communication about the University's strengths and opportunities had to be improved. At several research-intensive universities in Ontario that received the same amount of funding per student as the University of Toronto, students perceived that these universities provided a better experience. Improvements in the student experience at the University of Toronto would require the involvement of Deans, College Principals, Department Chairs, heads of the federated universities, and staff in units that offered first-entry programs, as well as students. However, given the budgetary reality and fiscal challenges, it might be necessary to make tradeoffs.

---

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.president.utoronto.ca/aboutthepresident/speeches/universityreportcards.htm>

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

##### **(b) University Rankings and Ratings and Performance Measures (cont'd)**

Professor Sinervo commented that, while students expressed their dissatisfaction with a number of things, there had been a number of positive improvements in programs and courses. The Faculties of Arts and Science and Medicine had worked closely together for a number of years to improve the popular program in Human Biology. First-Year Learning Communities – groups of no more than 24 students who took common classes together – had been introduced last year. The 199Y series of First Year Seminars had also contributed to a positive undergraduate student experience.

A member expressed her support of the importance of learning from the best practice of other institutions and noted the importance of consulting with students and faculty.

A member asked what steps were being taken regarding student access to courses they needed to complete degree requirements, but in which they were unable to register because enrolment was full. Professor Goel replied that the waitlist function that was now available in the Repository of Student Information (ROSI) facilitated access and would provide information that would provide guidance to divisions as to where efforts should be concentrated to address the issue. He also noted that the increased number of students resulting from the flow-through of the double cohort was reflected in the increased demand for upper-level courses this year.

##### **(c) Appointment of Vice-Provost, First-Entry Programs**

Professor Goel informed members that Professor Sinervo, Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Science, had been appointed as Vice-Provost, First-Entry Programs, effective November 23, 2006. The position had been created to represent first-entry programs at the senior administrative level, and to ensure that the University's programs and services for students were developed and delivered in a coordinated, effective and consistent manner. In addition, a Council of First-Entry Deans had been created to facilitate coordination and communication among the academic divisions responsible for first-entry programs, the senior administration and the central services that support our students.<sup>4</sup>

##### **(d) Symposium on Teaching and Learning**

Professor Goel informed members that the University had hosted a Symposium on Teaching and Learning on October 30, 2006 for three hundred participants. It had been noted that this was the first major event dedicated to teaching that the University's central administration had hosted.

##### **(e) Retreat on Humanities**

Professor Goel reported that faculty from the three campuses of the University had attended a retreat on Humanities that had been held in October. The retreat had examined matters of importance to the humanities, such as library services.

---

<sup>4</sup> Additional information is available at <http://www.provost.utoronto.ca/English/Vice-Provost-First-Entry-Programs.html>

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

##### **(f) *Speaking UP* Survey**

Professor Goel stated that the first university-wide employment experience survey of faculty and staff had been conducted in the period October 10 to November 10. The response rate at the end of the survey period had been approximately 50%, however, paper responses were still being received. The results of the survey would be reported to governance.

##### **(g) New and Revised Policies**

Professor Goel advised members that a *Policy on Interdisciplinary Education and Research Planning* would be considered by the Board at its January meeting. Also coming forward in the next governance cycle were a *Statement on Research Partnerships* and a *Statement on Conflict of Interest and Conflict of Commitment*. These two statements were available on the Provost's webpage, and members were invited to comment on the draft statements.

##### **(h) Multi-Year Agreement (MYA)**

Professor Goel reminded members that each University was required to sign a multi-year agreement (MYA) with the provincial government that outlined the institution's plans and the initiatives undertaken to improve quality and enhance student experience. The activities described in the draft MYA for the University of Toronto were based on the University's academic plan, and included divisional initiatives that had been prepared in response to *Stepping Up*. These activities could be measured over the three-year time frame of the agreement. Other indicators that had been developed by the University and were reported to governance viewed performance over a longer period.

Professor Goel explained that the MYA was not intended to be a static document. Each institution had been responsible for developing its own priorities and the indicators by which the priorities could be measured. The agreement would be reviewed each year, and the University could make changes if necessary.

A member asked why the number of students involved in small classes (under 50), participating in seminar and research courses, participating in the First-Year Learning Communities, and employed in research activities outside the classroom were not projected to change over the next two years. Professor Goel replied that the numbers were modest, given the available resources. The University did not want to set unachievable goals to which it would be held accountable by the government. The University's objectives were far more ambitious.

#### **5. Framework for Graduate Expansion**

Professor Gotlieb reported that the Planning and Budget Committee had thoroughly discussed the proposed *Framework*. In response to a request for clarification of the number of students that were eligible for government funding, Professor Zaky had explained that students enrolled in Master's programs were funded for a maximum of two years, while students enrolled in a Ph.D. program were funded for a maximum of four years. Members had been reminded that the final paragraph of the *Framework* clearly

## 5. Framework for Graduate Expansion (cont'd)

stated that implementation of the graduate enrolment expansion plan was contingent upon the availability of adequate research funding and student support awards.

