

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

REPORT NUMBER 185 OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD

May 2, 2013

To the Governing Council,
University of Toronto

Your Board reports that it held a meeting on Thursday, May 2, 2013 at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall at which the following were present:

Professor Ellen Hodnett, Chair
Professor David Naylor,
President
Professor Cheryl Misak, Vice-
President and Provost
Professor Scott Mabury, Vice-
President, University
Operations
Professor Cheryl Regehr, Vice-
Provost, Academic Programs
Professor Donald Ainslie
Professor Benjamin Alarie
Professor Catherine Amara
Professor Robert Baker
Mr. James Bateman
Professor Dwayne Benjamin
Dr. Katherine Berg
Ms Marilyn Booth
Ms Celina Caesar-Chavannes
Professor Elizabeth Cowper
Mr. Tyler Currie
Professor Karen Davis

Professor Luc De Nil
Professor Charles Deber
Professor David Dubins
Professor Zhong-Ping Feng
Mr. Omar Gamel
Professor Robert Gibbs
Mr. Andrew Girgis
Professor Avrum Gotlieb
Professor Rick Halpern
Professor Bart Harvey
Mrs. Bonnie Horne
Mr. Peter Hurley
Professor Ira Jacobs
Professor Alison Keith
Professor Paul Kingston
Mr. David Kleinman
Ms Beth Martin
Professor Douglas McDougall
Dr. Don McLean
Professor Matthew Mitchell
Professor Amy Mullin

Professor Emmanuel Nikiema
Professor Julia O'Sullivan
Professor Elizabeth Peter
Professor Russell Pysklywec
Ms Mainawati Rambali
Professor Michael Ratcliffe
Professor Neil Rector
Professor Yves Roberge
Professor Jeffrey Rosenthal
Professor Lock Rowe
Ms Deanne Saunders
Ms Ioana Sendroiu
Miss Maureen J. Somerville
Professor Richard Sommer
Professor Suzanne Stevenson
Professor Markus Stock
Mr. Andrew Szende
Professor Vincent Tropepe
Dr. Sarita Verma
Professor Cameron Walter
Professor Sandy Welsh

Regrets:

Dr. Francis Ahia
Mr. Larry Alford
Professor Cristina Amon
Professor Maydianne Andrade
Ms Katherine Ball
Professor Dwayne Barber
Professor Jan Barnsley
Professor Eric Bredo
Professor Terry Carleton
Ms Ching Lucy Chau
Ms Yifan Chen
Professor Brian Corman
Professor Gary Crawford
Professor Christopher Damaren
Professor Joseph Desloges
Mr. Michael Dick
Ms Hanan Domloge
Mr. Michael Donnelly

Professor Wendy Duff
Professor Anthony Duggan
Professor Suzanne Erb
Professor Angela Esterhammer
Mr. John A. Fraser
Mr. Peng Fu
Professor Meric Gertler
Professor Hugh Gunz
Professor Daniel Haas
Professor Robert Harrison
Professor Jim Lai
Professor Ron Levi
Professor John Magee
Professor Henry Mann
Professor Roger L. Martin
Professor Faye Mishna
Ms Michelle Mitrovich
Dr. Gary P. Mooney
Professor Carol Moukheiber
Professor Sioban Nelson

Dr. Graeme Norval
Professor Janet Paterson
Professor Laca Pavel
Professor Domenico Pietropaolo
Ms Judith Poë
Mr. Layton Reynolds
Professor Seamus Ross
Professor Mohini Sain
Ms Tisha Tan
Dr. Roslyn Thomas-Long
Ms Caitlin Tillman
Mr. Vijay Unnithan
Mr. Abhishek Vaidyanathan
Professor Njoki Wane
Dr. Shelly Weiss
Professor Catharine Whiteside
Professor Charmaine Williams
Professor Joseph Wong
Professor Howard Yee

Secretariat:

Ms Mae-Yu Tan

Non-voting Assessors:

