

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO  
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL  
REPORT NUMBER 123 OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD

November 13, 2003

To the Governing Council,  
University of Toronto.

Your Board reports that it held a meeting on Thursday, November 13, 2003 at 4:15 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall. An attendance list is presented at the end of this report. In this report, items 4, 5, 7, 8, and 9 are recommended to Governing Council for approval, 6, 10 and 11 are for Executive Committee confirmation and the remaining items are reported for information.

A motion to adjourn not later than 6:30 p.m. was duly moved and seconded. The motion was carried.

**1. Report of the Previous Meeting**

The report of the previous meeting, dated September 25, was approved.

**2. Report Number 109 of the Agenda Committee**

The report was received for information.

**3. Report of the Council of Ontario Universities (COU) Colleague**

The Chair invited Professor Perron to speak about the activities of the Council of Ontario Universities.

Professor Perron explained that the Council of Ontario Universities (COU) was composed of the President and an academic colleague from each Ontario university and that each had one vote. He said that the presidents dealt with matters of immediate concern such as the financial situation, while the colleagues anticipated issues and studied the longer-term matters. He referred to a series of working papers that were available on COU's web-site and noted that these represented the views of the colleagues rather than those of the presidents. Each year, the colleagues chose matters to be discussed in their working papers and this year the issues included information technology, graduate education, language proficiency and part-time teaching staff, their status and role.

He reported that not all issues affect the universities equally. There were no weighted votes at COU and so the Council dealt with commonalities. Deferred maintenance, for example, was of more importance to the older universities with the older physical plants. Differentiation was another matter that was not of equal concern. The latter was important to the University of Toronto, particularly in stressing the prominence of graduate education and research. He suggested that differentiation could be a crucial issue in determining the future of COU. The option for the University to leave the organization could be a matter of debate. As an example, he noted that some universities were interested in recruiting from within their own institutions for graduate studies while

**3. Report of the Council of Ontario Universities (COU) Colleague (cont'd)**

U of T wanted to recruit from a large pool including international students. This was not a majority agenda.

A member noted that it would be preferable to describe Ontario's universities as publicly funded rather than publicly assisted. The difference stressed the government's responsibilities in providing appropriate support. He also noted that COU appeared to support grants and not loans for student funding. Finally, he wanted to know the University's relationship with COU and how much it cost to be a member. Professor Perron said that U of T paid the lion's share of the costs of COU (based on enrolment) but had the same voice as the other members. He thought that debate was needed on this issue of representation and a weighted vote. Professor Perron recalled that the colleagues had discussed the advantages of grants over loans in student aid programs. Professor Neuman explained that the COU membership fee was based on student enrolment and this University and York paid the highest fees. U of T's fee was \$675,000 this year. She said that in return the U of T had benefited from the concerted stand taken by COU on a number of issues such as the funding for the double cohort and the Quality Assurance Funding.

The Chair asked whether COU was the best body to assess the effects of expanding enrolment in the provincial system. Professor Perron responded that if the student:faculty ratio was an indicator of quality, then quality had declined as the student numbers rose. There were also large numbers of retiring faculty. The government had increased its investment but Ontario was still tenth of 10 provinces in funding per student. He could see the effectiveness of COU lobbying; it got results.

A member suggested that an issue like differentiation would shatter the Council. Its strength was in dealing with issues the universities shared in common. That was what made it effective. The President said that the University would continue to work through COU. In a recent meeting with the new Minister, she had indicated that she would work through COU. On the matter of capital funding, the University had dealt directly with the government and the funding had favoured the GTA. He suggested that the differentiation issue would not be solved through COU.

**4. School of Graduate Studies: Proposed New PhD Program in Rehabilitation Science**

(arising from Report Number 103 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs and Report Number 92 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Smith noted that this program had been in development for some time, and discussion at the Committee had focused on the total enrolment (16 at steady state), the reasons for moving away from part-time Master's programs, and the flexibility of admissions processes.