At the Committee meeting, a question had been raised about the recruitment campaign that had been undertaken by the School of Graduate Studies (SGS). Professor Pfeiffer, Dean of SGS and Vice-Provost, Graduate Education, informed members of the Academic Board that, in light of the tight timelines for graduate enrolment expansion, SGS had advertised and promoted the graduate programs available at the University in various media, and had participated in graduate education fairs across the country. The response to the recruitment campaign had been excellent, and the number of applications from excellent students was likely to increase.

A member asked whether information was available on research funding per student in various categories, and what level of research funding would be necessary to support the increased number of students. Professor Pfeiffer replied that information was available about the amount paid to graduate students on research assistantships. She noted that a significant proportion of the increase in graduate growth was in professional programs, rather than doctoral stream programs and the link to research funding was not as direct in professional programs. Professor Goel remarked that there were a number of variables to consider. While additional funds for fellowships and for operating expenses would be welcomed, it was important for the University to identify a variety of sources of additional resources to support graduate enrolment expansion.

Professor Sinervo informed members that, in the Faculty of Arts and Science, approximately 20% of funding for graduate students - \$12 to \$13 million of \$65 million - came from research grants of Principal Investigators. Across the three campuses, 25% to 35% of funding received from granting councils supported graduate students in Arts and Science. Each department had considered the issue of graduate student financial support in planning for graduate enrolment expansion.

A member asked whether sufficient supervisory capacity and space would be available for the proposed graduate enrolment expansion. Professor Goel replied that, since a large percentage of growth in graduate enrolment was in course-based programs, instructional capacity was an issue for these programs rather than supervisory capacity. The current faculty renewal was resulting in an increase in supervisory capacity. With respect to space, almost \$100 million had been allotted by the government to the University for capital projects to support graduate enrolment expansion, contingent on targets being met.

A member asked what initiatives had been undertaken by SGS to increase the admissions acceptance rate. He also asked what SGS was doing with respect to international students. Professor Pfeiffer replied that a working group was reviewing the content and tone of the admissions letter. Tenders were out for the creation of a compact disk that could be included in the admissions package. Concern about increasing the number of international students and finding appropriate funding for them was widely shared.

## 5. Framework for Graduate Expansion (cont'd)

Although Connaught scholarships were available for international students, other sources of financial support were necessary.

President Naylor reminded members that \$340 million of infrastructure funding from the federal government for post-secondary education in Ontario had not yet materialized. Presidents of research-intensive universities were actively engaged in advocacy with the federal government concerning support for international students. He noted that the provincial government did not fund international students; however, funding was provided when an international student became a landed immigrant.

Professor Sinervo commented that divisions responded differently to the issue of international students. The Deans of the Faculty of Arts and Science, the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM) and the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC) had developed funding packages for international graduate students in addition to the existing funding guarantee for graduate students. Thirty percent of doctoral stream students enrolled on the three campuses were international students. The number of international graduate students at the University was the largest in Canada and one of the largest in North America. The appropriate proportion of international and domestic graduate students was a matter of discussion. Providing appropriate resources to support graduate students remained a significant challenge. Professor Sinervo also noted that the funding packages for offers to new graduate students were being re-evaluated to increase yield.

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the proposed graduate expansion as described in the *Framework for Graduate Expansion 2004-05 to 2009-10*, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "A", be approved.

## 6. School of Public Policy and Governance: Establishment

The Chair welcomed Professor Mark Stabile, Interim Director, School of Public Policy and Professor Carolyn Tuohy, Provostial Advisor on Public Policy for this item.

The Chair noted a minor error in the Budget Summary. Footnote 1 should have referred to the 'Faculty' line, not to the 'Visiting Practitioner Stipends' line.

Professor Gotlieb explained that the establishment of the School of Public Policy and Governance had been approved by the Arts and Science Faculty Council on October 3, 2006. The School would be structured as an interdisciplinary, cross-faculty unit administratively housed in the Faculty of Arts and Science. It would have its own budget and authority to administer research grants and would also have the authority to offer academic programs and to enroll students. The Director of the School would report

## **6. School of Public Policy and Governance: Establishment (cont'd)**

administratively and financially to the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Science and academically to a Council of Deans, chaired by the Dean, Faculty of Arts and Science.

The School would offer the Master of Public Policy program, and would organize seminars and events that would engage it with the broader community and strengthen its influence on public policy. Funding to support the initial growth of the School had been provided through the Academic Initiatives Fund, and additional sources of funding would be identified as the School developed.

Points raised in discussion had included clarification of primary faculty appointments and the ways in which faculty members with an interest in public policy but without an appointment to the School could become involved in its activities.

Professor Pfeiffer noted that, in the cover memorandum distributed to members, the School of Graduate Studies had been omitted from the list of signatories to the Memorandum of Agreement regarding the governance and administration of the School.

On motion duly moved and seconded

**YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS**

**THAT** the School of Public Policy and Governance be established as a new modified EDU:2 teaching and research entity, effective immediately.