Mr. David Palmer, Vice-President, University Advancement
 Professor R. Paul Young, Vice-President, Research and Innovation
 Ms Sally Garner, Executive Director, Planning and Budget
 Ms Gail Milgrom, Director, Campus and Facilities Planning

In Attendance:

Mr. Rastko Cvekic, Member-Elect of the Governing Council	Ms Nora Gillespie, Legal Counsel, Offices of the Vice-President and Provost and the Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity	Mr. Steve Moate, Senior Legal Counsel, Office of the President
Ms Judith Chadwick, Assistant Vice-President, Research Services and Portfolio Operations	Mr. Doug Hart, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE)	Professor Ken Pritzker, Speaker of the Faculty of Medicine Council
Mr. Todd Coomber, Faculty Affairs Officer, Faculty of Medicine	Professor Bernie Kraatz, Chair, Department of Physical Environmental Sciences, University of Toronto Scarborough	Ms Archana Sridhar, Assistant Provost
Ms Justine Garrett, Coordinator, Academic Programs and Planning, Office of the Vice-President and Provost		Ms Eileen Thomas, Institutional Governance Coordinator, OISE
		Ms Maggie Xu, Chair, By-Laws, Nominations and Equity Standing Committee, Faculty Council, OISE

Chair's Remarks

The Chair welcomed members and guests to the meeting. She thanked members who would continue to serve on the Board in 2013-14 and who had completed the online committee preferences form. The Board's Striking Committee would meet the next day to review members' requests as well as over 100 applications for co-opted positions on the Board. The Chair also thanked members of the Striking Committee for their work in reviewing the many applications and developing recommendations for appointments that would be considered by the Board at its meeting of June 3, 2013.

The Chair congratulated Professor Cheryl Regehr on having been appointed Vice-President and Provost effective September 2, 2013. The Board applauded Professor Regehr.

1. Report of the Vice-President and ProvostProvincial Tuition Framework

Professor Misak referred to the Provincial Government's recent announcement of a new four-year tuition framework for Ontario's higher education institutions. The new policy limited overall average annual increases to 3% across the institution and capped annual increases for undergraduate students to 3% for all years. Increases for graduate and professional programs were capped at 5%. Both caps represented decreases in projected revenue for the University and

1. Report of the Vice-President and Provost

Provincial Tuition Framework (cont'd)

would have adverse effects on University budget. A loss of approximately \$6.4 million in tuition fee revenue was anticipated in the first year of implementation of the new framework, and the losses would compound thereafter. The University had been preparing for a range of scenarios in anticipation of this possibility. As well, Professor Misak had been in discussion with the Deans about the potential impact on their divisional budgets.

Professor Misak noted that the University, through its progressive policies on student aid¹, had exceeded the government's mandated expectations for student financial aid over the years, flowing tuition dollars to those most in need. The provincial government's policies, including the broad-based Ontario Tuition Grant and the mandated cap on tuition increases for all students, were in tension with the University's policy.

The Chair thanked Professor Misak for her report and congratulated her on the recent publication of her book, *"The American Pragmatists"*.

2. [Guidelines on the Role and Appointment of University Ambassadors](#)

The Chair stated that the Board was being asked to consider two related items, the *Guidelines on the Role and Appointment of University Ambassadors*, and the *Policy on Presiding Officers for Convocation*. Both items had been considered and endorsed by the Board's Subcommittee on Convocation Ceremonial Procedures, which was composed of the Chancellor, the President, the Chair of the Academic Board and the Secretary of the Governing Council. If recommended by the Board, both items would be forwarded to the Governing Council for approval on May 23, 2013.

President Naylor introduced the two items, commenting that, with the growth of the University, the number of annual convocation ceremonies had increased over the years.² Significant demand was placed on the Chancellor, who presided over the ceremonies. Remarkably, the previous two Chancellors had managed to attend each of the ceremonies. However, it was not reasonable to have such expectations of others, particularly given the numerous other events they attended on behalf of the University. The proposed *Guidelines* would enable the President to call on a small corps of University Ambassadors from time to time to fulfill specific ceremonial responsibilities.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the proposed *Guidelines on the Role and Appointment of University Ambassadors* be approved, effective immediately.

