

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL
REPORT NUMBER 110 OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD

January 24, 2002

To the Governing Council,
University of Toronto.

Your Board reports that it held a meeting on Thursday, January 24, 2002 at 4:15 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall. An attendance list is attached to this report. In this report, items 6 to 20 are recommended to Governing Council for approval, item 5 is presented for Executive Committee confirmation and the remaining items are reported for information.

The Board meeting began in closed session.

1. Report of the Striking Committee

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT Mr. Anas Hamoui, a graduate student from the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering, be appointed to the Academic Board for 2001-02, effective immediately.

The Board moved to open session.

2. Add to the Agenda

The Chair asked for two items to be added to the agenda. The first was the Report on Academic Discipline Cases which he proposed to add to the list of for information items. The second was a proposal for an allocation from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund to purchase a number of properties around 155 College Street, the Toronto District School Board building. This item would be considered after the updated Capital Plan. There were no objections to proceeding in this manner.

3. Report of the Previous Meeting

The report of the previous meeting, dated November 15, 2001, was approved.

4. Report Number 96 of the Agenda Committee

The report was received for information.

5. School of Graduate Studies: Master of Nursing Program - Reconfiguration
(arising from Report Number 91 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs and Report Number 76 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Gallop noted that there were two parts to this proposal. The first concerned revisions to the Master of Nursing (MN) curriculum to provide greater focus and to streamline the program. Areas of focus within the field of "Clinical Nursing" had been defined, required clinical courses had been reconfigured, the number of elective courses had been reduced, and

5. School of Graduate Studies: Master of Nursing Program - Reconfiguration (cont'd)

the overall number of course requirements has been reduced from 12 to 9 courses. The second part concerned the conversion of the Acute Care Nurse Practitioner (ACNP) field of study to an e-learning format. This would be the first ACNP program in Canada to be offered in this way. It had been designed to be completed over 16 months of full-time study or 27 months of part-time study, and included three required periods of residency at the University of Toronto of 7-14 days each.

Professor Gotlieb reported that any budget implications for the proposed changes would be funded from revenues received from enrolment expansion in the Faculty of Nursing.

In response to a member's questions on accessibility, Professor Wells said that the tuition fees for this program were deregulated. Professor Gallop said that the building was not currently fully accessible but there were plans to install an elevator in the near future.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

The proposal for revisions to the curriculum of the Master of Nursing Program, including converting the Acute Care Nurse Practitioner field of study to an e-learning format, as described in the submission from the School of Graduate Studies dated October 19, 2001, be approved, effective September 2002.

Documentation is attached hereto as Appendix "A".

6. Capital Plan, Update December 2001
(arising from Report Number 76 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Gotlieb reported that with the increased capital activity over the past year, the Committee was pleased to see the updated Capital Plan, as well as a revised format that provided qualitative information.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the report entitled "December 2001 - Capital Plan for Buildings and Projects in Excess of \$2 million", a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "B", be approved in principle.

7. University Infrastructure Investment Fund: Allocation to Purchase 155 College Street, 240, 255 and 263 McCaul Street, and 63 and 65 Henry Street

Professor Sedra said that the University had expressed an interest in acquiring the Toronto District School Board (the Board) building on College Street. If the Board wished to dispose of the building, it was required, in the first instance, to offer it to the University. The Business Board had approved the purchase and the Academic Board was now required to deal with the source of the funds for the purchase. The University had submitted an offer of \$17 million which had been accepted, subject to Governing Council approval. It was proposed that the purchase be funded by the University Infrastructure Investment Fund and the forthcoming budget report would include a transfer of funds to the University Infrastructure Investment Fund, as well as carrying charges for the allocation. In the short-term, the building would be used by the Faculty of Nursing and the Department of Public Health Sciences in the Faculty of Medicine. In the long term, the building and/or the adjacent properties which were part of this purchase could be re-developed. Its location in close proximity to the hospitals made it an

7. University Infrastructure Investment Fund: Allocation to Purchase 155 College Street, 240, 255 and 263 McCaul Street, and 63 and 65 Henry Street (cont'd)

excellent addition to the University campus. He believed the price was a fair one and it had been accepted by the Board, which after the City's amalgamation, had found itself with a surplus of office space.

A member noted his understanding that the building was not in very good shape and he wondered whether there would need to be a further allocation of funds to renovate the building. Professor Sedra agreed that it would require renovation. The University would not take possession of the building for 12 to 18 months. At that time there would need to be a detailed assessment and funding sources identified, most likely from divisional budgets.

