

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

REPORT NUMBER 125 OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD

January 15, 2004

To the Governing Council,
University of Toronto.

Your Board reports that it held a meeting on Thursday, January 15, 2004 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 5, 6, 7 and 8 are recommended to Governing Council for approval, item 3 is for Executive Committee confirmation and the remaining items are reported for information.

A motion to adjourn not later than 6:30 p.m. was duly moved and seconded. The motion was carried.

The meeting began *in camera*.

1. Report of the Striking Committee

Mr. Josh Paterson, a full-time undergraduate student from the professional faculties, resigned from the Academic Board and the Agenda Committee following the November meeting of the Board.

Agenda Committee

The Striking Committee considered the current students on the Board for this position. On November 27, the members of the Board received an email on behalf of the Chair of the Board asking whether they wished to proceed to appoint a student to the Agenda Committee by email and whether they supported the recommendation from the Striking Committee. Seventy members responded; all but two agreed to proceed by email and no one spoke against the recommendation. The Board was asked to confirm the recommendation.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT Mr. Jorge Sousa be appointed the student member of the Agenda Committee for the remainder of 2003-04.

Academic Board

The Striking Committee agreed that Mr. Paterson should be replaced by a full-time undergraduate student also from the professional faculties. A notice was placed in the *Varsity* and a notice of the vacancy was sent to members of the Governing Council and to the President of SAC. The Striking Committee would like to acknowledge the help of SAC in making the opportunity to sit on the Board known to its members.

1. Report of the Striking Committee (cont'd)

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT Ms Melissa De Jesus, Faculty of Nursing, be appointed to the Academic Board for the remainder of 2003-04, effective immediately.

The meeting moved to open session.

2. Reports of the Previous Meetings

The reports of the previous meetings, dated November 13 and November 24, 2003, were approved.

3. Faculty of Physical Education and Health: Constitution - Amendment

The Chair recalled that at the previous meeting debate on this item was adjourned. Dean Kidd had not been in attendance. The following motions were on the floor.

THAT the Constitution of the Faculty of Physical Education and Health, as amended, dated October 15, 2003, be approved.

THAT the amended constitution be referred back to the Faculty for further consideration.

The Chair noted that Dean Kidd was present today to speak to the matter and report on action taken since the last meeting. The Chair proposed that the motions on the floor be withdrawn and that the matter be re-introduced by Dean Kidd.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the motion to refer back be withdrawn.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the motion to approve the amendments dated October 15, 2003, be withdrawn.

Dean Kidd said that following the last meeting of the Board, a new proposed amendment was considered by the Faculty's Council. The members of the Board had expressed concern about the method of appointment of professors emeriti. It was now proposed that those professors emeriti who were interested in serving on Council so indicate to the Secretary and they would automatically become members of the Council.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the Constitution of the Faculty of Physical Education and Health, as amended, dated October 15, 2003, and December 10, 2003.

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

4. Report Number 110 of the Agenda Committee

The report was received for information.

A member noted that during discussion of academic administrative appointments, it was proposed that new ways of approving routine appointments be considered. She asked whether that had been done. The Chair replied that the Committee had not discussed the matter as yet.

5. *Stepping UP: A Framework for Academic Planning at the University of Toronto* (arising from Report Number 93 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Hillan reported that at its December 9 meeting the Planning and Budget Committee considered “*Stepping UP*” a document that would frame academic planning at this University for the next six years. Professor Neuman was applauded for an excellent outcome to an unusually inclusive and consultative process. Members were excited with the challenges presented in the document; its emphasis on forward thinking; its focus on equity and diversity; its linkages between excellence in research and excellence in teaching; its holistic view; its serious consideration of this tri-campus setting; and, the values articulated. Comments throughout a full discussion were enthusiastically and whole-heartedly supportive of the document, and approval was unanimous.

Professor Neuman presented *Stepping UP: A Framework for Academic Planning*, explaining the vision, mission, values and goals by means of a powerpoint presentation, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix “B”. Following a brief recounting of the full consultative process that led to the current plan, she spoke of the vision, the four elements of the mission statement, and the values supporting the mission. The presentation showed the relationship between the priorities and the goals, and gave the next steps which included revising the *Statement of Institutional Purpose*, developing divisional plans, reviewing and revising policies and procedures and regular reporting on progress towards the goals.

Professor Neuman also spoke to what was different about this plan from former plans. In this plan, there was

- greater emphasis on the student experience
- greater emphasis on excellent teaching in terms of faculty satisfaction and student experience
- the explicit inclusion of a statement on risk-taking
- emphasis on the importance of the university staff
- emphasis on planning beyond complement planning, in terms of developments in disciplines, curricula and outreach
- a strengthened commitment to diversity.

The Chair thanked Professor Neuman for her presentation and opened the floor to debate.

A member noted that what was missing from the planning document was any recognition of the value of what she referred to as “knowledge translation” – for example, membership on CIHR committees, editors of journals, policy formulation, grant panel memberships, etc. Because this faculty role was not mentioned, she wondered whether it was no longer valued. Professor Neuman responded that a number of matters were not explicitly mentioned in the plan but there was no implication that those activities should stop. One of the University’s priorities was to share knowledge and the knowledge translation described by the member was an implied part of that activity. The member said that no recognition was given by the University to faculty who engage in these activities and a number of bodies were having trouble recruiting people to serve. She noted her understanding that some faculty who did this service were penalized in the PTR scheme. Professor Goel said that service to the academic community was recognized in the faculty’s PTR compensation scheme and it was a

5. *Stepping UP: A Framework for Academic Planning at the University of Toronto* (cont'd)

departmental decision about what would be included for recognition in that service. The President commented that community service was something everybody was expected to do without reward.

