

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL
REPORT NUMBER 189 OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD

January 30, 2014

To the Governing Council,
University of Toronto

Your Board reports that it held a meeting on Thursday, January 30, 2014 at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall at which the following were present:

Professor Ellen Hodnett, Chair	Professor Elizabeth Cowper	Professor Faye Mishna
Professor Andrea Sass-Kortsak, Vice-Chair	Professor Maria Cristina Cuervo	Professor Amy Mullin
Professor Meric Gertler, President	Mr. Rastko Cvekic	Ms Jessica Ng
Professor Cheryl Regehr, Vice- President and Provost	Professor Luc De Nil	Dr. Graeme Norval
Professor Scott Mabury, Vice- President, University Operations	Professor Charles Deber	Ms Jiwon Tina Park
Professor Sioban Nelson, Vice- Provost, Academic Programs	Professor Joseph Desloges	Professor Lacra Pavel
Dr. Francis Ahia	Professor Zhong-Ping Feng	Professor Elizabeth Peter
Dr. Ramona Alaggia	Professor Susanne Ferber	Professor Domenico Pietropaolo
Professor Cristina Amon	Mr. Peng Fu	Dr. Helen Polatajko-Howell
Dr. Dimitri Anastakis	Professor Avrum Gotlieb	Professor Russell Pysklywec
Professor Dwayne Benjamin	Professor Daniel Haas	Ms Daisy Qin
Professor John Bland	Professor Rick Halpern	Ms Jennifer Raso
Professor Eric Bredo	Professor Robert Harrison	Professor Michael Ratcliffe
Professor Markus Bussmann	Professor Bart Harvey	Ms Aditi Ratho
Professor David Cameron	Professor Richard Hegele	Professor Neil Rector
Professor Terry Carleton	Mrs. Bonnie Horne	Professor Sonia Sedivy
Mr. Ken Chan	Dr. Avi Hyman	Professor Salvatore Spadafora
Mr. Louis R. Charpentier	Professor Ira Jacobs	Professor Suzanne Stevenson
Dr. Caroline Chassels	Ms Jenna Jacobson	Professor Markus Stock
Professor Brian Corman	Professor Alison Keith	Professor Vincent Tropepe
	Professor Linda Kohn	Professor Cameron Walter
	Professor Ron Levi	Professor Catharine Whiteside
	Mr. Yingxiang Li	Ms Songyi Xu
	Mr. Ian Lin	Professor Howard Yee
	Professor Douglas McDougall	
	Ms Lorraine McLachlan	
Regrets:	Professor Wendy Duff	Professor Julia O'Sullivan
Professor Donald Ainslie	Professor Angela Esterhammer	Professor Janet Paterson
Professor Benjamin Alarie	Mr. John A. Fraser	Professor Peter Pauly
Mr. Larry Alford	Professor Robert Gibbs	Professor Michele Peterson- Badali
Ms Laura Amodio	Ms Alexandra Harris	Professor Yves Roberge
Professor Maydianne Andrade	Professor Howard Hu	Ms Melinda Rogers
Mr. Christopher Balette	Professor Douglas Hyatt	Professor Seamus Ross
Professor Jan Barnsley	Mr. Asad Jamal	Professor Mohini Sain
Dr. Katherine Berg	Professor Paul Kingston	Professor Richard Sommer
Dr. Heather Boon	Mr. David Kleinman	Professor Andrew Spence
Ms Marilyn Booth	Professor Jim Lai	Professor Scott Thomas
Professor Aziza Chaouni	Dr. Linda McGillis Hall	Ms Caitlin Tillman
Mr. Yuan Chung	Dr. Don McLean	Professor Nhung Tuyet Tran
Professor Gary Crawford	Ms Michelle Mitrovich	Professor Sandy Welsh
Ms Sara Dolcetti	Dr. Gary P. Mooney	Professor Joseph Wong
Ms Hanan Domloge	Professor Mayo Moran	
Professor David Dubins	Professor Emmanuel Nikiema	

Non-voting Assessors:

Professor Angela Hildyard, Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity
 Professor Deep Saini, Vice-President and Principal, University of Toronto Mississauga

Professor Edith Hillan, Vice-Provost, Faculty and Academic Life
 Ms Gail Milgrom, Director, Campus and Facilities Planning

Secretariat:

Ms Mae-Yu Tan

In Attendance:

Professor Steven Thorpe, Member of the Governing Council
 Mr. Chirag Variawa, Former Member of the Governing Council
 Dr. Brenda Andrews, Director, Donnelly Centre for Cellular and Biomolecular Research
 Mr. Lincoln De Freitas, Transitional Year Programme (TYP) alumnus

Ms Susan Froom, President, Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students
 Mr. Tony Gray, Director, Strategic Initiatives and Research, Office of the President
 Dr. Jane Harrison, Director, Academic Programs and Policy, Office of the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs
 Mr. Gerald McBride, TYP Alumnus

Ms Agnes So, Vice-President, University Affairs, University of Toronto Students' Union
 Ms Archana Sridhar, Assistant Provost
 Professor Emeritus Ron Venter, Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering

Chair's Remarks

The Chair welcomed members. She reported that fourteen teaching staff and one librarian had been acclaimed to the Academic Board for a three-year term effective July 1, 2014, and two vacant seats remained.¹ Nominations would be accepted for one one-year teaching staff seat for a Faculty of Arts and Science representative and one three-year teaching staff seat for a Faculty of Medicine representative. Members were asked to contact the Secretary for further information.

The Chair thanked both incoming and continuing members for their contributions, as well as everyone who helped to raise awareness of the work of the Academic Board. Information about applications for co-opted (appointed) members of the Academic Board, including administrative staff, alumni, and students, would be made available in March.

The Chair said that she had received and granted two speaking requests on agenda Item 4, the Project Planning Report for the Centre for Engineering Innovation and Entrepreneurship. Following discussion of that item by Board members, the Chair would invite Ms Susan Froom, President of the Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students, and Ms Agnes So, Vice-President, University Affairs, University of Toronto Students' Union, to speak.

1. Remarks from the President

The President expressed his appreciation for having been given the opportunity to address the Academic Board. He thanked the Chair, Vice-Chair, and Board members for their dedication to the University, noting that much of the University's success was due in part to bodies such as the Academic Board.

¹ A list of the acclaimed seats is attached to the Report.

1. Remarks from the President (cont'd)

Themes from the President's Installation Address

The President commented that nearly three months had passed since his installation. Based on the very positive response to his Address, there appeared to be strong consensus on the priorities that he had identified, which included a continued focus on research and teaching excellence, access to education, and outreach to surrounding communities. Ongoing challenges facing the University included increasingly scarce public funding; greater pressure to produce “job-ready” graduates; and challenges to the University’s status resulting in part from greater dissemination of knowledge through online tools.

The President referred to the three strategies he had proposed to meet the challenges: 1) leveraging more fully the University’s location; 2) strengthening international partnerships; and 3) re-examining or re-inventing undergraduate education. The President observed that the University could point to many successful examples of its community partnerships, and faculty and students continued to play a leadership role in building on the University’s tradition of outreach and debate. With respect to undergraduate education, the President noted that the University was under continuing pressure to demonstrate how the education it provided prepared its graduates for a life of success and fulfillment. He observed that the education offered by the University guided students in developing core competencies such as critical thinking, ethical awareness, leadership skills, and resilience that would serve them well throughout their lives.

The President reported on several steps he had taken since assuming office in strengthening international relationships. He had presided at the University’s Asia-Pacific graduation ceremony in Hong Kong, which had been a great success. During that trip, he had visited with key partner institutions and government agencies in Beijing and Hong Kong. A visit to the University by a delegation from Technion-Israel Institute of Technology had provided an opportunity for the University to showcase its talent. Strengthened relationships with Technion and other institutions of commensurate quality, such as the University of São Paulo (with whom the University had recently hosted a joint conference) would be of great benefit. The ground for such valuable partnerships had already been prepared by the University’s faculty, who continued to collaborate with their peers at other institutions in growing numbers.