A member stated that the Board building had been built in the early 1960s and had architectural merit. It also contained murals and works of art of some significance. There had been a rumour that the building would be demolished and concern had been expressed.

The President congratulated Professor Sedra and Mr. Chee for the work they had done in this acquisition which would give the University more flexibility in space allocation.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT an allocation of \$17 million from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund be approved to purchase properties from the Toronto District School Board, including 155 College Street, 255 McCaul Street, 263 McCaul, 240 McCaul Street, two vacant lots adjacent to 240 McCaul Street, namely 63 Henry Street and 65 Henry Street.

Documentation is attached hereto as Appendix "C".

8. Capital Project: Faculty of Arts and Science - Economics Building - Project Planning Report
(arising from Report Number 75 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the Project Planning Report for the Department of Economics, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "D" be approved in principle; and,

THAT the project scope of 1880 net assignable square metres (nasm) of new space and 450 nasm renovated space be approved at an estimated total project cost of \$14,300,000 (May 2004), with funding as follows:

- (i) external funding raised by the Department of Economics; and,
- (ii) a contribution from the University Investment Infrastructure Fund for the classroom, estimated at \$980,000, to be assigned once the full funding has been realized.

9. Capital Project: University of Toronto at Mississauga - Expansion of the Kaneff Centre - Project Planning Report

(arising from Report Number 76 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the Project Planning Report for the Expansion of the Kaneff Building, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "E", be approved in principle;

THAT the project scope of up to 660 nasm, comprising a minimum of 557 nasm of new construction and 40 nasm of renovation to suitably link the expansion on a site extending north from the Kaneff, be approved at an estimated cost of \$3.584 million. This cost includes the immediate campus improvements.

THAT the funding for the Expansion of the Kaneff Building in the amount of \$3.584 million be approved and funded from future donations and/or external contributions, and any shortfall financed from the Capital Renewal Fund with all debt service costs [principal and interest] being paid by University of Toronto at Mississauga from their enrolment expansion.

10. University of Toronto at Mississauga - Centre for Applied Bioscience and Biotechnology Vertical Expansion - Funding

(arising from Report Number 76 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Gotlieb explained that consistent with the Policy on Capital Planning and Capital Projects, projects with a total cost of less than \$2 million were approved by the Accommodation and Facilities Directorate (A.F.D.). This and the next three items fell into that category and their Project Planning Reports have been approved by the A.F.D. The Planning and Budget Committee's role had been to consider the source of funding. Members were interested in the process whereby governance was informed of A.F.D. approvals and were told that these would be communicated through the regular reports of the A.F.D. to the Planning and Budget Committee.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the funding for the Vertical Expansion of the Centre for Applied Bioscience and Biotechnology in the amount of \$800,000, be approved and funded from future donations and/or external contributions, and any shortfall financed from the Capital Renewal Fund with all debt service costs [principal and interest] being paid by University of Toronto at Mississauga from its enrolment expansion.

Documentation is attached as Appendix "F".

11. University Infrastructure Investment Fund: Allocation - Roberts Library, Accessibility Examination Centre

(arising from Report Number 76 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Gotlieb reported that this proposal would provide funding for the relocation of the Accessibility Examination Centre from the Koffler Student Centre to the Roberts Library.

11. University Infrastructure Investment Fund: Allocation - Robarts Library, Accessibility Examination Centre (cont'd)

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT an allocation of \$225,000 from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund be approved to address the complete cost of the Accessibility Examination Centre within the Robarts Library.

Documentation is attached as Appendix "G".

12. University Infrastructure Investment Fund: Allocation - Faculty of Arts and Science, Vertical Expansion of the New Soils Storage Facility
(arising from Report Number 76 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDED

THAT an allocation of \$718,323 from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund be approved toward the cost of the Vertical Expansion of the New Soils Storage Facility in the Earth Sciences Complex on Russell Street.

Documentation is attached as Appendix "H".

13. University Infrastructure Investment Fund: Allocation - 56 Spadina Avenue Renovation
(arising from Report Number 76 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Gotlieb explained that the renovation to 56 Spadina Avenue was proposed to allow Campus Co-op Daycare to move there from its current location which was needed for the adjacent construction of the Woodsworth College Residence. The proposed allocation would allow the retrofit of 56 Spadina to accommodate building code requirements for childcare facilities.