¹ *Policy on Student Financial Support* (April 30, 1998):
<http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/Assets/Governing+Council+Digital+Assets/Policies/PDF/ppapr301998.pdf>

² Secretary's Note: There are currently twenty-five ceremonies in June and eight in November.

3. *Policy on Presiding Officers for Convocation*

President Naylor explained that the proposed revisions to the *Policy on Presiding Officers for Convocation* would allow for Chancellors Emeriti, Presidents Emeriti and University Ambassadors to serve as presiding officers in specific circumstances. The revisions would also enable the President to delegate responsibilities among academic division heads, Vice-Presidents with academic appointments and others. In the past, President Naylor had found it necessary to delegate to others responsibility for approximately half of the convocation ceremonies so that he could fulfill his other roles. The revisions also helped to preserve the separation of the ceremonial role of the Chancellor from the administrative role of the President.

President Naylor noted that, at the suggestion of the College Principals, an additional amendment had been made to the proposed revised *Policy* and its Appendix A. In instances when both the Chancellor and President were absent and students from multiple units were graduating at the same convocation, the Chancellor would designate the head of one of the academic units to act on his/her behalf.³ There would be an equitable rotation among the heads invited to serve for the Chancellor. This process would replace the existing requirement for the head of the earliest established unit to act for the Chancellor.

A member expressed support for the proposed revisions. A member stated that she recognized the challenges faced by the Chancellor in having to attend multiple convocations. However, in her view, it was important to graduands for the Chancellor to preside at their ceremonies, providing continuity. The member suggested that, at the very least, an effort should be made for either the Chancellor or the President to be present at each ceremony. The member also asked what steps would be taken to ensure that any conflict of interest or appearance of such would be avoided when designating representatives to serve on behalf of the Chancellor.

President Naylor reiterated that, while the Chancellor's key role was to preside at convocation, the University also relied on the Chancellor to host and attend numerous functions across the country and internationally. President Naylor stated that he would be pleased to communicate to the Chancellor the preferred practice of having, at minimum, either the Chancellor or the President present at each ceremony, and he felt that in the overwhelming majority of instances, this would be possible. With respect to ceremonies at which an honorary degree would be conferred, in the future, correspondence with prospective honorary graduands could outline the possibility of delegation and thereby ensure flexibility rather than having coverage by the President and Chancellor concentrated on those ceremonies. Last, President Naylor responded that judgement would be required when identifying suitable delegates to preside at convocation, and he was sure that would be the case in future.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the amended proposed revised *Policy on Presiding Officers for Convocation* be approved, effective immediately, replacing the Policy approved on April 16, 2009.

³ Secretary's Note: The proposed amendments were projected on the screen for members.

4. *Vice-President, Research and Innovation – 2012 Annual Report*

At the invitation of the Chair, Professor R. Paul Young, Vice-President, Research and Innovation, gave a presentation on the 2012 Annual Report prepared by his Office. A copy of the slides is appended as [Attachment A](#).

There were no questions from the Board. The Chair thanked Professor Young for his excellent presentation.

The Chair stated that the Board was no longer being asked to consider for approval Items 5 and 6, the *Inventions Policy* and the *Research Administration Policy*. Rather, the items would be presented for information and would then be brought forward for approval in the next governance cycle.

5. [*Inventions Policy*](#)

Before introducing Ms Judith Chadwick, Assistant Vice-President, Research Services and Portfolio Operations, who would outline the revised *Inventions Policy* and the new *Research Administration Policy*, Professor Young commented that both policies had been updated to reflect current operational practice and the University's budget model. No material changes had been made as a result of either draft policy.

