

**UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO**  
**THE GOVERNING COUNCIL**  
**REPORT NUMBER 132 OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD**

**January 13, 2005**

To the Governing Council  
University of Toronto

Your Board reports that it held a meeting on Thursday, January 13, 2005 at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall. In this report, items 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9 are recommended to the Governing Council for approval, item 10 is presented to the Executive Committee for confirmation, and the remaining items are reported for information.

**Present:**

Professor Brian Corman, in the  
Chair  
The Honourable Frank  
Iacobucci, Interim President  
Professor Vivek Goel, Vice-  
President and Provost  
Professor John Challis, Vice-  
President, Research and  
Associate Provost  
Professor Ronald Venter, Vice-  
Provost, Space and Facilities  
Planning  
Professor S. Zaky, Vice-Provost,  
Planning and Budget  
Professor Rona Abramovitch  
Professor Stewart Aitchison  
Professor Derek Allen  
Ms Holly Andrews-Taylor  
Professor Gage Averill  
Professor George Baird  
Professor Mary Beattie  
Professor Clare Beghtol  
Mr. Mark S. Bonham  
Professor Rorke Bryan  
Professor Ragnar Buchweitz  
Mr. Bruce G. Cameron  
Mr. Blake Chapman  
Professor Mary L. Chipman  
Professor David Clandfield  
Professor David Cook  
Professor Luc F. De Nil  
Professor Raisa B. Deber  
Professor Miriam Diamond

Professor James Donaldson  
Professor Robin Elliott  
Dr. Inez. Elliston  
Professor Faith E. Fich  
Professor Steven T. Fong  
Mr. Sean Forbes  
Professor John J. Furedy  
Professor Jane Gaskell  
Ms Bonnie Goldberg  
Professor Avrum Gotlieb  
Professor Hugh Gunz  
Professor Anthony A. Haasz  
Ms Bonnie Horne  
Professor Yuki Mayumi Johnson  
Professor Bruce Kidd  
Professor Ronald H. Kluger  
Professor Christina Kramer  
Professor James Lepock  
Professor Robert Lewis  
Mr. William R.J. Lumsden  
Professor John F. MacDonald  
Ms Susan C. McDonald  
Mr. Raza M. Mirza  
Professor Cheryl Misak  
Professor David Mock  
Professor Mariel O'Neill-Karch  
Mr. Kedar Patil  
Professor Paul Perron  
Professor Susan Pfeiffer  
Mr. Andrew Pinto  
Ms Salma Rawof  
Professor Robert Reisz

Professor Richard Reznick  
Ms Marvi H. Ricker  
Professor Gareth Seaward  
Professor Anthony N. Sinclair  
Professor J. J. Berry Smith  
Miss Maureen J. Somerville  
Mr. Leo Trottier  
Ms Oriel Varga  
Professor Tas Venetsanopoulos  
Professor Judy Watt-Watson  
Professor Melissa S. Williams  
Ms 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  
Ms Catherine Riggall, Interim Vice-  
President, Business Affairs  
Professor Kwong-loi Shun, Vice-  
President and Principal,  
University of Toronto at  
Scarborough

Mr. Louis Charpentier, Secretary of  
the Governing Council

**Absent:**

Mr. Syed W. Ahmed  
 Professor Sidney Aster  
 Professor James Barber  
 Dr. Mary Barrie  
 Ms Janice Bayani  
 Professor Terry Blake  
 Ms Lisa E. Boyes  
 Professor Donald Brean  
 Professor Philip H. Byer  
 Mr. Shaun Chen  
 Ms Maple Chong  
 Professor Sujit Choudhry  
 Professor George Elliott Clarke  
 Professor W. Raymond  
 Cummins  
 Professor Frank Cunningham  
 Professor Ronald Daniels  
 Professor Donald N. Dewees  
 Professor Diane Doran  
 Professor Guy Faulkner  
 Dr. Shari Graham Fell  
 Mr. John Fraser  
 Professor Eric Freeman  
 Professor Wayne Hindmarsh  
 Ms Leigh Honeywell