The members had no questions.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the proposal for a new PhD program in Rehabilitation Science, as described in the submission from the School of Graduate Studies, dated May 29, 2003, the executive summary of which is attached hereto as Appendix "A", be approved, effective 2004.

**5. Faculty of Dentistry: Proposal for a Joint Bachelor of Dental Hygiene (BDH) / Diploma in Dental Hygiene with George Brown College**  
(arising from Report Number 103 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs and Report Number 92 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Smith reported this proposal arose from a collaborative effort between the Faculty of Dentistry and George Brown College. It would create a direct-entry integrated four-year program combining degree requirements with those for a diploma in dental hygiene. At the Committee, discussion of the program had focused on questions of quality control, maintaining ties to the University when courses were off campus, baccalaureate degrees versus double diplomas and the eligibility of the program's graduates for graduate work. He said that all concerns had been satisfied and the Committee had supported the proposal.

A member noted that the Policy on Diploma and Certificate Programs indicated that diplomas were associated with graduate degrees and certificates, with undergraduate degrees. He asked why a diploma was being offered in this case. Professor Tuohy responded that diplomas were the usual programs in the Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology.

A member said that a tuition fee of \$8500 seemed to be quite high. He asked if it was warranted and how it compared to other similar programs. Ms Dempster said that the fee was well within the range of similar programs. Fees at private institutions were higher but this fee was in the middle of the range. George Brown College's fee had been one of the lower fee, but it had now raised its fee.

A member compared the proposed four-year program to the usual two-year programs and asked why it was longer. Ms Dempster said that the College diploma program was two years but graduates of the proposed joint program would earn both a degree and a diploma.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the proposal for a joint Bachelor of Dental Hygiene/Diploma in Dental Hygiene program, offered by the Faculty of Dentistry in collaboration with George Brown College, as described in the submission from the Faculty of Dentistry, dated September 19, 2003, the executive summary of which is attached hereto as Appendix "B", be approved, effective September 1, 2004.

**6. Policy on Diploma and Certificate Programs: Revised**  
(arising from Report Number 103 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs)

Professor Smith said that the present policy recognized Diploma programs as coherent sets of courses taken after a student had obtained an undergraduate or graduate degree, and Certificate programs after high-school graduation. Many such programs were independent of, and often taken in place of, degree programs. This policy change clarified another category of these programs that were taken in conjunction with degree programs: certificates with undergraduate, and diplomas with graduate degree programs. As an example, the Committee at its last meeting approved (pending the Board's approval of this policy change) the establishment of a program combining the undergraduate law degree of Juris Doctor and a Certificate in Environmental Studies. The policy change made explicit the involvement of the relevant division in administering the combined diplomas and certificates, and in approving them prior to

**6. Policy on Diploma and Certificate Programs: Revised (cont'd)**

final approval at the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs. Professor Smith emphasized that the changes were consistent with current practice and were an update to clarify policy.

Professor Tuohy noted two amendments to the proposed policy. The “3.c” in the last bullet in 4.a and in 5.d should be “3.d.”

A member suggested that the policy of not being able to transfer credits from continuing studies programs to degree programs be reviewed. Professor Tuohy noted the member’s comment.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

The amendments to the Policy on Diploma and Certificate Programs, as described in the memorandum from Professor Tuohy dated October 6, 2003, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix “C”.

**7. University of Toronto Schools: Proposed Restructuring**  
(arising from Report 92 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Hillan noted that it was the responsibility of the Planning and Budget Committee to review the planning and budget implications of disestablishing an academic unit, to consider the appropriate use of University facilities and to review and recommend approval on the terms of an agreement for the incorporation of an associated organization. This proposal to negotiate the proposed restructuring of the University of Toronto Schools (UTS) came about at the initiative of the UTS and followed many months of discussion with representatives of the University and large numbers of individuals directly affected in the UTS system. The Committee was satisfied that the process which led to this proposal had been exemplary in its inclusiveness and it approved unanimously the recommendation that the administration go forward in negotiating a longer term relationship, which might be similar to what existed currently or not.