Ms Chadwick informed the Board that the proposed *Inventions Policy* revisions were intended to increase clarity and transparency, making it easier for users to understand the "rules". She then highlighted the following proposed changes to the *Policy*:

- Updates to clarify definitions and position titles;
- Removal of revenue distribution details outlined in Appendix A;
- Adjustment to the mechanism through which the University tracked subsequent licensing or assignment of Inventor-owned inventions to third parties;
- Authority for the Vice-President, Research and Innovation (or designate) to execute agreements without having to involve the Governing Council Secretariat; and
- Inclusion of gross revenue in the revenue distribution tables in Appendix A, making more visible the Inventor's majority share of revenue.

A member asked for clarification regarding the distribution of net revenue for single-departmental faculties. Ms Chadwick replied that no change in the process had been proposed and such divisions would continue to receive both the departmental and divisional revenue. In response to a follow-up question, Ms Chadwick explained that the inventor's share of revenue had been added to the proposed revised distribution table for clarity. However, there had been no change in the actual revenue flow.

6. [Research Administration Policy](#)

Ms Chadwick spoke of the importance of full cost recovery in research and said that the standard indirect cost rate of not less than 40% of the total direct costs contained in the *Research Administration Policy* was consistent with the rate sought through the federal Indirect Costs Program. A mechanism would continue to exist through which the head of an academic division could selectively reduce the indirect cost rate for projects where he/she felt it was appropriate. The accompanying *Research Administration Guideline* made explicit the different types of revenue associated with research, so that sponsored research, donations to research and service contracts could each be administered appropriately.

President Naylor stated that, together with its peer institutions, the University had been advocating for many years for the federal government to cover increased institutional costs of research. The policy, while allowing flexibility for divisions, basically involved making the same case for industrial partners. This was particularly so given the direct benefits of its research to industry funders. He noted that, whether government or industry was subsidized, the continued underwriting of institutional research costs by tuition fees, operating grants and the hard work of University members was not sustainable.

7. [Renewal and Proposed Revisions of Hospital – University Community Affiliation Template Agreements](#)

The Chair noted that one of the Board's responsibilities was oversight of agreements with external bodies and she stated that the proposed new and revised templates had been reviewed by the Planning and Budget Committee (P&B) on April 17, 2013. If recommended by the Board, the templates would be considered by the Governing Council for approval on May 23rd.

Professor Gotlieb provided an overview of the revised template agreements for community affiliation and non-hospital clinical site agreements and the proposed new affiliation template agreement for Toronto Academic Health Science Network (TAHSN) Associate Members between the University of Toronto and the relevant sites. He also outlined the discussion that had occurred at the P&B meeting, a summary of which is contained in the P&B Report.⁴

A Board member asked for clarification of the "Health Science faculty" definition contained in all three of the template agreements. She asked whether that terminology was applicable to a group of University faculty within the Department of Surgery who were sometimes referred to as "clinical faculty", although they were not physicians. Professors Misak and Verma stated that the templates did not affect faculty status within the University. Ms Nora Gillespie added that the definitions contained in the templates applied only to those agreements; they did not have an effect on any other University document or policy.

Professor Verma closed by acknowledging the assistance of the Office of the Vice-President and Provost and legal counsel.

⁴<http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/Assets/Governing+Council+Digital+Assets/Boards+and+Committees/Planning+and+Budget+Committee/2012-2013+Academic+Year/r0417.pdf>

7. **Renewal and Proposed Revisions of Hospital – University Community Affiliation Template Agreements (cont'd)**

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

- (a) THAT the revised template agreement for community affiliation agreements, the revised template agreement for non-hospital clinical site agreements, and the new affiliation template agreement for Toronto Academic Health Science Network (TAHSN) Associate Members between the University of Toronto and the relevant sites be approved, effective immediately;
- (b) THAT the President, or designate, be authorized to sign such agreements on behalf of the Governing Council, provided that the agreements conform to the approved template agreement; and
- (c) THAT the agreements signed under the provisions of this resolution be filed with the Secretary of Governing Council.