Professor Michael Hutcheon  
 Mr. Senai Iman  
 Professor Jenny Jenkins  
 Dr. Joel A. Kirsh  
 Ms Lesley Ann. Lavack  
 Professor Lori Loeb  
 Mr. Joseph Mapa  
 Professor M. Marrus  
 Professor Roger L. Martin  
 Professor Diane Massam  
 Professor Mark McGowan  
 Ms Vera Melnyk  
 Professor John R. Miron  
 Ms Carole Moore  
 Professor David Naylor  
 Professor Cheryl Regehr  
 Professor James A. Reilly  
 Professor Jay Rosenfield  
 Professor John Scherk  
 Professor Pekka Sinervo  
 Professor Brian Cantwell Smith  
 Professor Lisa Steele  
 Ms Arjuna Thaskaran  
 Professor Dennis Thiessen  
 Professor Rinaldo Wayne  
 Walcott

**Secretariat:**

Mr. Andrew Drummond  
 Ms Cristina Oke, Secretary

**In Attendance:**

Ms Sheree. Drummond, Assistant  
 Provost  
 Dr. Beata FitzPatrick, Assistant  
 Vice-President and Director,  
 Office of the President  
 Ms Silvia Rosatone, Manager of  
 Convocations and Governance  
 Committee Secretary  
 Mr. Mahadeo Sukhai, President,  
 Graduate Students' Union  
 Mr. Howard Tam, Vice-President,  
 University Affairs, Students'  
 Administrative Council

Professor Corman welcomed members to the meeting, and advised them that Professor Cummins was absent from the meeting due to illness.

He informed members that two speaking requests had been received for this meeting: The request from Mr. Mahadeo Sukhai, President of the Graduate Students' Union to speak to the agenda item concerning the M Phil program had been granted. A request from Mr. Andrew Reuben, former Executive Director of Chiefs of Ontario, to speak to the topic of research in the Centre for Biological Timing and Cognition had not been granted, as the capital project for the Centre had been approved by the Governing Council in December.

**1. Report of the Previous Meeting**

The Chair noted that the attendance list would be corrected to show the presence of a member who had been shown as absent. Report Number 131 of the meeting held on December 9, 2004, was approved as corrected.

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

There were two items of Business Arising from the previous meeting. Both items had been considered by the Agenda Committee, and would be addressed later in the meeting.

The Chair advised members that the Governing Council, at its meeting on December 16, 2004, had approved the Policy on Clinical Faculty. Because the policy was of major historical significance to the University, it was appropriate that the final approval of the policy be included in the Board's report.

### 3. Report Number 116 of the Agenda Committee (December 16, 2004) <sup>1</sup>

The report was received for information. The Chair drew the attention of members to the disposition of the two items of business arising from the previous meetings of the Academic Board. The discussion regarding questions raised concerning research to be conducted at the Centre for Biological Timing and Cognition was included on pages 2 and 3 of the Report. The motion approved by the Agenda Committee was on page 3 of the Report. <sup>2</sup> The discussion of documentation for academic administrative appointments was on page 4 of the Report.

A member asked for clarification of what could be discussed at the Board concerning research. The Chair referred to the second part of the resolution of the Agenda Committee, which stated that questions regarding the policies and procedures under which research was conducted at the University were appropriate for discussion at the Board. Professor Goel added that the proposal concerning the Centre for Biological Timing and Cognition had dealt with the capital project, in accordance with the *Policy on Capital Planning and Capital Projects*. <sup>3</sup>

A member repeated the questions that she had raised previously at the Board, concerning policy for research in aboriginal communities, and which had been answered. The Chair ruled the member out of order.

### 4. Policy for Assessment and Review of Academic Programs and Units

Professor Smith reported that the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs (AP&P) had considered this proposal at its meeting of Wednesday, December 8, 2004. The proposal had arisen from recommendations of the Undergraduate Program Review Audit Committee (UPRAC) report on the University of Toronto's review process. UPRAC had noted that University of Toronto review processes were fundamentally sound, but had suggested that a single overarching policy on reviews be developed. The University's current review processes were governed by procedures embedded within the *Raising Our Sights* process.

