

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO  
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL  
**REPORT NUMBER 148 OF**  
**THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD**

**June 2, 2008**

To the Governing Council,  
University of Toronto.

Your Board reports that it met on Monday, June 2, 2008 at 4:30 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, with the following members present:

Dr. Claude Davis, In the Chair  
Ms B. Elizabeth Vosburgh, Vice-Chair  
Professor Jonathan Freedman, Vice-Provost,  
Student Life  
Ms Anne E. MacDonald,  
Director, Ancillary Services  
Ms Diana A.R. Alli  
Dr. Louise Cowin  
Miss Saswati Deb  
Dr. Shari Graham Fell  
Ms Kaila Folinsbee  
Mr. Richard Hydal  
Professor Bruce Kidd  
Mr. Chris McGrath  
Mr. Alexandru Rascanu  
Mr. Tim Reid  
Dr. Sarita Verma

Non-Voting Assessors:

Professor Tony Chambers, Associate Vice-  
Provost, Students  
Mr. Louis R. Charpentier, Secretary of the  
Governing Council  
Mr. Jim Delaney, Director, Office of the Vice-  
Provost, Students  
Ms Lucy Fromowitz, Assistant Vice-President,  
Student Life  
Mr. Mark Overton, Dean of Student Affairs,  
University of Toronto at Mississauga  
(UTM)

Secretariat:

Mr. Henry Mulhall (Secretary)

Regrets:

Professor Varouj Aivazian  
Mr. Arya Ghadimi  
Mr. Robin Goodfellow  
Professor William Gough  
Ms Rebecca Spagnolo  
Ms Tian Tian  
Ms Estefania Toledo  
Mr. Jonathan Tsao

**REPORT NUMBER 148 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – June 2, 2008**

In Attendance:

Mr. Ken Davy, Member of the Governing Council  
 Ms Aisling Burke, Office of the Vice-Provost, Students  
 Mr. Arsalan Faizi, Part-time Undergraduate Student, UTM  
 Ms Nora Gillespie, Legal Counsel, Office of the Vice-President and Provost; Office of the Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity  
 Mr. Vlad Glebov, President, Erindale Part-time Undergraduate Students (EPUS)  
 Dr. Anthony Gray, Special Advisor to the President  
 Mr. Ahmad Khan, Part-time Undergraduate Student, UTM  
 Mr. Matthew Lafond, Committee Secretary, Office of the Governing Council  
 Ms Helen Lasthiothakis, Director, Policy and Planning, Office of the Vice-President and Provost  
 Mr. Jeff Peters, Executive Member, Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students (APUS)  
 Ms Mae-Yu Tan, Assistant Secretary of the Governing Council  
 Mr. Kyle Winters, Executive Director, University Advancement Partnerships

ITEM 3 (B) CONTAINS A RECOMMENDATION FOR GOVERNING COUNCIL APPROVAL.  
 ALL OTHER ITEMS ARE REPORTED FOR INFORMATION.

**1. Report of the Previous Meeting**

Report Number 147 (April 29, 2008) was approved.

**2. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting**

There was no business arising from the Report of the previous meeting.

**3. Compulsory Non-Academic Incidental Fees: Student Society Fees**

**(a) University of Toronto at Mississauga Part-time Student Societies: Fees**

Professor Freedman read a statement that provided context for the item under consideration. He reminded members that, in advance of the April 29, 2008 meeting of the University Affairs Board, the University administration had requested that consideration of the item related to student society fees and representation of part-time UTM students be deferred. The request from the Erindale College Student Union (operating as the University of Toronto at Mississauga Students' Union, UTMSU) and the Erindale Part-time Undergraduate Students (EPUS) had included a realignment of student society fees and formal representation to the Governing Council of part-time undergraduate students.

The Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students (APUS) had written to the administration on April 28, 2008 in order to request that the matter be deferred because APUS was intending to initiate legal proceedings against UTMSU and EPUS regarding the process used to support the request to the administration for this realignment of fees and representation. The administration had agreed to request deferral of the matter in order to provide APUS, UTMSU, and EPUS an opportunity to consider and resolve this matter amongst themselves. However, the administration had also advised APUS that it intended to ask the Board to consider this matter on June 2, 2008 unless there were compelling reasons to do otherwise.