8. **Constitutional Amendments**

The Chair said that the Agenda Committee had determined that two of three constitutional amendments - those for the Faculty of Medicine and the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE) - comprised major amendments and should be placed on the regular agenda to allow for discussion by the Board. The constitutional amendments for Woodsworth College were very minor and that item had been placed on the consent agenda.

a) [Faculty of Medicine](#)

Professor Misak stated that, in February, 2011, the Faculty of Medicine had undertaken a review of the membership of its Faculty Council, which been unchanged since 2003. A working group had resumed its work last year and had developed the changes detailed in the item documentation. In general, the changes were designed to reflect new or expanded constituencies. It was proposed that the Faculty Council membership be increased from 86 to 137 members and that existing proportions for each constituency be maintained. At its April 23, 2013 meeting, the Agenda Committee had observed that the quorum of 20% for Faculty Council was lower than the recommended quorum - 1/3rd of voting members - and it had suggested that the Faculty of Medicine consider increasing the quorum required for its Council in the future. The proposed constitutional revisions had been reviewed by all Standing Committees of Council and had been recommended for approval by Faculty Council on April 29th.

In response to a member's query regarding the Faculty's low quorum, Professor Ken Pritzker, Speaker of the Faculty of Medicine Council, stated that a quorum of 1/3rd was more appropriate than that of 20%. However, the latter appeared to be more achievable over the short term for the Faculty of Medicine. A member observed that Council met on a regular basis and commented that the apparent hesitation to increase quorum suggested that meeting attendance by

8. Constitutional Amendments (cont'd)a) Faculty of Medicine (cont'd)

1/3rd of members was not being achieved. Professor Verma stated that the Faculty would monitor attendance at its meetings and would undertake to increase its quorum in the future.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

It Was Resolved

THAT, subject to confirmation by the Executive Committee, the amended Constitution of the Faculty of Medicine, which was approved by the Council of the Faculty of Medicine on April 29, 2013, be approved.

b) OISE

Professor Misak informed the Board that the OISE Constitution had been previously amended in June, 2006. The proposed amendments had been outlined in the accompanying documentation provided to members. OISE's Faculty Council had been discussing revisions to its membership and definitions of the constituencies. Those discussions would continue, and related revisions would likely be brought forward to the Board for approval in 2013-14. The current proposed amendments had been approved by the OISE Council on April 17th.

There were no questions from members.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

It Was Resolved

THAT, subject to confirmation by the Executive Committee, the amended Constitution of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, which was approved by the Faculty Council of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education on April 17, 2013, be approved.

9. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units – Semi-Annual Report

Professor Doug McDougall provided a brief overview of the work of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs (AP&P) at its meeting of April 16th. At that time, AP&P had reviewed ten external reviews of units and/or programs, all of which had been commissioned by Deans. The Committee had had a thorough discussion of each of the reviews and had agreed that none of the reviews had identified issues that needed to be brought to the attention of the Agenda Committee.

Follow-up reports had been requested by the AP&P for four reviews – the Department of Italian Studies and its programs; the Department of Psychology and its undergraduate program; the Department of Biochemistry and its programs; and the University of Toronto Mississauga's Management and Professional Accounting program and Diploma in Investigative and Forensic Accounting.

9. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units – Semi-Annual Report (cont'd)

Professor McDougall advised the Board that the issue of degree completion times had been raised in two of the reviews, both in the Faculty of Medicine. In the review for the Department of Biochemistry, time-to-completion for both Master of Science and doctoral students had been identified as an area of concern. Dean Whiteside had expressed agreement with the reviewers and had noted that more attention to timely and effective program advisory committee meetings and clear timelines for research progress were needed, as had been outlined by the Department Chair in his response. In the review of Medical Biophysics, completion time had also been flagged. In her response, Dean Whiteside had pointed out that the Faculty of Medicine expected an average time-to-completion of approximately five years. The reviewers had been incorrect in stating that the average time-to-completion in other basic science departments in the Faculty was six to seven years.