A member noted that this site, adjacent to 45 Walmer Road, was some distance from the Sidney Smith building, for example, and might prove difficult for students in terms of dropping off and picking up their children. Professor Venter reported that 56 Spadina Avenue was chosen with the full agreement of the Campus Co-op Daycare. Both the daycare and Ms Susan Addario in the Office of Student Affairs had been consulted and were comfortable with the site.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT an allocation of \$575,000 from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund be approved, to address the cost of the 56 Spadina Avenue renovation to suitably accommodate Campus Co-op Daycare. This allocation includes the \$75,000 required to demolish the Campus Co-op Daycare facilities and to clear site 12.

Documentation for this item is attached hereto as Appendix "I".

14. Canada Research Chairs Fund: Allocation

(arising from Report Number 76 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Gotlieb recalled that last year at about this time, the Committee had recommended an allocation to support the first round of appointments in the Canada Research Chairs (C.R.C.) competitions. This was a request to approve allocations for a further eighteen Chairholders.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT an allocation of \$1.8 million from the Canada Research Chairs Fund be approved to cover the salaries, benefits, research allowances and cluster support for ten Chairholders approved in the December 2000, March 2001 and June 2001 C.R.C. competitions; and,

THAT an allocation of \$1.247 million (\$1.3 million less \$53,000 indirect cost of 6% of salaries and benefits) be approved for the Faculty of Medicine in support of 8 Chairholders based in Hospital and Research Institutes that were approved in the March 2001 C.R.C. competition.

Documentation for this item is attached hereto as Appendix "J".

15. Academic Priorities Fund: Allocation - Computing and Network Services

(arising from Report Number 76 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Gotlieb noted that the next four items were proposed allocations from the Academic Priorities Fund to support divisional initiatives in line with the long-term planning objectives outlined in each division's *Raising our Sights* plan. He referred members to Report Number 76 of the Planning and Budget Committee for the details of the discussion.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT a base allocation of \$687,575 be approved from the Academic Priorities Fund to Computing and Network Services in support of its *Raising our Sights* Plan.

Documentation for this item is attached hereto as Appendix "K".

16. Academic Priorities Fund: Allocation - University Art Centre

(arising from Report Number 76 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT an allocation of \$200,000 be approved from the Academic Priorities Fund to the University Art Centre in support of its plans to link the Centre to teaching and research activities of several academic units.

Documentation for this item is attached hereto as Appendix "L".

17. Academic Priorities Fund: Allocation - Student Information Systems
(arising from Report Number 76 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

A member asked what the allocations would support. Ms Snikkar said the funds would pay for licensing and hardware costs. She noted, in response to the member's concern, that there had been a question about the fact that ROSI had not been available during the Christmas break. The student web service allowed students to maintain their information on the system including changing courses. A decision had been made not to offer the service over the holidays because of the technical support required to be on hand in the event a problem arose. Professor Sedra reported that the cost would be \$28,000 to open ROSI over part of the holiday period. He would have to review the demand to determine if there was justification in making the service available.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT one-time-only allocations of \$348,000 in 2001-02 and \$386,300 in 2002-03 be approved from the Academic Priorities Fund in support of ROSI, the University's student information system.

Documentation for this item is attached hereto as Appendix "M".

18. Academic Priorities Fund: Allocation - Faculty of Physical Education and Health
(arising from Report Number 76 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT a base allocation of \$127,675 and a one-time-only allocation of \$100,000 be approved from the Academic Priorities Fund for the Faculty of Physical Education and Health.

Documentation for this item is attached hereto as Appendix "N".

19. Policy on Assignment and Usage of Academic Offices
(arising from Report Number 76 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Gotlieb reported that the Committee had considered a new policy concerning the assignment of office space. Several members of the Committee had commented very positively on this policy and looked forward to the increased fairness that should emerge from its implementation.

A member noted that the academic heads were responsible for allocating space for cross-appointed staff and he asked whether they would be asked to report regularly on those allocations. Professor Venter responded that the policy was not meant to be bureaucratic and that academic heads would be reporting periodically on office allocations as new appointments were made. The intent was to report all changes, new and discontinuing, as these occur so that updated information was available.