The administration had been advised by APUS that their court application against UTMSU and EPUS was scheduled to be heard on June 27, 2008. APUS had also provided a copy of its court application to

**REPORT NUMBER 148 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – June 2, 2008****3. Compulsory Non-Academic Incidental Fees: Student Society Fees (cont'd)****(a) University of Toronto at Mississauga Part-time Student Societies: Fees (cont'd)**

the administration. The administration had reviewed the matter and had concluded that it did not believe there was any compelling reason to further defer consideration of the request from UTMSU and EPUS.

On May 27, 2008 the University had been served with notice that APUS was initiating an application seeking an interlocutory injunction prohibiting consideration of this matter at the June 2, 2008 meeting of the Board and otherwise preventing implementation of any approval of the proposed resolutions on this matter, pending the court's consideration of APUS' main application against UTMSU and EPUS to be heard on June 27, 2008. APUS had also sought an injunction against UTMSU and EPUS requiring them to withdraw their request to the University until the court had adjudicated on the main application.

Professor Freedman stated that, given that the June 2, 2008 meeting was the final meeting of the Board for the governance year, the administration believed that it was important to proceed with consideration of the matter at that time by the full Board instead of under Summer Executive Authority. It was important to note that: (a) any approved fee changes would not be effective until the fall 2008 session; (b) such changes would not be implemented until July, 2008 as part of the normal fees assessment process; and, (c) the first installment of student society fees was not paid to the societies until mid-September. In addition, the administration had no reason to believe that the result of the referendum held among part-time undergraduates at UTM had not been a valid articulation of students' views on this matter.

Accordingly, the administration believed that it was appropriate to proceed to consider the advice of these students in support of the request from UTMSU and EPUS. The University would, of course, respect any decision of the court on the issue. The administration had assured APUS and would assure the court, if necessary, that in the event that approval was granted by the Board, the administration would delay implementation as long as possible. Further, the University had also assured APUS that should implementation proceed prior to the determination of the June 27, 2008 application, and the court subsequently found that the process leading up to the request had been defective and the change should not have occurred, the University would remit the fees which ordinarily would have been collected for APUS and EPUS to those bodies instead of UTMSU. With respect to the question of representation, if the request of UTMSU and EPUS was approved by the Board and subsequently the court found that the process leading up to the request had been defective and the change should not have occurred, the University would take steps to reinstate APUS as the representative student committee for the students in question.

Professor Freedman noted that, on the basis of these two assurances, APUS had abandoned its application to the court for an injunction against the University. He concluded by stating that the University administration believed it was important for this matter to proceed to be considered by the full Board as a matter of significance that it had been asked to consider by recognized student societies following a democratic process. Considering the assurances that had been provided regarding respecting the outcome of court proceedings initiated by APUS, and taking into account the practical considerations of the relevant business processes related to fee approval, implementation and fees assessment, the administration believed it was appropriate to proceed to consider the matter at the June 2, 2008 meeting.

The Chair invited Mr. Vlad Glebov, President of EPUS, to address the Board. He stated that his involvement with this issue had arisen when he had realized that part-time students at UTM did not receive equal services or comparable advocacy from their student society as did full-time UTM students. When he had become President of EPUS, he had received numerous complaints about the lack of

**3. Compulsory Non-Academic Incidental Fees: Student Society Fees (cont'd)**

**REPORT NUMBER 148 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – June 2, 2008****(a) University of Toronto at Mississauga Part-time Student Societies: Fees (cont'd)**

advocacy and services for part-time students, especially from users of the Child Care Facility, and so had raised these issues at meetings of the Class Representative Structure. That body had considered, but eventually not supported, a proposal from APUS to fold EPUS into APUS. It had then decided to hold a referendum to seek support to fold EPUS into UTMSU. To ensure that a fair and democratic referendum occurred, it had sought and received logistical support from UTMSU. The referendum had been held following best practises that included: equal opportunity for the Yes and No sides to register, the provision of Chief Returning Officers, advertisements in the *Medium* for a full month, extensive posterage across the UTM campus, emails sent to every part-time UTM student regarding the referendum, speeches about the referendum in classes, the provision of extended voting hours to accommodate the needs of part-time students, and the allocation of additional voting time to compensate for inclement weather. The Yes side had officially registered. Though those opposed to the proposal had expressed their views at the Representative Class Structure, they had chosen not to register. APUS had been made aware of the referendum by means of email messages and telephone calls. The result of the referendum was that part-time students had overwhelmingly supported the proposal, and Mr. Glebov urged the Board to vote in favour of the motions under consideration.<sup>1</sup>