10. Capital Projects

a) Governance Pathways for Capital Projects and Infrastructure Renewal Projects

Referring to the consultation document, *Governance Pathways for Capital Projects and Infrastructure Renewal Projects* (April 15, 2013), the Chair advised the Board of proposed changes to the procedures through which capital and infrastructural renewal project reports would be brought forward for governance approval. The purpose of the changes was to enhance the University's ability and ongoing efforts to (a) allocate its resources prudently and effectively, (b) maximize opportunities for cost containment and (c) ensure the value and integrity of the public procurement process. It was proposed that non-financial aspects be considered in open session and financial aspects be considered *in camera*. To that end, discussion of the site, space plan, and source of funds for a project would take place in the open session of the meetings of the appropriate governance body. Following a full and transparent discussion, a motion to approve the project in principle (subject to the *in camera* consideration of funding) would be made in the open session.

The overall cost of a project, as well as the delineation of amounts derived from the various sources of funds, would be considered in the *in camera* session of the same meeting. Following a full discussion, a motion to approve the total project cost and the sources of funding would be made in the *in camera* session. Complete documentation (i.e., all details – non-financial and financial) would be made publicly available on the Governing Council website at a later date, once the bids for the project had been received and finalized and the Governing Council Office had been notified.

Professor Mabury elaborated on the proposed procedures, noting that it would be to the University's advantage to ensure that planned budgets for capital projects remained confidential during the tender process. He noted that a similar practice was followed by some Provincial Ministries.

10. Capital Projects (cont'd)

b) [Report of the Project Planning Committee for the Relocation of the John H. Daniels Faculty of Architecture, Landscape and Design to One Spadina Crescent](#)

The Chair informed the Board that it was being asked to consider two capital project proposals that had been reviewed by the P&B on April 17th. If recommended by the Board, they would be considered by the Governing Council for approval on May 23rd.

Professor Gottlieb outlined the capital project for the relocation of the John H. Daniels Faculty of Architecture, Landscape and Design (FALD). It was proposed that the FALD be relocated from 230 College Street to One Spadina Crescent. Phase One of the project would accommodate approximately 2, 100 net assignable square metres (nasm) or one-third of the total space program. Phase Two, for which approval would be sought in the fall, would accommodate the remainder of the space program. The sources of funding would include the Capital Campaign, Provostial Central Funds, Graduate Expansion Funds, Deferred Maintenance Fund, and borrowing.

In response to a question from a member, Professor Mabury confirmed the intent for the original building at One Spadina Crescent to be ready for occupancy by July, 2014. Interim space would also be needed, and space in University College and 704 Spadina Avenue had been identified as sites where temporary studios and workshops could be housed until construction was completed.

A member asked what measures would be taken to ensure safety at One Spadina Crescent. Professor Richard Sommer, Dean of the FALD, replied that the new building would have a system similar to that currently in place at 230 College Street. Public areas would be open during business hours and student studios would be accessible by key fob only. A sustainable LED system that would be activated by motion in public areas was being considered. Professor Sommer also pointed to the growing undergraduate student population that would contribute to a greater sense of security within the building. Professor Misak noted that the proposed project would be beneficial in enlivening both the immediate vicinity as well as contributing to urban renewal in the surrounding areas.

Responding to a member's question regarding traffic flow around One Spadina Crescent, Professor Sommer said that approval of the site plan would be sought in stages. Once approval for the project had been obtained, other considerations with respect to traffic zoning could be considered. One option was to make the front of the building accessible.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

1. THAT the Project Planning Committee Report for the Relocation of the John H. Daniels Faculty of Architecture, Landscape and Design to One Spadina Crescent, dated March 29, 2013, be approved in principle; and
2. THAT the project scope totalling 4, 600 gross square metres (approximately 2, 100 net assignable square metres) be approved in principle for the First Phase, to be funded by the Capital Campaign, Provostial Central Funds, Graduate Expansion Funds, Deferred Maintenance Funds and Borrowing.

10. Capital Projects (cont'd)**c) [Report of the Project Planning Committee for the Environmental Science and Chemistry Building at the University of Toronto Scarborough](#)**

Professor Gottlieb informed the Board of the proposed capital project for the University of Toronto Scarborough (UTSC) Environmental Science and Chemistry Building. The new building would enable UTSC to keep pace with planned graduate expansion and increases in new faculty who would need laboratory facilities. The building would have a gross area of 10,116 square metres, with five levels above ground and a basement linked underground to the adjacent Instructional Centre. Sources of funding would include UTSC Operating Funds, Graduate Expansion Funds and borrowing.