A member asked whether a database would be constructed. Professor Venter said that the administration had been able to obtain a fairly good picture of the current situation but the data were not as accurate as they should be. He believed that the University should know that it was using its office space well since the average office was 13 net assignable square metres and space was at a premium. The proposed policy was intended to provide that assurance.

19. Policy on Assignment and Usage of Academic Offices (cont'd)

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the Policy on Assignment and Usage of Academic Offices, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "O", be approved.

20. Administrative Transitional Fund: Allocation - 175th Anniversary Program
(arising from Report Number 76 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Gotlieb reported that the Committee was supportive of recommending this allocation to fund special events during the University's 175th anniversary celebrations.

A member indicated his opposition to spending \$1 million when there was an operating deficit and tuition fees were rising. He asked for a justification for spending the funds. Professor Sedra indicated his strong support for the allocation. He noted that the University was in the final stages of the most successful fundraising campaign in the history of Canada. These celebrations would be a way to extend the University's outreach, including reaching many alumni that had not as yet been contacted. It was hoped that the celebrations would help the University reach the campaign's current goal of \$1 billion and it was seen as setting the stage for the next campaign. He believed it would be a terrific opportunity to reach out through the planned events and the launch of a new book on the history of the University.

The President commented that the question was a valid one and one that he, the Provost and their colleagues had considered. His first point was that the celebrations could indeed provide the final push in the campaign. Secondly, the long series of events would give the University community time to reflect with pride on its accomplishments. Finally, there would be an intellectual component such as the series of lectures by the University Professors which would be open to all and would permit members of the community beyond the University to hear and learn from the University's scholars. He suggested that these events might not happen unless there was time to celebrate. The President believed the expenditure was justified and would more than pay itself back.

A member indicated his support of the administration in the matter of fundraising, expressing his confidence in its experience and judgement in this area. Another noted that the track record showed that development funding was well spent and the return was very high.

A member asked why the total funding was not coming from the development budget. Professor Sedra responded that the budget was for existing and ongoing activities. These celebrations would be an incremental cost.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT a special one-time-only allocation of \$1 million from the Administrative Transitional Fund be approved in support of the 175th Anniversary Program. The allocation would be divided into two components: \$500,000 to be allocated in the 2001-02 fiscal year, and the remaining \$500,000 to be allocated in the 2002-03 fiscal year.

Documentation for this item is attached hereto as Appendix "P".

21. Items for Information

- (a) Report of the Vice-President and Provost
 - (i) Budget Update

Professor Sedra reported on three separate but related activities. The first concerned the update on the financial outlook for the current year, 2001-02. There had been a number of large changes but the financial result would be close to the bottom line recommended in the budget report. The biggest positive change had been the addition of federal funding for the indirect costs of research, the University's share of which was estimated at approximately \$16 million. The largest negative would be the loss in expected investment income. About \$20 million had been projected and approximately \$3 million had been achieved; the budget process would amortize the "loss" over three years but his preference would be to take as much of the loss this year as possible.

The second activity was to update the current budget planning document. The current six-year plan covered 1998 to 2004. Attached to Report Number 76 of the Planning and Budget Committee was a copy of a powerpoint presentation on the current budget situation. He noted that the process agreed to by Governing Council included the possibility of incurring deficits in any given year on the understanding that at the end of the six-year period, namely 2003-04, the budget would be balanced and the accumulated deficit would be within the 1.5 percent allowed by Governing Council policy. In order to achieve this goal, there would need to be budget reductions of the order of 4 to 5 percent over the next two years. This might change somewhat because of the third activity.

The University has had three six-year budget planning cycles beginning in 1990. Each has overlapped the previous one by two years. He intended to begin work on the 2002-2008 budget planning document shortly and noted that the new framework might supersede the remaining two years of the old plan and inform the preparation of the budget report for 2002-03. When new budget planning guidelines had been formulated and approved by governance, there might be an opportunity to reduce the size of the expected budget reductions.

A member noted that from the presentation appended to the Report, the University Infrastructure Investment Fund would be overspent by 2003. Professor Sedra said that there was not a cash flow problem as the capital projects requiring the funds were in different stages. He explained that a provision for \$30 million would need to be made in the forthcoming operating budget to cover this item.

- (ii) Teaching Assistants - Collective Agreement

Professor Sedra was pleased to report that Professor Hildyard and her team had been able to reach a tentative agreement with the teaching assistants. That agreement was currently undergoing a ratification vote. He hoped to be able to announce shortly the terms of the agreement which extended to April 2005. He indicated that both sides had been happy with the proposed settlement and, if ratified, it would provide stability for a number of years.

