

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO  
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL  
REPORT NUMBER 115 OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD

November 14, 2002

To the Governing Council,  
University of Toronto.

Your Board reports that it held a meeting on Thursday, November 14, 2002 at 4:15 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall. An attendance list is presented at the end of this report. In this report, items 7 to 10 are recommended to Governing Council for approval, and the remaining items are reported for information.

The Board moved *in camera*

**1. Report of the Striking Committee**

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT Ms Rochelle Fernandes, a full-time undergraduate Arts and Science student from UTM, be appointed to the Academic Board for 2002-03, effectively immediately.

**2. Academic Administrative Appointments**

The following academic administrative appointments were approved:

FACULTY OF MEDICINE

Professor Murray Urowitz

Associate Dean, Postgraduate Affairs from  
July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004  
(extension)

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO AT SCARBOROUGH

*Division of Physical Sciences*

Professor Charles Dyer

Chair from December 1, 2002 to June 30,  
2005

**3. Report of the Tribunal Selection Committee**

The Chair noted that this item was not ready at this time and with the consent of the Board, withdrew the item from the agenda.

The Board moved into open session.

A motion to adjourn at 6:30 p.m. was duly moved and seconded. The motion was carried.

---

**4. Report of the Previous Meeting**

The Chair noted that the date of the next meeting, item 10, should be November 14, 2002.

The report of the previous meeting, as amended, dated October 7, 2002, was approved.

**5. Business Arising**

Item 9(h) University Tribunal - Individual Case

The Chair noted that a member had asked a question about an individual case and Professor Neuman had taken the question under advisement. Professor Goel noted that the question concerned the section in which the Tribunal responded to the student's request to have his/her costs paid by the University, after the Tribunal had found in favour of the student. The Tribunal Chair had referred to a case where costs were awarded because there was clear evidence that the prosecutor had acted maliciously. But, in this case, the Tribunal found that the University was not liable for costs and that it had not acted unreasonably. The University's practice was to ask the Discipline Counsel, Ms Linda Rothstein, to investigate the case, and if there was sufficient evidence to be confident of a conviction, the University would proceed with the case. The Annual Report of the Tribunal, which appears later on this agenda, indicated that there was a high conviction rate.

A member asked what the student's costs were. Professor Goel did not know but noted that students had access to free legal services including those provided by the law students through Downtown Legal Services.

Other items

A member indicated that he had other matters to raise under business arising. The Chair responded that no other reports had been undertaken by the administration for presentation at this meeting and the member's matters could be raised under other business. The member appealed the Chair's ruling. The motion, duly moved and seconded, was defeated.

**6. Report Number 101 of the Agenda Committee**

The report was received for information.

**7. University Infrastructure Investment Fund: Allocation – Renovation of 256 McCaul Street**

(arising from Report Number 83 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Gottlieb hoped that the members had had the opportunity to read Appendix A of Report 83 that gave the background for this allocation for the renovation of 256 McCaul Street for the Department of Family and Community Medicine in the Faculty of Medicine. There were no questions or discussion at the Planning and Budget Committee meeting.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT an allocation not to exceed \$120,000 be made from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund to address the cost of the renovation at 256 McCaul Street that will house the Department of Family and Community Medicine.

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

**8. University Infrastructure Investment Fund: Allocation – Decommissioning of the SLOWPOKE Reactor**  
(arising from Report Number 83 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Gotlieb explained that this proposed allocation from the UIIF would cover the final portion of the expenses incurred for the decommissioning of the SLOWPOKE reactor. Again, there were no questions at the Planning and Budget Committee meeting on this item.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT an allocation of \$285,562 from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund be approved to complete the decommissioning of the SLOWPOKE reactor.

Documentation for this item is attached hereto as Appendix “B”.

**9. Canada Research Chairs Fund: Allocation, 2002-03**  
(arising from Report Number 83 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Gotlieb noted that the Planning and Budget Committee approved annually allocations from the Canada Research Chairs Fund. During discussion, the Committee learned that the program had not to date resulted in any charge against the University’s operating budget. However, stress from higher salaries and higher research cluster support could change that in the future. As a result, an appropriate way of changing the model would soon be under discussion.