Professor Goel said that these motions were part of a package, along with the constitutional change, going forward to Governing Council for approval. The Business Board had considered the by-laws and the business aspects of the agreement at its meeting on November 10. The Planning and Budget Committee and the Academic Board were concerned with the disestablishment of the old structure and the establishment of the new arrangements. He reported that the Business Board had discussed the interim period and the potential risk to the University. It was agreed that there would be no deficit through the interim period and UTS would not be able to borrow funds without the President’s approval. The Board had asked and the administration had agreed that the UTS audited financial statements and the business plan would be received by Governing Council for approval.

The Chair said that Mr. Robin Breon, Vice-President of USWA local 1998, had asked to address the Board and that he had granted his request. Mr. Breon said that he had not had the opportunity to raise the issue of administrative staff at the Business Board but wished to draw the matter to the Board’s attention. There were 10 administrative staff members at UTS, currently in local 1998, who would be disadvantaged by the establishment of the new ancillary. They would be moved into a separate bargaining unit and would not have the strength of numbers that the larger unit had in negotiating terms of employment. He likened it to moving a small academic department out of UTFa while the others

**7. University of Toronto Schools: Proposed Restructuring (cont'd)**

remained within UTFA and forcing the smaller unit to negotiate its own agreement with the administration. He proposed an amendment that would protect these staff members and keep them part of the larger unit.

The Chair said that such an amendment would not be in order. The Business Board was the appropriate place to discuss personnel concerns.

With the Chair's permission, Professor Goel asked Mr. Moate to address this issue. Mr. Moate explained that the employees of UTS would become employees of the new entity. Succession rights would be preserved by the new corporation. Specific assurances had been given that the staff would be considered as internal staff for the interim period. They would have access to the redeployment pool and to services of the Human Resources Department. Their wages and benefits would continue as before. Mr. Moate noted that it would be possible for USWA members to raise their issues in the negotiation period. He reiterated the intention to preserve the current terms of employment through the interim period.

In answer to a question about why the benefits were only extended through the interim period, Professor Goel responded that the future relationship of UTS with the University and the terms of that relationship would be negotiated by the new Board of UTS during the interim period. The administration was prepared to discuss options, including the suggestion to keep the staff within the University and contract their services to UTS during the negotiations.

A member referred to the UTS name and asked whether the School could be renamed. Professor Goel said that the UTS community was attached to the name and the brand associated with it, and had been since its inception in 1910.

A member asked what impact the new structure would have on the students, particularly in terms of student aid. Professor Goel reported that UTS had a fundraising campaign underway and also had a current endowment of \$13 million for student aid.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

**YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS**

1. THAT the University of Toronto Schools be disestablished as an organization unit of OISE/UT;
2. THAT the University of Toronto Schools be incorporated as a separate legal entity within the University community; and
3. The University enter into an interim affiliation, services and premises agreement substantially the same as the agreement attached to Professor Goel's memorandum of October 3, 2003, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "D".

**8. Canada Research Chairs Fund: Allocation**  
(arising from Report Number 92 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Hillan said that this item was the annual allocation from the Canada Research Chairs Fund. The Planning and Budget Committee supported the Provost's recommendation.

There were no questions.

**8. Canada Research Chairs Fund: Allocation** (cont'd)

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

## YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

1. THAT \$4.4 million be allocated from the Canada Research Chairs Fund to cover the salaries, benefits, research allowances and cluster support for twenty-four Chairholders approved in the April 2002 competitions.
2. THAT \$.7 million (\$.8 million less \$91,428 indirect cost of 16% of salaries and benefits) be allocated to the Faculty of Medicine in support of seven campus based Chairholders that were awarded in 2003.
3. THAT \$2.2 million (\$2.3 million less \$98,571 indirect cost of 6% of salaries and benefits) be allocated to the Faculty of Medicine in support of nine Chairholders based in Hospital and Research Institutes that were awarded in 2003.