The proposed policy separated procedures from the policy, so that the Provost's office could alter procedure to adjust to changing circumstance. The Committee on Academic Policy and Programs would perform a monitorial role in oversight of the procedures. The Committee had also discussed ways in which governance oversight of the review process might be enhanced, including a more direct tie-in of previous review processes to program changes, and reconsideration of the current method of examining the reviews.

Discussion about this policy had been quite positive. Members of the Committee had asked whether the *Stepping UP* process was reflected in the new policy and procedures; and whether the administration had considered the onerous workload involved in successive reviews of undergraduate and graduate programs in the same unit, including accreditation reviews. Professor Hillan had advised the Committee that *Stepping UP* did address the review process,

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.utoronto.ca/govcncl/bac/details/ac/2004-05/acr20041216.pdf>

<sup>2</sup> The Agenda Committee approved the following resolution:

1. Discussion of the specifics of any research project was not appropriate at the Academic Board.
2. Questions regarding the policies and procedures under which research was conducted at the University of Toronto were an appropriate topic to be raised at the Board or Committee level.
3. Concerns about the policies and procedures which govern research at the University should be referred to the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs for consideration.

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.utoronto.ca/govcncl/pap/policies/capplan.pdf>

#### **4. Policy for Assessment and Review of Academic Programs and Units (cont'd)**

and that the administration would continue to examine how to relieve some of the burdens imposed by review processes.

The Committee had approved the proposed policy unanimously.

A member congratulated the administration on the proposed policy. He asked whether an evaluation of student life could be included as an element of the self-study described on page 9 of the draft *Guidelines for Reviews of Academic Programs and Units*. Professor Goel thanked the member for his valuable suggestion, and indicated that efforts were being made to increase the measures relating to students. The results of the National Survey of Student Engagement (NESSE) would be reported to the University Affairs Board in February. It was hoped that faculties could draw on the data from NESSE in their self-studies.

The member asked how information about the Ontario Student Assistance Program (OSAP) and unmet student financial need could be obtained. Professor Farrar replied that the annual report on Student Financial Aid would be presented to the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs at its February meeting.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

**YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDED**

THAT the Policy for Assessment and Review of Academic Programs and Units, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix “A”, be recommended to Governing Council for approval, effective for proposals submitted as of September 2005 and for reviews that will be conducted after September 2005.

#### **5. School of Graduate Studies: Proposed In-Program Master of Philosophy Degree (M.Phil)**

##### **Introduction**

Professor Smith informed members that the first version of the M.Phil proposal had been considered by the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs in May, 2004. At that time the proposal had been referred back with a request to clarify elements of the proposed program and to include a broader justification of the degree in response to concerns raised by Committee members. As well, additional information about M.Phil. programs at other universities had been requested.

The program proposal was considered by the Committee at its meeting on December 8, 2004. As indicated in Report 111<sup>4</sup>, members of the Committee were divided on this proposal. The Committee discussed the proposal at length, with numerous arguments made both in favour and in opposition to the introduction of the M.Phil.

The main points raised during the discussion were

- 1) the possibility that the M.Phil would provide a disincentive to completion of the Ph.D.;

---

<sup>4</sup> <http://www.utoronto.ca/govcncl/bac/details/ap/2004-05/apr20041208.pdf>

## 5. School of Graduate Studies: Proposed In-Program Master of Philosophy Degree (M.Phil) (cont'd)

- 2) the fairness of awarding two degrees for the same work completed, and the concerns about inter-Departmental equity that might result;
- 3) alternative possibilities for introduction of such an in-program degree, including:
  - a. providing both degrees at the conclusion of a Ph.D.;
  - b. splitting the Ph.D. program into two distinct graduate programs with the Ph.D portion being the thesis-only part;
  - c. withdrawing the M.Phil at the successful conclusion of the Ph.D..

Other matters discussed included the support of the proposal by the Graduate Students' Union (GSU), the number of programs that would likely introduce the degree, the impact on student funding, and minor matters concerning the implementation of the degree.