A member noted the small number of chairs in the humanities and social sciences being funded by this allocation and asked what steps were being taken to increase that number. He also asked if there was a chair in diversity, equity or gender studies. Professor Neuman explained that there were a fixed number of chairs available to be awarded and that the number depended on the grant funding provided by each of the three granting councils. There were, de facto, fewest chairs in the humanities and social sciences because the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) had the smallest budget. The budget for the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council (NSERC) had four times the budget and the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR) had even more. The administration was monitoring the gender balance in appointments to chairs. Professor Tuohy added that there was a cluster involving the Faculty of Social Work and OISE/UT in social justice and equity studies.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT \$2.6m be allocated from the Canada Research Chairs Fund to cover the salaries, benefits, research allowances and cluster support for thirteen Chairholders approved in the September 2001 and December 2001 CRC competitions.

THAT \$.7m (\$.8m less \$77,000 indirect cost of 16% of salaries and benefits) be allocated to the Faculty of Medicine in support of seven campus-based Chairholders that were approved in the September 2001 competition.

THAT \$1.3m (\$1.4m less \$74,000 indirect cost of 6% of salaries and benefits) be allocated to the Faculty of Medicine in support of nine Chairholders based in Hospital and Research Institutes that were approved in the September 2001 competition.

Documentation for this item is attached hereto as Appendix “C”.

**10. Academic Priorities Fund: Allocation – Post-doctoral Office**  
(arising from Report Number 83 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

The Chair noted that the name of the office would be the Post-doctoral Office and not the Post-doctoral Affairs Office.

Professor Gotlieb said that this was a significant allocation to support the post-doctoral fellows at the University. The number of post-doctoral fellows was increasing and the proposed Post-doctoral Office to be created as a result of the allocation gave individuals in that group support that had been unavailable to them in the past.

A member noted that this was an important initiative and drew particular attention to the role of the officer in monitoring the impact of OSAP and Canada Customs and Revenue Agency regulations on post-doctoral fellows. He was concerned that post-doctoral fellows as trainees would not be eligible for OSAP debt relief. Professor Marrus responded that the School would have the officer in place shortly.

A member asked how many post-doctoral fellows there were at the University. A one-person office was small and if business was brisk this could be a drain on SGS resources. Professor Marrus said that the number was uncertain but according to a study completed by Associate Dean de Boni, much of the responsibility for post-doctoral fellows was discharged by the individual faculty members and at the divisional level. He hoped the Office would be able to determine the numbers. A member said that it would be useful if indeed the Office could develop a registry and respond to requests for information about the engagement of post-doctoral fellows. Professor Marrus said that the Office would co-ordinate the monitoring of post-doctoral fellows and with the co-operation of chairs and deans should be able to develop a University-wide picture of the placement of these individuals.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT a base allocation of \$67,363 and a one-time-only allocation of \$10,300 be made from the Academic Priorities Fund for the establishment of a Post-doctoral Office in the School of Graduate Studies.

Documentation for this item is attached hereto as Appendix “D”.

**11. Items for Information**

- (a) Report of the Vice-President and Provost
  - (i) Academic Planning Open Fora

Professor Neuman recalled that she had described the process of academic planning in some detail at the first meeting. The planning document, drafted over the summer, had been much revised and as a green paper would be reviewed by the President – Vice-Presidents group the following week. Following review by Principals and Deans, the green paper would be posted to the web in early to mid-December and would appear as a special supplement in the *Bulletin* on January 13. Professor Neuman was setting up a series of open fora, led by herself, in various venues on all three campuses for discussion by faculty, staff and students. She wanted particularly to encourage students to participate in these forums. The discussion phase should continue through mid-February with the green paper being available to various Boards and Committees at that time. In March, a white paper would be produced which would be considered by the Governing Council. She noted that the second phase of the process would be the drafting of divisional or departmental plans beginning next fall.

---

**11. Items for Information** (cont'd)

## (a) Report of the Vice-President and Provost (cont'd)

## (i) Academic Planning Open Fora (cont'd)

Professor Neuman said that the web site would be highly interactive. She was hoping for input in that format but from past practice she thought the forums would provide more feedback. Submissions were welcomed. She noted that academic planning was more necessary than ever in times of budget challenges.