Documentation is attached hereto as Appendix "E".

**9. Capital Project: Woodsworth College Residence: Basement Facilities for the Commerce Program and for Audio/Visual Storage for the University Library – Project Planning Report**

(arising from Report Number 92 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Hillan reported that this was a proposal for a capital project to complete the lower level of the new Woodsworth College Residence, which had been shelled in under the terms of the earlier approval of the Residence. The Planning and Budget Committee supported this cooperative plan.

There were no questions.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

## YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

1. THAT the Project Planning Report for the outfitting of the Woodsworth College Residence basement and first floor, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "F", be approved in principle;
2. THAT the project scope identified in the Project Planning Report, to establish the four classrooms, the A/V storage facility and the Commerce Career and Student Aid Centre within the defined shelled space of the Woodsworth College Residence, be approved at a cost of \$3,696,433 with the funding sources as follows:

Commerce Program	\$ 1,294,376
Rotman School of Management	\$ 571,589
Arts and Science	\$ 711,468
University of Toronto Library	\$ 1,019,000
Coopers PriceWaterhouse Donation	\$ 100,000

3. THAT the project scope will include the re-establishment of the Computer Room, currently located within the Rotman Building, RT117, to Woodsworth College to accommodate the needs of students enrolled in the Commerce program.

**10. Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto (OISE/UT): Constitution - Amendment**

Dean Gaskell said that the proposed amendment was a result of the earlier motion to disestablish UTS as an organizational unit of OISE/UT. It was proposed that the Principal and Assistant Principal of UTS would no longer be *ex officio* members of the OISE/UT Council.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

The Constitution of the OISE/UT Faculty Council, as amended, dated September 19, 2003, be approved.

Documentation is attached hereto as Appendix “G”.

**11. Faculty of Physical Education and Health: Constitution - Amendment**

Mr. Carson presented the changes to the Constitution on behalf of Dean Kidd, who was absent. He recalled that the Faculty had been established from the merger of the former School of Physical Health and Education and the Department of Athletics and Recreation. The Council had been operating for a number of years and it was time to make some housekeeping amendments to the constitution reflecting current practice.

It was duly moved and seconded,

The Constitution of the Faculty of Physical Education and Health, as amended, dated October 15, 2003, be approved.

A member indicated his concern with the amendment that would allow the membership on Council of professors emeritus on the recommendation of the Dean. He said that it could be misused to add new members to a council to get specific motions passed. Professor Neuman said that the issue had been raised at the Agenda Committee. The constitutions of all councils had been reviewed and a number of councils had professors emeritus on the council. This amendment was consistent with past approvals. The member responded that a bad practice spread throughout the University was not a reason to add members who had no close ties to a division to a divisional council.

It was duly moved and seconded,

THAT the amended constitution be referred back to the Faculty for further consideration.

Professor Neuman suggested that the administration undertake a review of the practice of having professors emeritus as members of divisional councils.

In response to a question, the Secretary indicated that the University of Toronto at Mississauga and the faculties of Forestry, Pharmacy and Applied Science and Engineering currently had professors emeritus on their councils, the first two had professors emeritus chosen by the Principal and Dean and the second two had all professors emeritus as members.

Dean Venetsanopolous, Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering, said that very few attended Council meetings, and those who did were mostly the parliamentarians. Ms Lavack, Leslie Dan Faculty of Pharmacy, said that professors emeritus had not affected a vote or broken a tie vote. Professor Misak, University of Toronto at Mississauga, noted

**11. Faculty of Physical Education and Health: Constitution – Amendment (cont'd)**

that the UTM constitution had recently been amended to add professors emeritus to the council and that the amendment had been supported by the faculty and students.

A member noted that comparisons were not useful as relationships were different in each division.