A majority of members present had voted in favour of the proposed program..

### External Speaker

At the invitation of the Chair, Mr. Sukhai, President of the GSU, spoke in favour of the proposal by the School of Graduate Studies for the in-program M.Phil. degree. He explained that the GSU had debated the proposed program numerous times throughout its development process. The organization supported the proposal because it was a student-friendly initiative that would benefit the current and future generations of graduate students who would attend the University of Toronto for a number of reasons that were summarized by Mr. Sukhai as follows.

The Ph.D. program was long, with times to completion often exceeding five or six years. For many programs, the most significant milestones, such as qualifying exams, comprehensives, course-work, field-work, and language requirements, were completed relatively early. Following the completion of those milestones was a lengthy stretch of research until the writing of the thesis and final defense. It was during this period that most students withdrew, where they were, perhaps, most vulnerable to burnout. The M.Phil. would serve as an additional “staging” or milestone within the doctoral program.

With this additional milestone definition in place, students faced with extenuating circumstances might benefit from being able to leave the program with a degree. The M. Phil would be part of a natural progression toward the Ph.D., as well as a natural end-point. The M.Phil. would **not** be a consolation prize, or a drop-out degree, and would be a more appropriate option than the back-transfer to an M.A. or M.Sc.

Direct-entry Ph.D. students who already had a Master's also would be able to benefit from the M.Phil., as it would provide them with recognition for work accomplished if they were forced to leave due to mitigating circumstances.

Finally, the M.Phil would positively add to the diversity of programs at the University of Toronto. A criticism of the proposal had been that departments would have the flexibility and choice to offer the M.Phil., thus increasing the inequality in doctoral programs at the University. However, different fields and disciplines at the University, by their very nature, had different degree requirements and milestones, and were therefore by definition unequal, but not any less meaningful.

The GSU, as an organization, had discussed additional merits and criticisms of this proposal, as had other groups, including the School of Graduate Studies, Principals and

## **5. School of Graduate Studies: Proposed In-Program Master of Philosophy Degree (M.Phil) (cont'd)**

Deans, and the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs. The GSU had seen the potential that the M.Phil. would offer in strengthening the graduate program at the University. The logistics of implementation of the M.Phil. would occupy the University for the time of the current generation of graduate students. On behalf of the GSU, Mr. Sukhai asked members of the Board to consider the benefits the M.Phil would have on the perspectives and choices of incoming classes of graduate students, and vote in favour of the proposed program.

### **Discussion**

A member asked how the M. Phil. would link to a Master's degree, since a Master's degree included course work and a thesis, while an M. Phil. would include coursework only. Professor Pfeiffer, Dean of the School of Graduate Studies, replied that, while a Master's degree included course work and a thesis or research requirement, a Ph. D. program included language requirements, comprehensive exams, and additional work of a program nature. The M. Phil. would recognize the completion of these requirements. The member said she remained uncomfortable with the language in the proposal. She was concerned that the M.Phil. degree would lessen the value of a Master of Arts (M.A.) degree. Professor Goel replied that it was not the intent of the proposal to suggest that the M.A. degree was in any way inferior to a M. Phil. In most departments, there would be differences between the two degrees, and each would be separate. Each department would decide whether it wished to offer the M. Phil.

A member observed that the M. Phil. met the current designation of 'abd' ('all but dissertation') and asked whether the approval of the proposed degree program would lead to a proliferation of degree programs in different disciplines. Professor Goel replied that the Doctor of Philosophy degree was standard across disciplines and programs, and the Master of Philosophy would also be standard across disciplines and programs.

A member spoke in support of the proposed program, and observed that students in her discipline did a substantial amount of work prior to their comprehensive exams. She noted that the term 'abd' often had a derogatory meaning.

A member expressed his concern at double counting courses for two degrees. In his view, the proposed program resulted in a 'quasi' degree. Professor Pfeiffer drew the attention of members to the addendum that had been prepared after the meeting of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs. The addendum provided examples of current practice that allowed coursework to be counted toward more than one degree. These included graduate diplomas within graduate programs and combined graduate degrees. The member repeated his opinion that double counting coursework for two degrees was wrong despite the justification that had been provided.