## (ii) Challenges with the Budget

Professor Neuman's report covered a number of areas.

**Unrealized budget assumptions:** Professor Neuman reported that there were two unrealized revenue assumptions. The first was a projected inflationary increase in the grants per student received from the provincial government of 1 % this year and 2% next year. This year's increase had not occurred and it was extremely unlikely that next year's would either. The second revenue assumption concerned investment return. The endowment fund provided a payout based on a rolling four-year average; in addition, a percentage of the income was returned to the endowment to preserve the capital value. At the moment, the payout rate was set at 5%, while the actual returns on the endowment were negative. The University also had a considerable float – funds that were committed but not spent – which was invested to earn interest. The interest earned on the float was below that projected in the budget. On the expense side, she noted that the pension fund has had a surplus above the amount needed to meet its liabilities for a number of years and the University has been prevented, by law, from contributing. Not only had the University had a contribution holiday but so had faculty and staff. The contribution holiday for faculty and staff has ended and the surplus has been eroded by the downturn in the market with the result that the University would have to re-commence its contributions earlier than anticipated. This would be a substantial expense item. The combination of these three items would have a considerable impact on the budget.

**Uncertainties:** Professor Neuman listed a number of current uncertainties that would affect the budget. The first of these was the SuperBuild Fund, from which a sizable allocation would alleviate some of the budget woes. Intense negotiations were currently underway with the government but the matter had not yet been approved by the provincial cabinet. The second uncertainty concerned the assumption that the federal government would increase funding for indirect costs of research by 7 %. It appeared likely that the costs already received would be rolled into base which would be good news but that the increase would be less than 7%. The third area concerned enrolment expansion. It now appeared the provincial government had substantially underestimated the number of university-bound students as a result of the double cohort. Seventy-five percent or more of graduating high school students would likely qualify for University and not the previously expected 60 %. The University could be asked to take an additional 1,100-2,400 students a year earlier in 2003-04 rather than 2004-05. Fiscal arrangements have not been clarified although the students have already started applying.

**Past accomplishments:** Professor Neuman stated that there had been significant renewal through the allocation of the Academic Priorities Fund. New resources had been introduced through the Access to Opportunity Program (ATOP) funds for Engineering and Computer Science and through the Canada Research Chairs Program. Over the past two years, full funding for graduate students has been introduced. This was a bold initiative and an extraordinary achievement for the University. Such a commitment did have a financial cost and funding it was part of the challenge. Finally, there had been a great deal of capital expansion over the last few years.

---

**11. Items for Information (cont'd)**

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

(ii) Challenges with the Budget (cont'd)

**Anomalies:** There were a number of anomalous situations. In the Maclean's rankings, the University had moved up in the ranking of funding available per student. However, the funding had come not from the provincial government or tuition fees but from increased research funding and donations, both revenues that were targeted to specific purposes. The University had more funds overall but there were constraints around the operating budget.

**Development of the budget:** Professor Neuman gave notice on what might be expected in the upcoming budget exercise. The University had been borrowing to support capital expansion and a first step would be to create a capital budget. The operating budget would continue to be balanced within a given planning period and the capital budget would show mortgaged infrastructure debt financing. Carrying charges for the debt would be part of the operating budget. Her Office and that of the Vice-President, Business Affairs were collaborating on this project to bring together all the capital activity in one place. As a result, there would be two budgets presented this year: a capital budget and an operating budget. Finally, she noted that the divisions had been expecting to accommodate a 1.5% budget adjustment in next year's budget. This would probably be closer to 4 – 5%, mostly as a result of the lack of an inflationary increase and poor investment returns. Some cutbacks would continue until government grants and/or investment returns improved. The Board would receive more budget data later in the year but she had thought it appropriate to update the members now. The principals and deans had already been informed.