Role of the Academic Board

The President spoke of the evolution of the University’s governance system and the development of the Academic Board, which had been foreshadowed by President Emeritus Claude Bissell. The President pointed to the important role of the Board in considering the University’s operating budget, capital projects, strategic plans, and other matters not typically presented to university senates. The fundamental role of the Board within the University had grown intentionally, and the Board was well-positioned to provide critical input through debate and decision-making.

1. **Remarks from the President** (cont'd)

Among the matters that arose during the Board's discussion were the following.

a) Board Deliberations

A member expressed agreement with the President's statement that the Academic Board should be a forum for discussion of key University issues. He commented that, in his experience, there had been relatively little discussion at the Board level, and he hoped that greater discourse would be promoted in the future. The President replied that efforts had been made to encourage members to participate actively during Board meetings. The Chair added that, while it might be difficult to engage fully in discussions in a body of such a large size, members could perhaps participate more freely during smaller group sessions, such as the upcoming session on the budget, and during meetings of the Board's standing committees. A member reiterated that committee discussions of proposals were meaningful, and he encouraged members to serve on those committees.

b) International Student Support

A member spoke of challenges in facilitating admission of some international students, and he pointed to one category of students who received full funding from their respective governments. The President said that he understood the challenge of admitting greater numbers of international graduate students, particularly those entering doctoral stream masters or doctoral programs. He noted that, because there was no provision of support for such students by the Ontario Government, the University bore the full cost. Advocacy on this matter had been ongoing for some time and current discussions about the Strategic Mandate Agreement had provided an opportunity for the University to highlight this issue. With the University's position as a leading institution in Canada and in the world, it could draw on its strengths in offering advanced research education.

The President said that steps had been taken by the School of Graduate Studies (SGS), together with divisional leaders, to make it easier to accept international candidates who were academically qualified and who had their own funding. Professor Brian Corman, Dean of the SGS, added that extensive discussions had occurred with divisions about this matter. The role of the SGS was to examine applicants' academic records to ensure they met the requirements set out by the academic units, but graduate admission decisions were made by the divisions themselves.

c) University Access

In response to a member's request to comment on access, the President said that access was one of the University's core values. Alongside its status as a research powerhouse, the University was also a public, open, accessible institution with over 80,000 students on three campuses. In comparison to other international peer institutions, the University was remarkably affordable, and staff worked hard to make it even more so through the access guarantee which stated that "No student offered admission to a program at the University of Toronto should be unable to

1. Remarks from the President (cont'd)

enter or complete the program due to lack of financial means".² The University's access guarantee differentiated it from other institutions, and close to \$150 million per year was allocated to student aid. In addition to the provision of close to \$150 million in financial aid, the University also offered specific access programs, such as the Transitional Year Programme (TYP).

d) Job-Readiness of Undergraduate Students

A member commented that many community colleges had implemented one- to two-year programs for University graduates, and he asked whether the President thought the University would need to compete in such a marketplace. The President replied that the role of the University was to educate students for a lifetime of success, providing them with a broad foundation that would prepare them for a range of options, including graduate studies, scholarly pursuits, or employment after graduation. The University needed to ensure that all of its undergraduate programs addressed those competencies. To that end, the Faculty of Arts and Science had systematically examined the competencies of each of its programs. The President said that it was also crucial that the University's students were aware of the competencies that they were acquiring from their education so that they would be able to articulate them and demonstrate the full breadth of what they had learned. The President expressed his optimism that the University would be able to address that challenge.

The Chair thanked the President for his remarks to the Board.

2. Report of the Vice-President and Provost

Professor Regehr said that the University used a wide range of indicators to assess its performance. One set of indicators involved surveys of students, alumni, staff and faculty on dimensions of satisfaction. Recently the University had completed the COACHE (The Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education) Faculty Satisfaction Survey.³ Among the key points of the survey presented by Professor Regehr were the following.