Another member also voiced his concern about double counting courses. He noted that it was an academic offense to submit the same work twice for credit. He suggested that provision be made for the upgrade of an M. Phil. degree to a Ph. D. once the thesis and defence had been completed. A member replied that a similar comment had been made at the meeting of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs. The provision of upgrading an M.Phil. to a Ph.D. would imply that the

## **5. School of Graduate Studies: Proposed In-Program Master of Philosophy Degree (M.Phil) (cont'd)**

M. Phil. represented a failed doctoral degree. In his view, the benefits of the M. Phil. outweighed the objections that had been raised.

Two members spoke in favour of the proposal, particularly because it was a student-friendly initiative. One member suggested that the M. Phil. be a convocated degree, rather than an *in absentia* degree as proposed. The member indicated that he was aware of some discussion concerning the possibility that faculty would use the proposed program as a way of dismissing students from a program. He had not supported the proposal originally, but, in light of the strong support voiced by students, he would now vote in favour of the proposed program.

Professor Goel commented that the proposal had been considered a number of times and had been approved by various bodies within the University, and had received strong support from graduate students. He believed that the argument in favour of the proposed program had been stronger than the arguments opposed to the proposal.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDED

THAT the proposal from the School of Graduate Studies for an In-Program Master of Philosophy (M.Phil.) degree, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "B", be approved.

## **6. Capital Plan: November 2004 to December 2010**

### **Introduction**

Using a Powerpoint presentation, Professor Goel summarized the proposed Capital Plan. He reminded members that capital expansion at the University was governed by the *Policy on Capital Planning and Capital Projects*. He explained that, in the past, universities had received two regular streams of funding from the provincial government: one for capital and one for operating expenses. This meant that funds were usually in hand before projects began. Now it was necessary to borrow money in order to proceed with capital projects, as there was not a regular stream for capital. Since 1999, the Governing Council had approved forty-two capital projects estimated at \$847 million, of which \$503 million had to be borrowed.

Professor Goel observed that the capital expansion goals of the University had been to renew the physical infrastructure of the three campuses, to meet the needs of the students in the double cohort, to meet the needs for research activity and to improve accessibility. Over the past few years, the University had added academic space, student activity space, new residences and enhanced amenities. However, even with the additional space, the University's space capacity was less than the overall system average as defined by the space guidelines of the Council of Ontario University (COU).

Professor Goel emphasized the importance of basing capital priorities on clearly defined needs. Capital plans had a number of constraints, including approved campus master plans and open space plans, municipal zoning requirements, and resources such as capital in hand, debt capacity and the ability to service debt. Currently, the University had an available borrowing capacity of \$115 million.

## 6. Capital Plan: November 2004 to December 2010 (cont'd)

Professor Goel highlighted details of the proposed Capital Plan. There were four categories of projects:

- i) projects that had been approved and/or completed as part of the Capital Plan 1999-November 8, 2004;
- ii) projects that were ready to proceed, and were included in the Short-term Capital Plan;
- iii) projects that were in the planning stages, and were included in the Long-term Capital Plan beyond 2010;
- iv) All other projects.

A capital project would have to meet the following six criteria to be included in either the long-term or short-term capital plan:

- 1) Mission Objectives
- 2) Policy Objectives & Legislative Requirements
- 3) Space Standards
- 4) Strengthening Scholarship
- 5) Providing Academic Leadership
- 6) Student Experience

To move from long-term to short-term status, projects would be evaluated by the following three criteria:

- 7) Economic Consistency
- 8) Resources
- 9) Deferred Maintenance

Professor Goel reminded members that the Board was being asked to approve the principles by which projects would be included in the Capital Plan. Each project would be considered individually for approval.

Professor Gottlieb informed members that there had been a lengthy discussion of the proposed Capital Plan at the Planning and Budget Committee meeting. Members had raised a number of questions, including the following:

- How would the decision to borrow funds to complete a project rather than to wait until full funding had been assembled; be made?
- At what point would the University become facilities-rich and faculty-poor?
- How would deferred maintenance be addressed?