The President reported that there was good news in that the University had received \$34 million in start-up funding for new faculty from the Canada Foundation for Innovation. This would be matched by the provincial government for a total of \$68 million. This could be used to meet indirectly some of the shortfall. He noted that there had been a meeting with Minister Allan Rock about indirect research costs and that Mr. Rock was committed to moving this matter into the budget. Although the federal budget was not expected until February, it was hoped that the Prime Minister would make a statement of support sooner. The University was working with AUCC on this issue. On the matter of the graduate student funding guarantee, the President noted that the shortfall in the budget was the same amount as the cost of this new program. He said that every time a decision was made to do one good thing, there were less resources for other matters. The funding pot was finite. Finally, with respect to the Maclean's survey, the President was most pleased with the rise in the reputational and innovation category for programs offered to undergraduate students. The challenge remained though to continue to make the case that universities needed more funding to maintain their quality programs.

The Chair invited questions on the Provost's report. A member asked for a full explanation of the connection between the loss of the revenue stream and a possible 5% budget reduction for the divisions. Professor Neuman explained that return on investments represented a significant revenue stream. The investment of the float had produced a negative return. It was expected that the investment of the endowment should earn a 9% return in order to pay out 5%, the rest being used to preserve the capital value of the endowment. The endowment was clearly not earning 9%; it was not even making the 5% the University was committed to paying out. This then became a charge on the operating budget. Finally, with respect to the pension plan, because of its surplus position, the University had not been permitted, by law, to contribute to the fund, and the funding that would have been used for its contribution, had been used for other purposes. The contributions would begin again sooner than expected. The member suggested that some universities used their endowments for "rainy days". This was a "rainy day". Professor Neuman responded that the University's endowment fund was committed to support specific items such as chairs and student financial

---

**11. Items for Information (cont'd)**

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

(ii) Challenges with the Budget (cont'd)

aid and could not be used as the member suggested. It was in very large part a targeted endowment. The expenses that were supported by the endowment must be paid whether the interest earned covered them or not.

A member suggested that the number one Maclean's ranking reflected prudent management of the resources the University had.

A member asked about the government's definition of "qualified" students. If the numbers were higher than projected by the government, students would have a hard time gaining admission and might go back to high school, spreading the double cohort increase over another year. Dr. Levy said that the University defined "qualified" student as one who met the University's standards. The government assumed that the average for admission in 2002 would be the same in 2003. Based on that, the government believed 75-90% of high school students would be academically ready to attend university. He noted that there was not a good geographical match between the spaces available and where the students wished to go. The spaces were in the north and the students were in the GTA.

A member noted that investment issues were the purview of the Business Board. The question was how to get the government to increase base funding. He suggested the University look to ways to invest in itself and indicated that there were successful models.

A member commented on the possible 4-5 % reduction in divisional budgets to which the Provost had referred. He hoped it would not be necessary but he suggested that it would be very important to have a communication strategy in place so that members of the University community understand the budget challenges. The budget challenges seemed to be based on unrealized assumptions. He noted that his colleagues in other universities did not seem to be as concerned about their budgets although they too would presumably be affected by a lack of an inflationary increase and market performance. If the difference was the significant new obligation the University had assumed in implementing the graduate student funding, it should be stated. The President said that other universities were in the same position and were predicting reductions in their budgets. Professor Neuman noted that the member was correct in that the University had made a number of major commitments including graduate student funding and capital expansion. The fact remained that the revenue assumptions had not been met. They were part of the six-year framework in which budget decisions were made. At the end of the sixth year, Governing Council required that the amount of debt be within the limit set by its policy. Dr. Levy concurred that other universities were concerned; some had used the funding associated with growth to offset budget reductions. The member suggested that the level of awareness at this University was a reflection of the transparency of the budgeting process.

A member spoke to the importance of the graduate funding package. It gave the divisions the ability to attract excellent graduate students and this had an immediate impact on undergraduate students through their interaction with the graduate students.

A member cautioned against linking the graduate student funding package with the budget problems just because the amounts were similar. The funding package was a great achievement and should be presented as such. Another member suggested that the stock market problems were temporary but the real problem was inadequate provincial funding and the need for an increased investment in education. Perhaps there should be an outreach initiative to the alumni to lobby the government. The President said that he was very proud of the graduate funding initiative and he had not meant it to be taken as the cause of the budget

**11. Items for Information (cont'd)**

- (a) Report of the Vice-President and Provost (cont'd)
  - (ii) Challenges with the Budget (cont'd)

shortfall. He and his vice-presidential colleagues worked incessantly with the government but, he added, the general public also needed to be persuaded on the value of and the need to support post-secondary education.