The Chair invited Mr. Arsalan Faizi, a part-time student at UTM, to address the Board. He urged the Board to support the motion because part-time students at UTM had overwhelmingly voted to join UTMSU. He had done so as a result of his dissatisfaction with the lack of presence and services provided by APUS on the UTM campus. During the previous year he had sought assistance to receive coverage through the health and dental plan, and had discovered that APUS had no physical presence on campus, and that there was no full-time counselor to assist students to receive such coverage. Most part-time UTM students had not heard of APUS, and APUS organized few events or campaigns that involved UTM students or their issues. In contrast, UTMSU was attempting to provide services to part-time UTM students, though it was not required to do so. For example, it intended to hold a referendum to allow part-time students to receive UPASS transit passes that were already available to full-time students. He noted that UTM had grown rapidly in recent years, and now had a wide range of facilities such as a student centre, career centre, and athletics and recreation centre. What it lacked was a strong student society to represent part-time students, and he urged the Board to support the motion that would overcome that deficiency.

The Chair invited Mr. Ahmad Khan, a part-time student at UTM, to address the Board. He stated that the item before the Board reflected the outcome of the referendum at UTM which had been supported by a 95% majority of students voting. Part-time students at UTM wanted to be represented by UTMSU because there was a 'disconnect' between APUS and the part-time student body. APUS had a minimal presence and no office on the UTM campus, and provided few services or information about those services to the students it represented. There was no access to discounted photocopying or printing, discounted Metropasses, or UPASS transit passes. APUS had provided no support in the recent campaign to establish a child care facility, despite the fact that most of the patrons of the new facility would be part-time students. EPUS had been largely inactive for the previous two years due to a lack of funds to hire staff and provide services. In contrast, UTMSU had advocated for the child care facility and was working to extend access to UPASS transit passes to part-time students. It had recently appointed a Vice-President, Part-time Issues, and was committed to equal representation for part-time students. The part-

**3. Compulsory Non-Academic Incidental Fees: Student Society Fees (cont'd)**


---

<sup>1</sup> Secretary's Note: Each of the guest speakers made reference to the referendum results which were as follows: approximately 752 part-time students were eligible to vote in the referendum. Of these, 55 voted Yes, 2 voted No, and 1 abstained.

**REPORT NUMBER 148 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – June 2, 2008****(a) University of Toronto at Mississauga Part-time Student Societies: Fees (cont'd)**

time student body wanted and needed to be represented by UTMSU, and it had been its elected representatives (EPUS) that had called for the referendum to seek support to fold EPUS into APUS.

The Chair invited Mr. Jeff Peters, Executive Member of APUS, to address the Board. He stated that the UTM referendum had been undemocratic, and had been conducted without formal notice having been given to APUS. A key feature of democracy was that those on both sides of an issue were to be given an opportunity to express their positions. However, this had not occurred because there had not been an officially registered No campaign in the referendum. APUS had repeatedly but unsuccessfully tried to contact the President of EPUS in order to ensure that services were provided to part-time students at UTM. APUS did not have a presence at UTM because it did not want to interfere with the work of EPUS. It had brought to EPUS' attention its concerns that the EPSU office had not been open for much of the previous year, and that students had not had adequate access to information about the services available to them. APUS had offered to provide staff for the EPUS office, but the offer had been rejected. The President of EPUS had not attended APUS Board meetings, and there had been no engagement between APUS and EPUS to settle their differences in a professional and respectful manner. Mr. Peters urged the Board to encourage the two organizations to engage in such discussions. It was being alleged that a majority of part-time students had supported the proposed changes contained in the referendum question, when in fact only 57 of nearly 1,000 part-time students on the campus had voted to do so. APUS maintained that EPUS had no authority to conduct a referendum to withdraw APUS members from APUS. APUS had represented part-time students on all three campuses for forty years, and the referendum was a violation of its student union rights to be the sole representative of its own membership. After a year of unsuccessful attempts to engage EPUS in discussions, APUS had had no other option except to launch a legal action. Mr. Peters urged the Board not to approve the motions before it, but rather to defer their consideration until a proper democratic process had taken place at UTM.