The motion had passed unanimously.

### Discussion

A member referred to the Varsity Stadium project that had been presented for information in the spring of 2004, and suggested that negative effects of capital projects be included among the criteria. Professor Goel replied that the secondary effects of projects were considered by Project Planning Committee as a matter of course.

A member commented that student experience did not seem to have a high priority for projects in the Capital Plan, and asked whether the effect of a project on student experience was being considered. He noted that a student center was the final entry on

## 6. Capital Plan: November 2004 to December 2010 (cont'd)

the list of 'all other projects' in Sector 7 (St. George Campus). The member suggested that the Varsity stadium site be used for a student center. The member also expressed his concern that students would be asked to contribute funds towards a student center. Another member spoke in support of the comments. Professor Goel replied that many completed and planned capital projects included significant new student space. The University had taken a nodular approach to a student center on the St. George campus, following the advice of the Task Force on Student Activity Space that had reported to the administration in February 1999. A project planning committee was currently considering appropriate uses for the Varsity Stadium site which would significantly enhance student experience.

Professor Clandfield noted that the references to a student center at New College should be corrected to read 'student services'.

A member asked whether the Residence Phase 5 project at the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC) would include graduate student and family housing. Professor Venter replied that the demand for residence space at UTSC was highest for undergraduate students. He acknowledged the need to increase available housing for graduate students. Professor Venter also noted the support of students at the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM) and at UTSC for the recently-constructed student centers on those campuses.

A member said he was encouraged to see the approach to capital planning that was being taken by the University.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

### YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDED

1. THAT the University of Toronto *Criteria for the Selection of Capital Projects* as defined in Section 2 of the Capital Plan, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 100 of the Planning and Budget Committee as Appendix "A", be approved, superceding the Report entitled *December 2001 – Capital Plan for Buildings and Projects in Excess of \$2 million* approved by the Governing Council on February 14, 2002.
2. THAT an updated Capital Projects List as described in Section 4 of the Capital Plan be tabled at the appropriate Governing Council Board or Committee meeting at which approval is sought, pursuant to the *Policy on Capital Planning and Capital Projects*, for a capital project.

## 7. Capital Project: University of Toronto at Scarborough - Electrical & Mechanical Upgrades Phase 3: Cooling Towers: Project Planning Report

Professor Gottlieb informed members that the upgrading of the cooling towers had provided an opportunity to bring together all the aspects of the infrastructure upgrades at the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC). Over the last eighteen months, several projects in Phases 1 and 2 had been approved by the Accommodation and Facilities Directorate (AFD), since the cost of each project had been less than \$2 million.

**7. Capital Project: University of Toronto at Scarborough - Electrical & Mechanical Upgrades Phase 3: Cooling Towers: Project Planning Report (cont'd)**

These approvals had been reported to governance through the Planning and Budget Committee in the 2003-04 report of the AFD.<sup>5</sup>

A Committee member had asked whether the possibility of retrofitting the buildings to reduce heating and cooling demands had been considered as an alternative to upgrading the equipment. Professor Venter replied that, in every project, such alternatives were examined.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

**YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDED**

1. THAT the Project Planning Report for the Electrical and Mechanical Infrastructure Upgrades at the University of Toronto at Scarborough, Phase 3 Mechanical: Cooling Towers, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 100 of the Planning and Budget Committee as Appendix “D”, be approved in principle.
2. THAT the project scope, consisting of the replacement of the existing cooling towers by new units and appropriately designed screens, be approved at an estimated total project cost of \$2,515,000 to be funded from the following sources:
  - i) A cash contribution in the amount of \$1,218,166 from the 2004/05 operating budget of the UTSC.
  - ii) A cash contribution in the amount of \$500,000 from the 2005/06 operating budget of the UTSC.
  - iii) Deferred Maintenance Funds allocation to UTSC in 2005-06 in the amount of \$596,834.
  - iv) Facilities Renewal Program allocation 2005-06 in the amount of \$200,000.