A member wondered whether the Academic Board should demand that all faculty councils' constitutions be the same. Different faculties might find unique ways to extend the membership that worked well for them. He was content to have variety in the membership but perhaps the ratios of different types of membership was the basis of the concern. He did not want professors emeritus to be regarded as second class citizens. He believed that the deans were in a position to identify those individuals who would contribute to the work of councils.

Another member said that the Board should not dictate to the divisions regarding the membership of their councils. However, the concern about the possibility of changing the membership to affect an outcome was real. He would like to hear from Dean Kidd the background to this proposed change.

It was duly moved and seconded,

THAT debate be adjourned until the next meeting when Dean Kidd could be present.

The Chair undertook to relay the Board's concerns to Dean Kidd.

**12. Items for Information****(a) Report of the Vice-President and Provost****(i) Academic Planning**

Professor Neuman reported that consultation on the academic plan continued. She had recently held nine focus groups, four town hall meetings, three sessions with various Governing Council constituencies and discussions with Principals and Deans. The academic plan would be slimmed down from the current version and would be discussed at a meeting of the President and Vice-Presidents next week.

**(ii) Long-Range Budget Guidelines**

Professor Neuman said that Professor Zaky and Mr. England were drafting the long-range budget guidelines. She understood that the provincial government would institute a tuition fee freeze for two years that applied to all programs. She also understood that the provincial government would provide replacement funding, although the method to be used to decide the amount each university would receive was not known. It could be a formula or the exact amount lost. One of the other issues presently being studied was the accommodation of the double cohort as it passed through the University and put enrolment pressure on graduate and professional programs.

A member asked whether the fees would be re-regulated. Professor Neuman did not know. She noted that as she understood the matter, the fees would be frozen, that is, they could not be increased. Regulation concerned the ability of a university to set a fee within a corridor and she did not believe that the government would reset the fees and then freeze them.

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

(iii) Appointments and Status Changes / Appointment of Professors Emeriti

The above item was presented for information. There were no questions.

(b) Items for Information in Reports Number 91 and 92 of the Planning and Budget Committee

Professor Hillan had no comments on the information items and members had no questions.

(c) Report Number 103 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs

Professor Smith had no comments on the information items and members had no questions.

(d) Report on Award of Degrees

The report was presented for information. There were no questions.

(e) University Tribunal: Annual Report 2002-03

This report was presented for information. There were no questions.

**13. Date of Next Meeting**

The Chair noted that the next regular meeting of the Board would be held on January 15, 2004.

**14. Other Business**

There was no other business.

**15. Academic Administrative Appointments**

The following academic administrative appointments were approved:

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO AT SCARBOROUGH

Professor Sue Horton

Interim Vice-Principal (Academic)  
and Dean from January 1, 2004 to  
June 30, 2004 (extension)

**16. Report of the Striking Committee**

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT Professor Brian C. Smith, Faculty of Information Studies, be appointed to the Committee for Academic Policy and Programs for the remainder of 2003-2004, effective immediately.

The meeting adjourned at 5:40 p.m.

**Present:**

Professor W. R. Cummins, Chair  
 Professor B. Corman, Vice-Chair  
 Professor R. J. Birgeneau, President  
 Professor S. Neuman, Vice-President  
 and Provost  
 Professor J. Challis, Vice-President,  
 Research and Associate Provost  
 Professor V. Goel, Deputy Provost and  
 Vice-Provost, Faculty  
 Professor C. Tuohy, Vice-President,  
 Policy Development and Associate  
 Provost  
 Professor R. Abramovitch  
 Professor D. Affonso  
 Professor M. Beattie  
 Mr. F. Bellaurdo  
 Dr. T. Blake  
 Professor R. Bryan  
 Professor P. Byer  
 Professor N. Camerman  
 Mr. C. Davis  
 Professor J. Donaldson  
 Professor R. Elliott  
 Dr. I. Elliston  
 Dr. S. Graham Fell  
 Professor F. Fich  
 Professor E. Freeman  
 Professor J. Gaskell  
 Ms R. Ghosh  
 Professor A. Gotlieb  
 Professor H. Gunz  
 Professor A. Haasz  
 Professor E. Hillan  
 Professor W. Hindmarsh  
 Ms L. Honeywell  
 Mr. M. Hyrcza  
 Professor R. Kluger  
 Professor B. Langille  
 Ms L.A. Lavack  
 Professor R. Lewis  
 Professor D. Massam  
 Professor C. Misak  
 Ms C. Moore  
 Professor M. O'Neill-Karch  
 Mr. J. Paterson  
 Ms T. Pazonis  
 Professor P. Perron  
 Professor S. Pfeiffer  
 Mr. C. Ramsaroop  
 Professor C. Regehr  
 Professor J. Reilly  
 Professor J. Rosenfield  
 Professor B. Sampson  
 Professor J. Scherk  
 Professor P. Sinervo