A member stated that similar concerns about inadequate representation and provision of services by APUS had been raised at UTSC. On that campus, the Scarborough Campus Students' Union (SCSU) provided representation and services to part-time students despite the fact that APUS received the fee revenue collected from those students. The only service provided by APUS was the health and dental plan outlined in a brochure available in the UTSC health center. Now that part-time students at UTM had voiced similar concerns through a democratically conducted referendum, it was only fair that the Board respond to those concerns by supporting the motions before it. The voter turnout had been within the normal range of 5-10% for such processes in recent years. UTMSU had overwhelmingly supported the proposal at its Annual General Meeting, had created an executive position with responsibility for part-time issues, and had committed to the establishment of new director positions to represent part-time students. In addition, QSS (Quality Service to Students), a body consisting of staff, faculty and students had also reviewed and supported the proposal to realign the UTM part-time students' representation and fees. The member urged that the Board similarly to support the proposal.

Professor Freedman reiterated that the University would respect any subsequent ruling made by the courts if such should occur. However, in the meantime it was appropriate that the Board consider the recommendation before it that had arisen as a result of the expressed desire of part-time students at UTM to realign their representation.

**3. Compulsory Non-Academic Incidental Fees: Student Society Fees (cont'd)****(a) University of Toronto at Mississauga Part-time Student Societies: Fees (cont'd)**

**REPORT NUMBER 148 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – June 2, 2008**

On the recommendation of the Vice-Provost, Student Life,

## YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT all fees currently charged to University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM) students on behalf of Erindale Part-time Undergraduate Students (EPUS) be discontinued, and by virtue of this change, that EPUS no longer be recognized as a student society of the University of Toronto;

THAT all fees currently charged to UTM students on behalf of the Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students (APUS) be discontinued; and

THAT a new fee of \$80.51 be established and charged on behalf of the Erindale College Students' Union (currently operating as the UTM Students' Union; UTMSU) to UTM part-time undergraduate students including designated portions for the Society (\$12.65), an Accident and Prescription Drug insurance plan (\$28.80, including provincial sales tax), a Dental Plan (\$27.45, including provincial sales tax), the Ontario Public Interest Research Group (\$0.50 in fall and winter, \$1.00 in summer), the Canadian Federation of Students (CFS) and CFS-Ontario (\$3.31), and the UTM Student Centre (\$7.80).

**(b) University of Toronto at Mississauga Students' Union: Recognition as a Representative Student Committee**

On the recommendation of the Vice-Provost, Student Life,

## YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the Governing Council cease its recognition of the Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students (APUS) as the Representative Student Committee of part-time undergraduate students registered at the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM); and

THAT the Erindale College Students' Union (currently operating as the University of Toronto at Mississauga Students' Union, UTMSU) be recognized as the Representative Student Committee and primary representative body of part-time undergraduate students registered at UTM.

Terms and conditions of the foregoing recommendation and approval:

1. That for the purposes of the *Memorandum of Agreement between the University of Toronto, the Students' Administrative Council, the Graduate Students' Union and the Association of Part-Time Undergraduate Students for a Long-Term Protocol on the Increase or Introduction of Compulsory Non-Tuition Related Fees* (the "Protocol"), the Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students shall continue to represent part-time undergraduate students registered at UTM until such time as a new or revised Protocol is approved; and
- 3. Compulsory Non-Academic Incidental Fees: Student Society Fees (cont'd)**
- (b) University of Toronto at Mississauga Students' Union: Recognition as a Representative Student Committee (cont'd)**

**REPORT NUMBER 148 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – June 2, 2008**

2. That the Erindale College Students' Union (currently operating as the UTMSU) will:
  - (a) undertake, in consultation with the Students' Administrative Council (currently operating as the UTSU), to address the formal representation of full-time undergraduate UTM students; and (b) will report to the administration the society's progress on addressing this matter no later than the spring of 2010.

Documentation is attached hereto as [Appendix "A"](#).

**4. Code of Conduct for Trademark Licensees: Annual Report**

The Chair noted that this was an annual accountability report, and that the Board's responsibility was to satisfy itself that there was appropriate compliance with the *Trademark Licensing Policy*. He introduced Mr. Kyle Winters, Executive Director, University Advancement Partnerships, who was responsible for the on-going administration of the Policy.