- In 2013, the University had received many awards and recognition as a top employer in Canada. The COACHE Survey results also demonstrated a high level of satisfaction among the University's faculty.
- In 2012, both tenured and pre-tenure faculty of the University had participated in the COACHE Survey, based at the Harvard Graduate School of Education, with an overall response rate of 47%. Through COACHE, comparative data had been obtained that enabled the University to rank its results against five peer institutions selected by the University.

² *Policy on Student Financial Support* (1998):

<http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/AssetFactory.aspx?did=4833>

³ A copy of the presentation slides is attached to the Report.

2. Report of the Vice-President and Provost (cont'd)

- The University had scored well, including in comparison with its peers, on measures of overall satisfaction, autonomy (influence over research, scholarly work, and teaching), department culture, quality of colleagues, compensation and benefits.
- University facilities, work resources, and communication from divisional and central leadership had been identified as areas requiring improvement.
- In the coming weeks and months, the results would be shared with the University community. The survey results would allow for comparisons among divisions, and that data would also be made available to them. Other future steps included improving communications by University leadership, enhancing faculty members' access to resources, and addressing levels of satisfaction at the associate professor level.

A member commented that some of the survey results, such as the desire for greater communication with senior administration, could likely be attributed to structural factors such as the size of the University. The President said that great efforts had been and would continue to be made to improve communication throughout the University.

A member asked for comment on faculty members' satisfaction with benefits, the pension deficit, and the planned pooling of Ontario pension funds. Professor Regehr said that the University would continue to work hard to address challenges presented by the pension deficit. The President added that the survey results reflected faculty members' confidence that the University was on track to resolving issues within its control. During upcoming budget discussions, members would be provided with information about existing and possible new measures that were being considered to address the pension deficit.

The Chair thanked Professor Regehr for her presentation.

3. Disestablishment of the Banting and Best Department of Medical Research

The Chair said that the Academic Board was responsible for considering both the establishment and disestablishment of academic units. The proposal for the disestablishment of the Banting and Best Department of Medical Research (BBDMR) had been considered by the Planning and Budget Committee (P&B) at its meeting on January 15, 2014. If recommended by the Board, it would be forwarded to the Governing Council for its consideration and approval on February 27, 2014.

Professor Cowper introduced the proposal. She informed the Board that the BBDMR was a long-standing research unit that did not offer academic programs. Its closure had been recommended by two external reviews and had been the subject of extended discussion and consultation. With the establishment of the Donnelly Centre for Cellular and Biomolecular Research in 2006 there had been an extension of the work conducted within the BBDMR. Over the past three years, all operating funds, endowed funding, research chairs and research grants associated with the

3. **Disestablishment of the Banting and Best Department of Medical Research** (cont'd)

BBDMR had been transferred to the Donnelly Centre. Professor Cowper then summarized the comments on the proposal that had been made at the P&B meeting.⁴

A member asked about the effect of the closure of the BBDMR on faculty appointments, particularly if the Donnelly Centre were disestablished at some point. Professor Regeher explained that every proposal for the establishment or disestablishment of an academic unit underwent extensive study and consultation. It was the University's practice to carefully consider issues such as implications for faculty with respect to such proposals. Dr. Brenda Andrews, Director of the Donnelly Centre, noted that the BBDMR was unusual in its status as a purely research-focused unit within the University. With the transfer of the diabetes research centre to the Donnelly Centre, it was now appropriate to close the BBDMR.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

It Was Recommended to the Governing Council

THAT the proposal to disestablish the Banting and Best Department of Medical Research, dated September 12, 2013, be approved, effective July 1, 2014.

4. **Capital Project: Project Planning Report for the Centre for Engineering Innovation and Entrepreneurship**

The Chair reminded members that, under the *Policy on Capital Planning and Capital Projects*, the Academic Board considered capital projects with a total project cost of \$3-million and above. Projects with a total cost between \$3- and \$10-million were normally placed on the Board's consent agenda and required Executive Committee confirmation, following approval by the Board. Projects with a total cost above \$10-million, such as the proposal for the Centre for Engineering Innovation and Entrepreneurship, were considered by the Board for recommendation to the Governing Council. The project scope would be considered in open session, and the project cost and funding would be discussed by the Board *in camera* at a later point in the meeting.