- (iii) Application Data

Professor Sedra reported that preliminary information from the Ontario Universities' Application Centre indicated that, compared to this time last year, the number of applicants to the University was up by 32 percent. The system increase was 15 percent. This was confirmation that students in increasing numbers continued to find the University an attractive choice. Dr. Levy indicated that the numbers might actually be higher. Professor Sedra believed that the growth in applicants would be higher from the Greater Toronto Area. The figures should help in the University's advocacy efforts to receive capital funding for new growth. He assured the Board that, in view of these figures, the University could keep to its planned growth and that its student body would be excellent.

21. Items for Information (cont'd)**(a) Report of the Vice-President and Provost (cont'd)**

A member noted that during the debate on discontinuing the three-year degree in the Faculty of Arts and Science, skeptics had suggested that enrolment would suffer without the three-year degree option. He believed these numbers supported the approved change.

A member asked if this increase was the beginning of the double cohort. The President suggested that these students might be the high end of the cohort who were able to accelerate their studies and apply early. The University might have its highest entering average this year.

(iv) Graduate Enrolment Funding

Professor Sedra recalled that part of the provincial government's announcement of \$220 million over the next three years was a component for graduate enrolment expansion. The Council of Ontario Universities (C.O.U.) had established a task force to recommend how to apportion the funds available or, in other words, to determine where the expansion in graduate enrolment should take place. The University in the past had consistently received about one third of funds for graduate enrolment in the province (the figure was 17 percent at the undergraduate level). The C.O.U. task force, on which Mr. England represented the University, has recommended a distribution methodology which would approximately maintain the University's share unchanged.

(v) Office of Teaching Advancement

Professor Sedra announced the establishment of the Office of Teaching Advancement and the appointment of the first Director, Professor Ken Bartlett of the Department of History. He gave credit to Professor Carol Rolheiser from OISE/UT for starting the initiative. Professor Bartlett would be consulting widely and would issue periodic reports on the Office's activities. The Office would be located in the Robarts Library, adjacent to the Resource Centre for Academic Technology.

(vi) Ethnocultural Academic Initiatives

A member commented that one project, "Development of teaching, videos and workbooks to focus on strengthening skills in anti-racist and anti-oppressive practice", appeared to have very little academic content and could be open to censure. Professor Tuohy indicated that it was a description of the project rather than its title.

(vii) University Professor Selection Committee: Membership

The membership of the Committee was presented for information.

(viii) Appointments and Status Changes / Professor Emeritus

The appointments were presented for information.

(b) Items for Information in Report Number 91 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs

There were no questions or comments.

(c) Items for Information in Reports Number 75 and 76 of the Planning and Budget Committee

There were no questions or comments.

21. Items for Information (cont'd)**(d) Reports Number 258, 259, 260 and 261 of the Academic Appeals Committee**

A member complimented the Committee on its activity and its decisions and made two comments arising from the reports. The first one arose from Report Number 258 and concerned the Committee's comment that if faculty members use class attendance for assessment purposes it should be clearly communicated, including the penalties, and proper monitoring of compliance put in place. He said that class attendance was not quantifiable in the same sense that marks were. However, he believed the instructor had the right to use attendance as a qualitative form of evaluation the exact worth of which need not be spelled out. His second point concerned the notion that a professor could employ predicted performance as a way of determining a student's grade on a missed exam (from Report Number 260). He considered this irresponsible behaviour on the part of the faculty member and said that a formal reprimand should be issued.

Professor Goel noted that reprimands were not in the purview of the Committee. With respect to the issues in general, the practices concerning grading students' work were laid out in the Grading Practices Policy. He agreed that it was important to inform the students of any course requirements. The Dean of the Faculty involved confirmed that if a mark were missing from a student's course at the end of the year, the instructor would be asked to extrapolate a mark.

Another member expressed his surprise that the Faculty of the student in question did not provide the opportunity to write supplemental exams. He had thought that this was a universal opportunity for all students and suggested that the Faculty in question reconsider its stance on this matter.

A member suggested that in fact the report of the Committee and the allowed appeal were a rebuke of the Faculty. The Chair of the appeal hearing panel confirmed her understanding that reprimands were not within the terms of reference of the Committee.