**8. Academic Initiatives Fund: Allocations**

Professor Gottlieb explained that the synthesis of *Stepping UP* had identified the major themes that had emerged from the consultations with the University community and from the Divisional plans that had been submitted. The Academic Initiatives Fund (AIF) had been established in the Long-Range Budget Guidelines to assist in the implementation of initiatives arising from the academic planning process. The AIF consisted of a total of \$30 million in base funding, with \$5 million available in each of the next six years.

Requests for AIF funding had been submitted by the Dean on behalf of a Faculty. Fifty-two proposals from thirteen divisions had been received, with requests totaling \$2.7 million in base funding and \$42 million of OTO support. The allocation decisions had been based on advice from a Review Committee, which had included Principals, Deans, Vice-Presidents and Vice-Provosts.

---

<sup>5</sup> <http://www.utoronto.ca/govcncl/bac/details/pb/2004-05/pba20040921-09ii.pdf>

**8. Academic Initiatives Fund: Allocations (cont'd)**

Some Committee members had expressed concern at the use of allocations for debt remission rather than for program enhancements. Professor Goel had explained that it had been the decision of the division to ask for capital support rather than for program support.

A member expressed her appreciation for the synthesis of *Stepping UP*. She asked whether the proposal to enhance the support of teaching at the University would apply only to university-level teaching. Professor Goel replied that this initiative was aimed at University faculty, particularly those who had not attended postsecondary institutions in Canada. The member observed that the Centre for Urban Schooling was an important initiative. She asked whether the Centre would produce models of best practice for life skills. She noted that the AIF was providing one-time-only (OTO) funding, and asked how ongoing funding would be sought to support the Centre. Dean Gaskell replied that the Centre would look at best practices, and that research would be developed in partnership with school boards. The two years of OTO funding would provide an opportunity for the Centre to establish partnerships with school boards that could lead to ongoing operating support.

The member also applauded the establishment of a Centre for Community Partnerships. She asked whether the Centre would include only mainstream groups, or whether attempts would be made to reach beyond those groups. Professor Goel replied that the Centre for Community Partnerships would be as broad and inclusive as possible to open the University to all communities of the Greater Toronto Area (GTA).

A member asked whether the proposals that did not receive funding could be made available. Professor Goel replied that the academic plans for each division were available on line.<sup>6</sup> It would be more informative to consider divisional priorities than to review funding requests, which were often affected by issues of timing

A member recalled the discussion at the Planning and Budget Committee of the use of AIF allocations for debt relief, and commented that such allocations could be seen to send the message that divisions could take on debt, then seek relief from the Provost. Professor Goel replied that the allocations addressed unique circumstances within specific divisions. Deans had received a clear message that the Provost would not provide debt relief without a strong and compelling rationale.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

**YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDED**

THAT the First Round of Academic Initiative Funds, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 100 of the Planning and Budget Committee as Appendix "E", be allocated as per the table (Appendices 3 & 4) attached to the Memorandum from the Vice-President and Provost dated November 30 for December 7, 2004.

---

<sup>6</sup> <http://www.provost.utoronto.ca/English/SteppingUp-Divisional-Plans.html>

## **9. Canada Research Chairs Fund: Allocations**

Professor Gottlieb explained that this allocation was a routine annual item. No questions had been raised at the Planning and Budget Committee.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

**YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDED**

That \$3.8m be allocated from the Canada Research Chair Fund to cover salaries, benefits, research allowances and cluster support for the nineteen Chairholders approved during the 2003 competitions.

That \$1.24m (\$1.4m less \$.16m indirect cost of 16% of salaries and benefits) be allocated to the Faculty of Medicine in support of nine campus based Chairholders that were awarded in 2004.

That \$1.627m (\$1.7m less \$72,857 indirect cost of 6% of salaries and benefits) be allocated to the Faculty of Medicine in support of the twelve Chairholders based in Hospital and Research Institutes that were awarded in 2004.

## **10. School of Graduate Studies: Institute Name Change**

The Chair reminded members that Section 5.2.7 of the Board's Terms of Reference stated that name changes in academic divisions were considered by the Academic Board and confirmed by the Executive Committee.