The documentation for this item is attached hereto as Appendix “B”.

## **7. Capital Project: Project Planning Report: Medical Academy at the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM)**

The Chair noted that there had been two errors in the documentation. On page 5 of the cover memo, under ‘funding’, the contingent funding amount should have been \$5.407 million. The amount of short-term debt in the final part of the motion should also have been \$5.407 million.

Professor Gotlieb reported that members of the Planning and Budget Committee had been informed that the following enhancements were required by the creation of the Medical Academy at UTM:

- facility, audio visual and information technology improvements at both the Medical Sciences Building (MSB) and UTM;
- expansion of the anatomy teaching laboratories and other teaching space in the MSB;
- the consolidation of Academic Computing and Computer Services in the MSB; and
- teaching, student, research and associated administrative support space at UTM.

## **7. Capital Project: Project Planning Report: Medical Academy at the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM) (cont'd)**

An interim space program had been created because completed new facilities would not be fully available for the fall semester of 2007 when the UTM Academy was scheduled to open. Permanent UTM Academy space would be completed in time for the 2008/09 academic year.

Professor Gottlieb explained that the Province of Ontario was providing capital funding for the Academy, in the form of a stream of payments annually over 20 years.

Questions raised in discussion had included whether the twenty-year funding was binding on future governments. The Provost had replied that, although the funding was not binding, it was unlikely that a future government would withdraw the funding, given the number of stakeholders.

In response to a question about accessibility and environmental concerns being addressed by the Project Planning Committee, Ms Sisam had confirmed that the Committee had considered such issues.

On motion duly moved and seconded

### **YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS**

1. THAT the Project Planning Report for the Medical Academy at the University of Toronto at Mississauga, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "C", be approved in principle;
2. THAT space vacated in the South Building and including an adjacent addition be made available to the UTM Medical Academy;
3. THAT improvements and renovations at the Medical Sciences Building to support the distributed learning model of the UTM Medical Academy be approved in principle;
4. THAT the project scope of 3415 nasm for the Academy having a total project cost of \$20.107 million be approved; and
5. THAT \$20.107M funding required for the UTM Medical Academy comprise:
  - i) provincial funding in the form of annualized payments having a present value of \$14.7 million, and
  - ii) \$5.407 million short term debt carried by the Faculty of Medicine and the University of Toronto at Mississauga.

## **8. Declaration of Property as Surplus to the University's Requirements**

Professor Gottlieb advised members that, before the University could dispose of, or develop, University property, the property had to be declared surplus to University requirements on the advice of the Planning and Budget Committee.

## **8. Declaration of Property as Surplus to the University's Requirements (cont'd)**

He reminded members that the parking facility at 240 McCaul Street had been one of the properties purchased by the University in 2002 from the Toronto District School Board. Because of structural inadequacies, the parking structure had been converted to a surface parking lot in early 2006. Since that time the lot had operated without full occupancy.

Professor Gotlieb noted that questions had been raised about the possibility of purchasing other property in the area for development, or using the property for student housing. Ms Sisam had reminded members that the property was not zoned for institutional use.

The Chair acknowledged the question raised by a member of the Board in advance of the meeting concerning the availability of background information for this item, such as a cost-benefit study of the University developing the space for low-density housing, or rezoning to allow other uses. Professor Goel thanked the member for raising the question in advance. He noted that rezoning of residential to institutional use in the University environs remained controversial. The current use of the McCaul property was designated by the City of Toronto as legal non-conforming use. The property either had to continue to be used as a parking facility or be used in conformity with its low-density residential zoning designation. Student housing was considered to be institutional for zoning purposes.

Professor Goel remarked that the University had generally not been successful in doing things other than its core business. Declaration of the property as surplus to University requirements would be the first step in the process of determining the appropriate action with respect to the property. A member asked what the property was worth, given its prime location. Professor Goel replied it was best that the market would determine the value of the property.

On motion duly moved and seconded

**YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS**

**THAT** the property 240 McCaul Street be declared surplus to University requirements.

The documentation for this item is attached hereto as Appendix "D".

## **9. Items for Information**

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

- (a) Appointments and Status Changes

It was noted that "Professor with tenure" for Professor Sorenson of the Rotman School of Management had been omitted from the report.

- (b) Report Number 123 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs (May 31, 2006).

**9. Items for Information (cont'd)**

- (c) Report Number 124 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs (September 20, 2006).
- (d) Report Number 125 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs (October 25, 2006).

Professor Sass-Kortsak commented on the language citation that would be available through the Faculty of Arts and Science. One benefit of the citation would be the encouragement of the study of languages. She indicated that there had been a good debate on the proposal, which had been recorded in Report 125, and that this could serve as a precedent for citations of other skills.

**10. Date of Next Meeting**

The Chair reminded members that the date of the next meeting was January 11, 2007, and wished them a safe and happy vacation.

The meeting adjourned at 5:35 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

January 2, 2007