(e) Quarterly Report on Donations, August - October, 2001

A member asked for clarification concerning the Scholars at Risk Program. Professor Sedra indicated that these were academics forced out of their own countries. From a recent experience with one of these scholars, a suggestion had been made to establish a permanent endowment to help support these people while they were at the University.

(f) Report of Academic Discipline Cases, September 1, 2000 to August 31, 2001

The Chair noted that this report had been distributed at the meeting. It was presented for information.

A member noted that the cases of plagiarism were increasing dramatically and constituted about 42 percent of all offences. He believed this increase was due to access to the internet. He asked if there were any plans to combat this problem. Professor Sedra took the question under advisement.

A member asked how the University compared to other institutions in terms of the number of academic offences. This too was taken under advisement.

The Chair invited members with further questions to contact the Secretary.

22. Date of Next Meeting

The Chair noted that the next regular meeting of the Board would be held on February 28, 2002.

The Board moved into closed session.

23. Academic Administrative Appointments

The following academic administrative appointments were approved:

FACULTY OF ARCHITECTURE, LANDSCAPE, AND DESIGN

Professor Robert Wright	Associate Dean July 1, 2002 to June 30, 2003
-------------------------	--

FACULTY OF APPLIED SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING

Professor Javad Mostaghimi	Vice-Dean, Research and Graduate Studies, January 1, 2002 to December 31, 2007
----------------------------	--

FACULTY OF ARTS AND SCIENCE

Department of English

Professor Brian Corman	Chair July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2008 (re-appointment)
------------------------	--

Department of Germanic Languages and Literatures

Professor John Noyes	Chair, July 1, 2002 to June 30, 2007
----------------------	--------------------------------------

Department of Philosophy

Professor Wayne Sumner	Acting Chair January 1, 2002 to June 30, 2002
------------------------	---

Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures

Professor Ken Lantz	Acting Chair July 1, 2002 to December 31, 2002
---------------------	--

FACULTY OF MEDICINE

Department of Health Policy, Management and Evaluation

Professor Louise Lemieux-Charles	Acting Chair from January 1, 2002 to June 30, 2002 (extension)
----------------------------------	--

SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

Professor Don Cormack	Acting Dean (leave replacement) from February 8, 2002 to June 9, 2002
-----------------------	---

FACULTY OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND HEALTH

Graduate Department of Exercise Sciences

Professor Marius Locke	Acting Chair from January 1, 2002 to June 30, 2002
------------------------	--

23. Academic Administrative Appointments (cont'd)

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO AT MISSISSAUGA

Professor Angela Lange

Acting Associate Dean of Sciences from
July 1, 2002 to December 31, 2002

23. Report of the Tribunal Selection Committee

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the following be re-appointed as Co-Chairs of the University Tribunal for the period February 1, 2002 to June 30, 2005:

Mr. Raj Anand	Weir Foulds LLP
Mr. Robert Armstrong, Q.C.	Torys
Ms. Rodica David, Q.C.	David Eklove Charles
Ms. Julia Hannaford	Borden Ladner Gervais
Mr. Michael Hines	Hicks Morely Hamilton Stewart Storie LLP
Mr. John A. Keefe	Goodmans LLP
Ms. Sherry Liang	Sherry Liang Arbitrations
Mr. Frank N. Marocco	Smith Lyons LLP
Ms. N. Jane Pepino, Q.C.	Aird & Berlis LLP
Mr. Ronald Slaght	Lenczner Slaght Royce Smith Griffin

THAT the following be re-appointed as Co-Chairs of the University Tribunal for the period July 1, 2002 to June 30, 2005:

Ms. Kirby Chown	McCarthy Tétrault LLP
Mr. Bernard Fishbein	Koskie Minsky

THAT Mr. C. Anthony Keith, Q.C. (Keith and Krammer) be re-appointed as Senior Chair of the Tribunal for the period July 1, 2002 to June 30, 2005;

THAT Ms. Patricia Jackson (Torys) be re-appointed as an Associate Chair of the University Tribunal for the period July 1, 2002 to June 30, 2005; and

THAT Ms. Janet E. Minor (Ministry of the Attorney General) be re-appointed as an Associate Chair of the University Tribunal for the period February 1, 2002 to June 30, 2005.

The meeting adjourned 5:45 p.m.