A member raised the issue of budget reductions particularly for faculties that were expanding. For example, one faculty was doubling its enrolment and hiring new teaching staff. Taking a 5% budget reduction would be a challenge while at the same maintaining the excellence of the program to attract the new students and staff. He raised the question of differential re-allocation. Professor Neuman responded that there were some concerns with differential re-allocation at the University due to the relative sizes of the faculties. With three large faculties and a number of smaller ones, varying the re-allocation positively from the norm even slightly for one of the larger faculties would drastically reduce the funds available for re-allocation to the smaller ones. She also noted the flip side of the argument for those faculties with expansion funding, namely, that they would have more funds from which to find the budget reduction.

A member asked whether it would be possible to change the endowment to have a small amount, such as 1 %, untargeted. Professor Neuman said that donors, particularly those who gave large donations, liked to have their donations used for the purpose they designated. Dr. Dellandrea was focusing, however, on the annual campaign where the donations were smaller. He hoped to increase the number of donors making undesignated gifts which would provide some relief.

Finally, a member referred to the CAUT sponsored Canada Post-Secondary Education Act which provided a core mechanism for funding post-secondary education. He noted that a number of people were supporting this initiative and asked whether the University had been involved. Dr. Levy indicated that the administration had reviewed the Act. He noted that there were many different routes for advocacy for improved funding for universities in Canada and this was one of many routes. A number of aspects of the proposed Act would have major implications particularly for the entire role of governance. He concluded that the University did not plan to take this issue further.

- (iii) Appointments and Status Changes / Appointment of Professors Emeriti
- (iv) Provost's Advisory Committee on the University of Toronto Library System: Membership 2002-03

The above two items were presented for information. A member asked why there were no administrative staff representatives on the Advisory Committee. Professor Neuman responded that this membership was based on past practice of faculty, student and librarian members.

- (b) Items for Information in Report Number 96 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs

A member noted the approval of a first-year level university biology course as an admission requirement for the undergraduate program in the Leslie Dan Faculty of Pharmacy. She was concerned that this would prevent the admission of U of T students since the Biology 150 course was already a very large class and it would be difficult to take more students. Professor Tuohy responded that it has been determined that there would be only a modest increase based on the current experience of students applying to the undergraduate program.



---

**11. Items for Information (cont'd)**

- (c) Items for Information in Report Number 83 of the Planning and Budget Committee

There were no questions or comments.

- (d) Report Number 269 of the Academic Appeals Committee

The Chair noted that the Secretary had not been informed of any questions.

A member commented that this decision balanced equity and fairness with compassion. It recognized the extraordinary challenges faced by some students, especially when performance was constrained by the need to function in situations that were new and demanding. The previous report was another example of a student who had faced similar life management problems made worse by financial difficulties. She was concerned that in spite of the provision of a range of support services, some students continue to experience extraordinary difficulties in the areas of self and life management which became a hindrance to good performance. She asked whether the forthcoming planning paper on student experience would capture information and examples to understand better those areas of self and life management skills which need to be met and how students, especially those new to the country, were coping or could be assisted to cope better.

Professor Neuman remarked that the University provided a wide range of student services including financial counselling. Advice and support were available but the students must seek it out. Unfortunately, those most at risk were least likely to have the time, energy or will to do so. It would not be appropriate to provide a report on specific cases because of privacy issues, but her office could provide information on services currently available to meet student needs in this area. Certainly part of the study of student experience would be to examine the student services and to improve them where appropriate.

- (e) University Tribunal: Annual Report on Academic Discipline Cases 2001-02

A member noted the increase in the number of plagiarism cases and was pleased that the University would be using turnitin.com. He suggested that if students cheat because they could, then the new software program should be a deterrent and the number of cases should decrease. However, should the data show no change, then the problem would be more difficult to address. He asked whether there were plans to monitor the effectiveness of the new program. Professor Goel said that the introduction of turnitin.com was being done as a major anti-plagiarism initiative. There would be a workshop later in the week conducted by the Office of Teaching Advancement on how to prevent plagiarism and to detect it, including with the software. The impact of turnitin.com would be monitored but he cautioned that when a new screening device was introduced, the number of incidents detected usually increased.