A member noted that the Report stated that the University sold products under the Jansport Brand produced in the PCCS Garment Factory in Cambodia, and that conditions in that factory met the conditions of the *Code of Conduct*. He asked how this could be the case given that workers in that factory earned \$0.32 per hour, and the Policy stated that the University's name, trademarks and images should appear only on high quality approved products produced under humane and non-exploitative conditions. Jansport had, on more than one occasion, closed factories when unions were organized. Other universities such as the University of California had discontinued the sale of Jansport products, and he asked if the University would review the issue and consider taking the same action. Mr. Winters responded that the wage was within the minimum legal standard required in Cambodia, and that this was a best in class factory. The Worker's Rights Consortium (WRC), the largest recognized monitoring organization in the world had been monitoring the factory since 2003. Its advice to the University and other universities had been that it would be counter-productive to cease dealing with Jansport on the grounds that it did not meet all the criteria of their codes of conduct. Rather, it advised that the University and other stakeholders collectively engage the company to bring about further changes to improve the lives of factory workers. He clarified that the University was working alongside local and international Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) and the WRC to this end. The ultimate goal of these groups, and one also shared by many student activists, was to see the implementation of living wages rather than merely minimum wages in these factories. This was becoming increasingly important in light of the ongoing global increase in food prices.

The member noted that the University of Guelph had a committee which worked to ensure that university-branded products were not produced under exploitative conditions, and whose membership included student organizations and anti-sweatshop organizations. He asked if it would be possible to establish a similar body at the University that would allow broader consultation and greater student input. Mr. Winters responded that the University was considered the leader on this issue in Canada, and that it had advised more than 20 Canadian universities, including Guelph, on the development of their codes of conduct. Guelph was a smaller university, and did not have a trademark licensing policy by which it collected fees from licensees. Canadian universities worked collaboratively together so as to make the most efficient use of the resources available to them. Though it did not have a formal representative committee, the University was always seeking input from stakeholder groups on these issues.

**4. Code of Conduct for Trademark Licensees: Annual Report (cont'd)**

A member asked if the University had a strategy with established targets so that it could track its progress over time on these issues? Mr. Winters responded that the University's greatest challenge was that of economies of scale. The branded products sold by all the Canadian universities combined were a small fraction of those sold by some of the single largest American institutions like Notre Dame. Independent

## REPORT NUMBER 148 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – June 2, 2008

action by the University would have little impact, and so its strategy would be to continue to work collaboratively with the WRC and the Fair Labour Association (FLA). These groups targeted specific companies where they hoped to have the greatest impact to improve the lives of workers. The member acknowledged that the issues were complex, but expressed concern that at some point it became unacceptable to use the rationale that it was better to continue to do business with offending companies in the hope that continued engagement might bring about positive change. Mr. Winters noted that he had seen evidence of the possible outcomes of these different approaches during his recent fact finding trip to Thailand and Cambodia. Some factories under investigation had closed down and the workers had lost their jobs; others like PCCS had made improvements and provided their workers with the minimum wage and a medical clinic.

A member asked what percentage of the University's profits was reinvested in developing countries. Mr. Winters responded that the licensing program did not make a profit, its revenue being offset by monitoring and administrative costs. A member asked for clarification that while the licensing program made no profit, the retail operation sold several million dollars worth of products each year. Mr. Winters confirmed that this was correct, and that the profit from the retail operation went to the U of T Book Store.

A member made a number of suggestions about the content of future reports to the Board. He thought it would be useful to include some case studies that would illustrate the complexity of the issues involved, and the dilemmas that were being faced by the University and other stakeholders in addressing them. Mr. Winters responded that it would be possible to include information from the bi-annual reports received by the University from monitoring organizations that detailed the specific investigations that were ongoing. Some of these would involve companies with which the University's licensees did business. The member added that it would also be helpful to receive information on the criteria used by the monitoring organizations to decide which of the thousands of possible factories it would target for investigation. The Chair concluded by agreeing that these were useful suggestions for future reports.

### 5. Recognized Campus Groups, 2007-08: Report #2

Professor Freedman stated that this was the second such report to be presented to the Board for information for the 2007-08 year. In response to a question, he confirmed that the total number of groups continued to grow. This was a positive development as there was general agreement that the groups added a richness to student and campus life outside the classroom. There was some difficulty, however, in determining the level of active participation of the nearly 120,000 individuals listed as members of the 417 campus groups. A member reported that efforts were made in the Faculty of Medicine to ensure that newly formed groups did not duplicate the activities of existing groups, and she asked if this occurred elsewhere. Ms Fromowitz responded that a single database was being developed to include all groups on the three campuses that would assist members to search for other groups and to develop affiliations and avoid duplication.