Professor Cowper introduced the proposal for the Centre to be located on 47- 55 St. George Street. The Engineering building would include teaching facilities, design studios, administrative offices, a 500-seat classroom, and student club space. As part of the project, one level of underground parking would also be created. In order to accommodate the planned construction, the TYP would be relocated to 123 St. George Street. Professor Cowper then outlined the discussion about the proposal that had occurred at the P&B meeting.

Professor Cristina Amon, Dean of the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering (FASE) noted that there had been significant growth within the Faculty, both at the undergraduate and graduate level, over the past few years. The proposed capital project would create a much-needed facility. Mr. Mauricio Curbelo, President of the Engineering Society, advised the Board that the FASE

⁴<http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/Assets/Governing+Council+Digital+Assets/Boards+and+Committees/Planning+and+Budget+Committee/2013-2014+Academic+Year/r0115.pdf>

4. Capital Project: Project Planning Report for the Centre for Engineering Innovation and Entrepreneurship (cont'd)

students had been very excited to learn of the new facility and were pleased to have been able to contribute \$1-million to the project cost.

Representatives of the Association of Part-Time Undergraduate Students, the TYP, and the University of Toronto Students' Union expressed support for the FASE students, but called for further consideration of the planned relocation of TYP. Noting that the University's development plan included the Huron/Sussex corridor, it was suggested that TYP might be relocated to one of the houses identified for redevelopment. Requests for a task force to further examine the matter of space allocation and to consider increased funding and faculty for TYP were reiterated, with each of the speakers noting the unique and valuable qualities of the TYP program and its community.

A member expressed concern over past decreases to the TYP's budget and said he hoped in the future that TYP would be able to achieve its former size. The member noted that the TYP had been designed to aid students from marginalized communities, and he pointed to differences between the TYP and the Millie Rotman Shime Academic Bridging Program at Woodsworth College.

Professor Regehr outlined the University's suite of access programs which included, in addition to the TYP and the Bridging program, the University of Toronto Scarborough Green Path pre-admission program for international students, outreach programs through the First Nations House, mentoring programs for students who were the first in their family to attend university, facilitated pathways for students from Seneca College entering Woodsworth College, and programs offered by the Faculties of Applied Science and Engineering, Law, and Medicine. Each of the unique programs required a different set of resources. In considering resource allocation, it was important to differentiate between a physical move necessitated by a building project (as in the case of the proposed CEIE) and resources required for the operation of access programs such as the TYP.

Professor Mabury advised the Board that the TYP had 400 net assignable square metres (nasms) at its current location of 49 St. George Street. Initially, the TYP had been allocated 198 nasms at 123 St. George Street based on standard space requirements outlined by the Council of Ontario Universities, together with additional allowances for TYP students, computing, and commuter space. Following feedback from the TYP community, an extra 50 nasm had been added for a second kitchenette and a lounge, resulting in a total of 248 nasms. Professor Mabury then outlined the responses he had provided in writing to a member who had raised questions about the thermal energy intensity for University buildings and electrical supply.

A member asked whether a discussion about the TYP move should have occurred within governance, separate from the discussion of the proposed CEIE. Professor Regehr explained that the TYP move was not a governance matter, and that it was common for discussions of physical space to occur outside of governance, often arising from the secondary effect of a capital project. The TYP's operating budget remained unaffected by the move of its physical location. In addition, there were a number of resources at Woodsworth College that would be of benefit to the TYP community, including opportunities for access to student support services.