A member said that it was important to catch those who plagiarize but it was also important to educate and explain why plagiarism was unacceptable. He asked what was being done to explain what the expectations were. Professor Neuman said that it was the responsibility of the teaching staff to take the time to explain what plagiarism was and why it was unacceptable.

A member stated that he found the best way to deal with this problem was to set assignments that did not lend themselves to copying. On another point, he noted that, ironically, in some cases the statements about plagiarism on a course web site did not provide the source of the statement. Not only was education important for the students, but the faculty should be as careful as they expect their students to be in attributions.

---

**11. Items for Information (cont'd)**

- (e) University Tribunal: Annual Report on Academic Discipline Cases 2001-02 (cont'd)

A member referred to the University's participation in a higher education data survey in which graduate students had been asked if they had been made aware of concerns about plagiarism. A significant number said they had not and he said that this was being addressed.

A member said that there were a number of ongoing initiatives in his Faculty. There had been an increase in the volume of cases; plagiarism was prosecuted aggressively and in a timely fashion. New faculty members were given information on this problem in their orientation sessions. A professor in the Department of Philosophy had created a website which was a model for others. Handouts were available from the writing centre. Examinations were arranged to minimize the opportunities to plagiarize. Vice-Dean Rolph was co-ordinating the Faculty's efforts in this area and he assured the Board that the problem was taken very seriously.

A member noted that the data indicated that there were more cases of plagiarism at UTM than on the St. George campus. He wondered whether there were more cheaters or was UTM better at catching them. Professor Goel responded that the number of cases varied by program area, student experience and many other factors would need to be understood before conclusions could be drawn.

**12. Date of Next Meeting**

The Chair noted that the next regular meeting of the Board would be held on January 16, 2003.

**13. Other Business**

A member had a number of items to raise.

He asked for a written report on diversity and gender with respect to the Canada Research Chairs. Professor Tuohy said that she could provide information on gender based on the data they had collected.

He asked whether post-doctoral fellows would get OSAP debt-relief. Professor Goel repeated the Dean's statement that the new Post-doctoral Office would lobby on this issue, as the decision was not the University's.

He asked how a discussion of the CAUT Canada Post-secondary Education Act could be initiated at the Board. Professor Tuohy noted that a question had been asked about this Act at the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs. Both the Chair and the Secretary of Governing Council suggested that it was the administration's decision whether there was something in the document that might merit discussion by the Board. The member suggested the governors might wish to initiate discussion the Act.

On his final point, the member referred to the Performance Indicators for Governance Annual Report on student debtload. He noted that the OSAP debtload has decreased but he believed the debtload was shifting to bank loans. This was a problem in his view and a potentially serious academic issue and he asked for more data on Scotia bank loans. Professor Orchard, former Vice-Provost, Students, said that these data were available in the annual Report on Financial Student Aid given to the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs each spring and fully accessible on the web. The report of that meeting came to the Board for information. In response to the member's request that it be distributed to the members, the Chair said that the url would be provided to members who could review the report if they wished. Professor Levy noted that it was important to take care in interpreting the loan

---

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

information. It was wrong, for example, to conclude that student debt was on the rise by the fact that the University was providing students with opportunity to access bank loans at low interest rates. In fact the opposite could be happening as old loans at higher rates were moved to the new institution at lower rates.

Another member noted that at the Governing Council meeting, a request had been made for a diversity action plan and he asked for a report on its status. Professor Neuman said that Professor Goel was assembling information on the extensive array of programs in place at the University and this would be discussed at the December meeting of Governing Council.

He also commented on the problem of increasing corporatization of the campus as shown in a recent matter at St. Michael's College. The Chair said that that was a matter to be discussed with the St. Michael's Board.

A member asked whether there could be seats on the Board for students who were full-time Arts and Science students. The Chair noted that there were usually 6 full-time Arts and Science student members of the Board from all three campuses.

The meeting adjourned at 6:10 p.m.