Secretary
January 25, 2002

Chair

ACADEMIC BOARD

ATTENDANCE

January 24, 2002

Present

Professor J. Carr, Chair
Professor D. Wells, Vice-Chair
Ms W. M. Cecil, Chairman, Governing Council
Professor R. J. Birgeneau, President
Professor A. S. Sedra, Vice-President and Provost
Professor V. Goel, Vice-Provost, Faculty
Professor C. Tuohy, Vice-President - Policy Development and Associate Provost
Professor B. J. Adams
Professor D. Affonso
Mr. M. F. Ahmad
Professor G. Allen
Professor C. Amrhein
Professor M. Beattie
Ms R. Bhavnani
Professor J. M. Boyle
Mr. J. Burnett
Professor N. Camerman
Mr. A. Chapnick
Professor M. L. Chipman
Professor D. Clandfield
Professor D. Cook
Professor W. R. Cummins
Professor L. De Nil
Professor S. Desser
Professor M. Diamond
Professor J. Donaldson
Professor D. Edwards
Dr. I. Elliston
Dr. S. Graham Fell
Ms E. Fillion
Professor E. Fiume
Professor E. Freeman
Professor J. J. Furedy
Professor R. M. Gallop
Dr. R. Geist
Ms B. Goldberg
Professor A. I. Gotlieb
Professor M. Gotlieb
Mr. B. Greenspan
Mr. A. Hamoui
Mr. D. Herbert
Professor W. Hindmarsh
Ms B. Horne
Professor L. C. Howarth
Mr. J. Hunter
Mr. M. Hyrza

Ms M. J. Jackman
Professor G. Kerr
Professor B. Kidd
Professor R. Kluger
Dr. M. Letarte
Ms K. Lewis
Professor S. G. Matthews
Professor R. H. McNutt
Ms V. Melnyk
Mr. D. Melville
Professor D. Mock
Mr. A. Morgan
Professor P. Pennefather
Professor P. Perron
Professor O. Pugliese
Professor R. Reisz
Ms P. Ricci
Professor L. Richards
Professor B. Sampson
Ms C. M. Seymour
Professor A. Sheps
Professor B. Sherwood-Lollar
Professor J. J. B. Smith
Ms J. Snow
Ms. S. Stringer
Professor P. Thompson
Professor V. R. Timmer
Professor A. Venetsanopoulos
Professor D. Vincent
Professor L. Wilson-Pauwels

Non-Voting Member

Mr. L. R. Charpentier

Non-Voting Assessors

Dr. S. Levy
Professor D. McCammond
Professor I. Orchard
Professor R. Venter

Secretariat

Ms S. Girard, Secretary
Ms C. Oke

Absent

Professor B. Baigrie
 Professor C. Barnes
 Dr. M. Barrie
 Professor N. Bascia
 Professor D. Beach
 Professor C. Beghtol
 Professor B. Benhabib
 Mr. E. Brock
 Professor R. Bryan
 Mr. G. Chan
 Professor J. J. Connon
 Professor B. Corman
 Professor F. Cunningham
 Professor R. Daniels
 Dr. R. B. Deber
 Professor C. Dyer
 Professor M. Eichler
 Mr. J. A. Fraser
 Professor M. Fullan

Professor H. Gunz
 Professor P. Halpern
 Professor S. H. Horton
 Professor H. Munroe-Blum
 Professor A. R. Jones
 Professor A. Jorgensen
 Professor C. La Vigna
 Professor M. R. Marrus
 Professor R. L. Martin
 Professor C. Misak (on sabbatical)
 Professor E. Morgan
 Professor V. K. Murty
 Professor D. Naylor
 Professor M. O'Neill-Karch
 Professor R. W. Pruessen
 Professor C. Regehr
 Ms S. Reichert
 Professor K. Rice
 Professor C. Rolheiser
 Mr. J. Satkunasingham
 Professor W. Shera
 Dr. K. Stangeby
 Mr. A. Vered

In Attendance:

Professor R. Abramovitch, Director, Transitional Year Program
 Professor L. Cicutto, Program Director, Acute Care Nure Practitioner Program - Adults, Faculty of Nursing
 Dr. B. Fitzpatrick, Director of the Office of the President and Assistant Vice-President
 Professor M. McAllister, Program Director, Acute Care Nure Practitioner Program - Children, Faculty of Nursing
 Ms M. McGee, Assistant Provost
 Ms A. Snikkar, Student Information Systems
 Professor J. Watt-Watson, Graduate Co-ordinator, Faculty of Nursing