Professor Goel explained that the Institute for Human Development, Life Course and Aging proposed to re-focus its current mission and place less emphasis on child development. A number of units dedicated to human development existed at the University. In the next seven years, the Institute wished to enhance its added value to the University by sharpening its original mission and goals to focus more on the life course and aging component of the mission.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

**YOUR BOARD APPROVED**

That the Institute for Human Development, Life Course and Aging change its name to the Institute for Life Course and Aging, effective September 2005.

## **11. Report from the Vice-President and Provost**

Professor Goel informed members that the Postsecondary Review (Rae Review) was at a deliberative stage and was finalizing its recommendations, in consultation with a number of stakeholders. President Iacobucci added that the Rae Review report was scheduled to be released in February. Following the release of the Report, initiatives in support of the recommendations will be undertaken. The University had established a Task Force on Rae Advocacy that would be active in the coming months.

## **12. Appointments and Status Changes**

Members received for information a number of appointments and status changes.

### 13. Reports for Information

#### (a) Accountability Reports

##### (i) Report of the Vice-President, Research and Associate Provost

Members received a copy of the 2003-2004 Report and 2004-2005 Plans of the Office of the Vice-President, Research and Associate Provost. A member noted that the University of Toronto had received 16 per cent of the total funding provided by the three federal granting councils. The member asked whether a measure of whether research was serving the public good could be added to the Report. Professor Challis replied that new performance measures were being developed for the Report.

##### (ii) Quarterly Report on Donations August – October, 2004

This report was presented for information in accordance with the Provost's Guidelines on Donations. Members were reminded that the report was marked strictly confidential.

A member recalled that Dr. Dellandrea was leaving the University at the end of June, 2005. On behalf of the Board, he expressed his thanks to Dr. Dellandrea for his service and contributions to the University.

#### (b) Standing Committee Reports

Members received for information the following reports:

Report Number 111 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs (December 8, 2004)

Report Number 100 of the Planning and Budget Committee (December 7, 2004)

Report Number 292 of the Academic Appeals Committee

Report Number 293 of the Academic Appeals Committee

Prior to the meeting, a member had asked for clarification of the final sentence in Report Number 293 of the Academic Appeals Committee.<sup>7</sup> Professor Goel explained that the Committee had found that it had no jurisdiction to provide a remedy because the student had not provided information about any extenuating circumstances related to his failing grade.

### 14. Date of Next Meeting

The Chair reminded members that the next meeting of the Board was scheduled for **Monday, February 21, 2005 at 4:10 p.m.**

### 15. Other Business

#### (a) Elections

The Chair reminded members that nominations for sixteen teaching staff and one librarian seat on the Academic Board would open on Monday, January 17. Nominations would open at the same time four teaching staff and eight student seats on the Governing Council. Nomination forms for these positions would be available on the Governing

---

<sup>7</sup> *"The Appeals Committee had no jurisdiction to offer academic relief due to financial considerations that had no bearing on his previous performance in the course."*

**15. Other Business (cont'd)**

**(a) Elections (cont'd)**

Council website beginning at 9 am on January 17. The Chair asked members to support the election process by standing for re-election, encouraging colleagues to stand for election, and voting in the elections in their constituency.

**(b) Information Session on University Finances**

The Chair reminded members of the information session on University finances, tuition fees and student financial aid that was being held on Friday, January 14, 2005.

**(c) Appeal of Ruling of the Chair**

A member expressed her disappointment that, in her view, discussion concerning research being conducted in aboriginal communities had been stifled during the meeting. The Chair ruled the member out of order.

It was duly moved and seconded

THAT the ruling of the Chair be appealed.

The motion to appeal the ruling of the Chair was defeated.

On motion duly moved and seconded, the Board moved *in camera*.

**16. Academic Administrative Appointments**

The following academic administrative appointment was approved:

**UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO AT MISSISSAUGA**

**Department of Biology**

Professor Angela Lange

Interim Chair

January 14, 2005 to June 30, 2005

The meeting adjourned at 6:05 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

January 26, 2005