4. Capital Project: Project Planning Report for the Centre for Engineering Innovation and Entrepreneurship (cont'd)

Professor Regehr said that meetings were planned to discuss support needed for the University's access programs.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

It Was Recommended to the Governing Council

1. THAT the Report of the Project Planning Committee for the Centre for Engineering Innovation and Entrepreneurship (CEIE), dated November 22, 2013, be approved in principle;
2. THAT the project scope totalling 7,513 nasm (15,026 gsm) for the CEIE space program, to be located on Site 10 (47- 55 St. George Street – Simcoe Hall Parking Lot), be approved in principle, to be funded by the Capital Campaign, the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering, Provost's Central Funds and borrowing; and
3. That the project scope of a single level of underground parking (2,900 gsm) to be located on Site 10 (47- 55 St. George Street – Simcoe Hall Parking Lot) be approved in principle, to be funded by Central Funds and the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering.

CONSENT AGENDA

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the consent agenda be adopted.

5. [Capital Project: Project Planning Report for the University of Toronto Mississauga Biology Greenhouse](#)

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

Your Board Approved

THAT, subject to confirmation by the Executive Committee

1. THAT the Project Planning Committee Report for the Biology Greenhouse at the University of Toronto Mississauga (UTM), dated October 31, 2013, be approved in principle; and
2. THAT the project scope to accommodate construction of the Biology Greenhouse at UTM comprising 134 nasm of a green house space and 143 nasm of header house space, be approved in principle, to be funded from Capital Reserves derived from the UTM Operating Budget.

6. Capital Project: Project Planning Report for the University of Toronto Mississauga Phase 4 of the Renovation of Biology Undergraduate Teaching Laboratories

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

Your Board Approved

THAT, subject to confirmation by the Executive Committee

1. THAT the Project Planning Committee Report for the Renovation of Biology Undergraduate Teaching Laboratories at the University of Toronto Mississauga (UTM), dated November 1, 2013, be approved in principle; and
2. THAT the total project scope of approximately 598 gross square meters (approximately 598 nasm), be approved in principle, to be fully funded from Capital Reserves derived from the UTM Operating Budget.

7. Approval of the Report of the Previous Meeting: Report Number 188 – November 21, 2013

Report Number 188 of the meeting held on November 21, 2013 was approved.

8. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting

There was no business arising from Report Number 188.

9. Items for Information

The following items for information were received by the Board.

- (a) Report Number 196 of the Agenda Committee – December 17, 2013
- (b) Report Number 197 of the Agenda Committee – January 21, 2014
- (d) Report Number 158 of the Planning and Budget Committee – January 15, 2014
- (e) Report Number 2 of the University of Toronto Mississauga Campus Council – December 9, 2013

10. Date of the Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Board was scheduled for Thursday, March 20, 2014, 4:10 – 6:00 p.m., in the Council Chamber.

11. Other Business

A member expressed concern that no resolution had been made with respect to the request for the creation of a task force to examine TYP matters. The Chair explained that Professor Regehr had committed to continuing discussions on access programs.

The Board moved *in camera*.

12. Capital Project: Project Planning Report for the Centre of Engineering Innovation and Entrepreneurship – Sources of Funding and Total Project Cost

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDED

THAT the recommendation regarding the proposed Centre of Engineering Innovation and Entrepreneurship contained in the memorandum from Professor Scott Mabury, Vice-President, University Operations, dated December 10, 2013, be approved.

IN CAMERA CONSENT AGENDA

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the *in camera* consent agenda be adopted.

13. Capital Project: Project Planning Report for the University of Toronto Mississauga Biology Greenhouse - Sources of Funding and Total Project Cost

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT, subject to confirmation by the Executive Committee

THAT the recommendation regarding the proposed University of Toronto Mississauga Biology Greenhouse contained in the memorandum from Professor Scott Mabury, Vice-President, University Operations, dated December 2, 2013, be approved.

14. Capital Project: Project Planning Report for the University of Toronto Mississauga Phase 4 of the Renovation of Biology Undergraduate Teaching Laboratories – Sources of Funding and Total Project Cost

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT, subject to confirmation by the Executive Committee

THAT the recommendation regarding the proposed renovation of the University of Toronto Mississauga Biology Undergraduate Teaching Laboratories contained in the memorandum from Professor Scott Mabury, Vice-President, University Operations, dated December 2, 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 6:00 p.m.

Secretary
February 3, 2014

Chair