In response to a question, Mr. Delaney clarified that there were very few campus groups where students did not make up the large majority of the membership. The few exceptions had generally existed for many years, and were groups that enabled staff, faculty or alumni members to maintain a connection to campus life. Ms Fromowitz clarified that all recognized campus groups, including those that were identity or faith-

### 5. Recognized Campus Groups, 2007-08: Report #2 (cont'd)

based, were required to be open to all students, faculty or staff. In response to a question, Dr. Cowin noted that a number of the Hart House groups had existed since the establishment of the House in 1919. They engaged a large number of students at a high level, but were also open to all members of the University community. Hart House was planning to carry out a review of its programming in order to determine what groups remained that most relevant and worthy of support. A member asked if it was likely that more

**REPORT NUMBER 148 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – June 2, 2008**

groups would be allocated physical space in the near future. Ms Fromowitz responded that this was unlikely given that space was at such a premium, but that the planned Student Commons might assist in this regard. Mr. Overton confirmed that similar space constraints existed at UTM. Dr. Cowin noted that any group could book space free of charge at Hart House.

A member commented that this Report contained a wealth of information about the student experience outside the classroom that could be communicated and disseminated more effectively. In particular, he recommended its inclusion with additional analysis in the annual Performance Indicators Report, and its use in promotional materials distributed to prospective students in high schools. The Chair added his agreement, and recommended that future Reports also contain information about Hart House clubs and groups, in order to provide a more comprehensive description of co-curricular activities across the University's three campuses. Dr. Cowin noted that quantitative registration data was available for all Hart House clubs, and that exit surveys were also being introduced in order to develop qualitative data about the value of the experience provided by those clubs. Ms Fromowitz added that, in addition to the recognized campus groups and the Hart House groups, there were also hundreds of other clubs and groups which drew their membership from a single academic division, and were not included in the Report under consideration.

**6. Report of the Senior Assessor**

Professor Freedman stated that he had enjoyed serving as Senior Assessor to the Board for the 2007-08 governance year. The University Affairs Board was an important body that addressed significant and sometimes challenging issues in a thorough and serious manner.

**7. Date of the Next Meeting**

The Chair informed members that the first regular meeting of the Board for the 2008-09 governance year was tentatively scheduled for Tuesday, September 23, 2008 at 4:30 p.m.

**8. Other Business**

The Chair thanked the members of the Board, its assessors, the secretariat, and all members of the administration who had contributed to the work of the Board over the course of the previous year. He offered special thanks to those who were completing their term of service on the Board, including Professor Freedman who had served as its Senior Assessor. In addition, he thanked the very large number of staff, faculty, alumni, and especially students who had volunteered to serve on the Board for the upcoming year as co-opted members. The Striking Committee had been able to recommend only a small number for appointment to the Board, but had been impressed with the depth and quality of the pool of applications. There was no other business to transact in open session.

On a motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

The Board moved *in camera*.

***In Camera Session*****9. Elections Committee, Chair: Appointment**

On a motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

**REPORT NUMBER 148 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – June 2, 2008**

THAT Mr. Stephen Smith be re-appointed Chair of the Elections Committee for a one-year term from July 1, 2008 to June 30, 2009.

**10. Report of the Striking Committee**

**(a) Co-Opted Membership of the University Affairs Board for 2008-2009**

On a motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the following be appointed as co-opted members of the University Affairs Board for one-year terms from July 1, 2008 to June 30, 2009:

Ms Mariana Bockarov  
Mr. Reza Hajivandi  
Mr. Keith Ho  
Mr. Stephen Job  
Mr. Ben Liu  
Mr. Christopher McGrath  
Ms Fiorella Shields  
Mr. David Stiles

**(b) Discipline Appeals Board: Appointment of Members for 2008-2009**

On a motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the following be appointed to the Discipline Appeals Board for one-year terms from July 1, 2008 to June 30, 2009:

Mr. Ken Davy  
Miss Saswati Deb  
Professor Emeritus Sherwin Desser  
Mr. Alexandru Rascanu  
Ms Cheryl Shook  
Ms Tian Tian

On a motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

The Board returned to open session.

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

**REPORT NUMBER 148 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – June 2, 2008**

Secretary

Chair

June 8, 2008