Secretary  
November 15, 2002

Chair

**Present:**

Professor W. R. Cummins, Chair  
Professor B. Corman, Vice-Chair  
Dr. T. Simpson, Chair, Governing Council  
Professor R. J. Birgeneau, President  
Professor S. Neuman, Vice-President and Provost  
Professor V. Goel, Vice-Provost, Faculty  
Professor D. McCammond, Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget  
Professor C. Tuohy, Vice-President, Policy Development and Associate Provost and Interim Vice-President, Research and International Relations  
Professor R. Abramovitch  
Professor D. Affonso  
Mr. S. Ahmed  
Professor D. Allen  
Professor G. Allen  
Professor C. Amrhein  
Professor S. Aster  
Professor B. Baigrie  
Professor B. Benhabib  
Mr. M. Bonham  
Professor N. Camerman  
Mr. A. Chapnick  
Professor M. Chipman  
Professor D. Clandfield  
Professor L. De Nil  
Professor S. Desser  
Professor J. Donaldson  
Professor C. Dyer  
Professor D. Edwards  
Dr. I. Elliston  
Ms R. Fernandes  
Professor E. Fiume  
Professor U. George  
Ms R. Ghosh  
Professor A. Gotlieb  
Dr. G. Halbert  
Professor P. Halpern  
Professor E. Hillan  
Professor W. Hindmarsh  
Professor E. Hodnett  
Ms B. Horne  
Professor L. Howarth  
Mr. J. Hunter  
Professor M. Hutcheon  
Mr. M. Hyreza  
Ms M. Jackman  
Professor G. Kerr  
Professor R. Kluger  
Professor J. Lepock  
Professor L. Loeb  
Professor M. Marrus  
Ms S. McDonald

Ms V. Melnyk  
Professor C. Misak  
Professor M. O'Neill-Karch  
Mr. E. Ohayon  
Professor I. Orchard  
Professor P. Pennefather  
Professor P. Perron  
Mr. C. Purchase  
Mr. C. Ramsaroop  
Professor C. Regehr  
Professor R. Reisz  
Professor L. Richards  
Mrs. C. Seymour  
Professor B. Sherwood Lollar  
Professor P. Sinervo  
Professor J. J. B. Smith  
Professor D. Thiessen  
Mr. N. Turk-Browne  
Professor T. Venetsanopoulos  
Ms S. Walker

**Non-voting Member:**

Mr. L. R. Charpentier

**Non-voting Assessors:**

Professor A. Hildyard  
Dr. S. Levy

**Secretariat:**

Ms S. Girard, Secretary  
Ms C. Oke

**Absent:**

Dr. M. Barrie  
Professor N. Bascia  
Professor D. Beach  
Professor M. Beattie  
Professor C. Beghtol  
Professor M. Berkowitz  
Ms H. Brabazon  
Professor R. Bryan  
Mr. G. Chan  
Professor S. Choudhry  
Professor D. Cook  
Professor F. Cunningham  
Professor R. Daniels  
Professor R. Deber  
Professor M. Diamond  
Professor M. Eichler  
Dr. S. G. Fell

---

Mr. J. Fraser  
Professor E. Freeman  
Professor M. Fullan  
Professor J. Furedy  
Professor R. Geist  
Professor L. Girolametto  
Ms B. Goldberg  
Professor M. Gotlieb  
Mr. B. Greenspan  
Professor H. Gunz  
Professor A. Haasz  
Mr. A. Hamoui  
Mr. D. Herbert  
Professor S. Horton  
Professor A. Johnston  
Professor A. Jones

Professor B. Kidd  
Dr. M. Letarte  
Professor J. MacDonald  
Professor R. Martin  
Professor M. McGowan  
Mr. D. Melville  
Professor D. Mock  
Ms C. Moore  
Professor D. Naylor  
Professor K. Rice  
Professor B. Sampson  
Mr. R. Sanders  
Mr. V. Sekhar  
Professor P. Thompson  
Professor V. Timmer  
Professor L. Wilson-Pauwels

**In Attendance:**

Professor D. Farrar, Vice-Provost, Students - Designate  
Ms E. Sadowski, President, Association of Part-time Undergraduate Studies  
Ms M. Somerville, Chair, College of Electors