No questions were raised by members.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the Project Planning Report for the Environmental Science and Chemistry Building at the University of Toronto Scarborough (UTSC), dated March 29, 2013, be approved in principle; and

THAT the project scope totaling 5,058 net assignable square metres (10,116 gross square metres) to be funded by UTSC Operating Funds, Graduate Expansion Funds and Borrowing, be approved in principle.

CONSENT AGENDA

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the consent agenda be adopted.

11. Report of the Project Planning Committee for the University of Toronto Libraries High-Density Library Storage Facility Expansion at the Downsview Campus

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

IT WAS RESOLVED

THAT, subject to confirmation by the Executive Committee

1. THAT the Project Planning Report for the University of Toronto Libraries Expansion to Library Storage at the Downsview Campus, dated March 29, 2013, be approved in principle; and
2. THAT the project scope to expand the existing high density library storage facility by two bays, or approximately 1, 670 gross square metres (1, 288 net assignable square metres), be approved in principle, with funding by an allocation from the University's operating budget.

12. Constitutional Amendment: Woodsworth College

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

IT WAS RESOLVED

THAT, subject to confirmation by the Executive Committee, the amended Constitution of Woodsworth College, which was approved by the Council of Woodsworth College on March 27, 2013, be approved.

13. Approval of the Report of the Previous Meeting: Report Number 184 – March 21, 2013

Report Number 184 of the meeting held on March 21, 2013 was approved.

14. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting

There was no business arising from Report Number 184.

15. Items for Information

The following items for information were received by the Board.

- a) Appointments: University Professors Selection Committee
- b) Report Number 190 of the Agenda Committee Meeting – April 23, 2013
- d) Report Number 154 of the Planning and Budget Committee – April 17, 2013

The Chair stated that Report Number 161 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs (April 16, 2013) would be provided to members for the next meeting of the Board.

16. Date of the Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Board was scheduled for Monday, June 3, 2013, at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber.

17. Other Business

There were no items of other business.

The Board moved *in camera*.

18. Relocation of the John H. Daniels Faculty of Architecture, Landscape and Design to One Spadina Crescent – Sources of Funding and Total Project Cost

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the recommendation regarding the proposed relocation of the John H. Daniels Faculty of Architecture, Landscape and Design to One Spadina Crescent contained in the memorandum from Ms Gail Milgrom, Director of Campus and Facilities Planning, dated April 4, 2013, be approved.

19. The Environmental Science and Chemistry Building at the University of Toronto Scarborough – Sources of Funding and Total Project Cost

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the recommendation regarding the proposed University of Toronto Scarborough Environmental Science and Chemistry Building contained in the memorandum from Ms Gail Milgrom, Director of Campus and Facilities Planning, dated April 4, 2013, be approved.

20. Appointments: President's Teaching Award Recipients

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT Dr. Chris Perumalla, Professor Lawrence Sawchuk, and Professor Alissa Trotz receive the President's Teaching Award for 2012-2013.

21. Appointment: Assistant Discipline Counsel

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT Ms Tina H. Lie be appointed Assistant Discipline Counsel, effective immediately.

IN CAMERA CONSENT AGENDA

22. University of Toronto Libraries High-Density Library Storage Facility Expansion at the Downsview Campus – Sources of Funding and Total Project Cost

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

IT WAS RESOLVED

THAT, subject to confirmation by the Executive Committee

THAT the recommendation regarding the proposed University of Toronto Libraries High-Density Library Storage Facility Expansion at the Downsview Campus contained in the memorandum from Ms Gail Milgrom, Director of Campus and Facilities Planning, dated April 4, 2013, be approved.

The Board returned to open session.

The Chair thanked members for their attendance and participation in the Board meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 6:10 p.m.

Secretary
May 6, 2013

Chair