Professor J. J. B. Smith  
 Ms M. Somerville  
 Mr. J. Sousa  
 Professor D. Thiessen  
 Mr. N. Turk-Browne  
 Professor T. Venetsanopoulos  
 Professor J. Youson

**Non-voting Member:**

Mr. L. R. Charpentier

**Non-voting Assessors:**

Professor A. Hildyard, Vice-President,  
 Human Resources  
 Professor R. Venter, Vice-Provost,  
 Space and Facilities Planning  
 Professor S. Zaky, Vice-Provost,  
 Planning and Budget

**Secretariat:**

Ms S. Girard, Secretary  
 Ms C. Oke

**Absent:**

Mr. S. Aggarwal  
 Mr. S. Ahmed  
 Professor D. Allen  
 Professor G. Allen  
 Professor S. Aster  
 Professor J. Barber  
 Dr. M. Barrie  
 Professor N. Bascia  
 Professor D. Beach  
 Professor C. Beghtol  
 Mr. M. Bonham  
 Professor P. Catton  
 Professor M. Chipman  
 Professor S. Choudhry  
 Professor D. Clandfield  
 Mr. J. Cohen  
 Professor F. Cunningham  
 Mr. B. Davis  
 Professor L. De Nil  
 Professor M. Diamond  
 Dr. R. Deber  
 Ms A. Emam  
 Ms R. Fernandes  
 Mr. S. Forbes  
 Mr. J. Fraser  
 Professor J. Furedy  
 Professor R. Geist  
 Ms B. Goldberg

Professor D. Goring  
Professor M. Gotlieb  
Professor P. Halpern  
Ms B. Horne  
Professor S. Horton  
Professor M. Hutcheon  
Ms M. Jackman  
Professor J. Jenkins  
Professor M.Y. Johnson  
Professor A. Johnston  
Professor G. Kerr (on leave)  
Professor B. Kidd  
Professor J. Lepock  
Professor L. Loeb  
Professor J. MacDonald  
Professor M. Marrus  
Professor R. Martin

Ms S. McDonald  
Professor M. McGowan  
Ms V. Melnyk  
Professor D. Mock  
Mr. S. Morley  
Professor D. Naylor  
Professor I. Orchard  
Professor R. Reisz  
Professor L. Richards  
Ms C. Seymour  
Professor B. Sherwood Lollar  
Professor A. Sinclair  
Professor B. C. Smith  
Ms F. Turgeon  
Professor M. Williams

**In Attendance:**

Mr. P. Carson, Executive Assistant to the Dean, Faculty of Physical Education and Health  
Ms L. Dempster, Faculty of Dentistry  
Ms S. Drummond, Assistant Provost and Special Assistant to the Vice-President and Provost  
Dr. B. FitzPatrick, Assistant Vice-President and Director, Office of the President  
Mr. S. Moate, Senior Employment Relations Legal Counsel  
Professor P. Pauly, Rotman School of Management  
Mr. A. Slater, Project Manager, University of Toronto Schools Restructuring Project  
Professor M. Verrier, Chair, Department of Physical Therapy