A member believed that the section on excellence, equity and diversity, beginning on page 29, was unclear and he was concerned about its impact on readers from the general public. For example, the report referred to Companion Paper 6, when it should be 5, and the meaning of the title “excellence x equity: equity and diversity” was a mystery. This was not a proper equation. He suggested the title be made more transparent. Professor Neuman agreed that there was an error in the number of the report and that it would be corrected. She said that the phrase to which he referred had started with an equal sign, but other individuals had suggested the colon would be better. The Chair noted that members of the University community had appeared to understand the meaning of the phrase in the various consultations undertaken leading to the drafting of the final report.

A member asked how the divisions would be judged to be following the *Framework* document. Professor Neuman replied that accountability and budgeting would be the tools to chart progress. Annual evaluations would be undertaken whereby she would review with the deans their progress on completing their plans. Budgeting decisions would also depend on progress made. There would be benchmarks established and questions would be asked on how the divisions were progressing, what had been accomplished, what had not been done, why not, and what changes should be made to meet the goals.

A member asked whether the priorities in this document should be seen as overarching priorities and that, if current policies seemed to be inconsistent with the goals, the *Framework* document should be used to override the policies. Professor Neuman indicated that part of the planning process was to review policies that appeared to be inconsistent and to bring forward amendments. Current policies continued to be in force. The Chair encouraged members to bring to the attention of the administration policies that might not be consistent with the new plan. Amendments to policies would come forward to the various committees in governance in the usual manner.

A member commended the emphasis on the student experience and asked whether the administration would be consulting with the campus-wide student governments such as the Students' Administrative Council, the Graduate Students' Union or the Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students. Professor Neuman said that the process did emphasize student consultation. As the divisions draft their plans, they had been asked to include student input in the process.

A member said that he had noted an apparent conflict between the *Framework* and current policy in the area of excellence, equity and diversity. He said that there were currently problems in the United States in selection processes and legal challenges where diversity and merit were in conflict. He wondered whether there was an implication that funding would be withheld if equity and diversity were judged insufficient. Professor Neuman explained that this University's notion of fostering diversity through excellence and equity was not the American version of affirmative action. She assumed his reference was to the lawsuits at the University of Michigan where preference was given to certain students because of their race by means of a point system with respect to admissions. That was not the University of Toronto's philosophy. The *Framework's* emphasis was on expanding the pool from which the choices of new faculty, students and staff were made. If the University recruited internationally and made the pool broader and deeper and then recruited for excellence, diversity should follow. These procedures were consistent with current policy. Departments were asked to advertise broadly. Part of the approval process for new appointments was to explain what actions had been taken to broaden the pool. The member believed that this

5. ***Stepping UP: A Framework for Academic Planning at the University of Toronto*** (cont'd)

process of using the goal of diversity to defend preferential hiring was contrary to the notion of hiring for merit.

A member found it troubling that equity and diversity were being questioned. He noted that the University had come a long way in past years but it was not where it should be yet. He applauded directions outlined in the *Framework* document.

A member referred to the objective of increasing the time to tenure. This was mentioned on page 27 and required an amendment to the current policy. The member asked for an explanation of the rationale behind this objective. Professor Neuman said that current policy required faculty to be considered for tenure at the end of five years. That meant that the preparation of the dossier would begin at the completion of the fourth year. Other universities had a longer period to tenure, ranging from 6 – 10 years. Four years was not thought long enough for young faculty to put together a research program that involved risk-taking and that produced a meaningful result. In many cases, tenure was considered on the basis of incomplete work and a second guessing of the faculty member's research promise. Second guessing, if wrong, could produce long-term problems for the departments and divisions concerned. It was proposed that the time to tenure be increased to give the faculty members an opportunity to produce results and to give the administration an opportunity to award tenure on the basis of demonstrated excellence. In response to a question, Professor Neuman said that the administration and the Faculty Association were in the process of setting up committees to look at a number of policy issues.

A member commented that he would like to see more emphasis on internationalization. Peer universities were highlighting this area not only in research but also in teaching. There was much to do at this University. A study of practices at peer institutions and benchmarking would help the University improve in this area. Another member added that student recruitment and internationalization were important. The University was part of a diverse city. She suggested that there were opportunities for all constituencies – students, staff and alumni – to be involved. She hoped there would be qualitative measures, as well as quantitative ones, to measure success.

A member, an employee since 1972, applauded the emphasis on the importance of the administrative staff in achieving the University's goals. It was the first time she had seen such an explicit acknowledgement of the efforts of the staff.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

Subject to the understanding that, in due course, the President and the Vice-Presidents will bring forward for consideration by the Governing Council or its appropriate board or committee:

- (a) proposals to implement the new academic plan, including but not limited to, revisions to the *Statement of Institutional Purpose*;
- (b) summary reports on divisional academic plans and recommendations for resource allocations in support of these plans; and
- (c) periodic reports on the University's and academic divisions' progress toward achieving the goals defined in their academic plans,

THAT the key priorities and the framework for planning as outlined in pages 1 to 35 of ***Stepping UP: A Framework for Academic Planning at the University of Toronto – 2004-2010***, dated November 27, 2003, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "C", be approved in principle.

6. Capital Project: University of Toronto at Scarborough – Science Laboratory Upgrades – Project Planning Report
(arising from Report Number 93 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Hillan noted that this proposal for an upgrade to the Science Laboratories at UTSC was the first phase of a four-phase plan to expand facilities for science-based programs at UTSC. The renovations were urgently needed and would be financed from a combination of provincial government funding (formerly SuperBuild 2002) and Enrolment Growth Funds.

There were no questions.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

1. THAT the Project Planning Report for the Renovation and Expansion of Science Facilities at the University of Toronto at Scarborough, Phase 1 2003-04: Science Teaching Laboratories, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix “D”, be approved in principle.
2. THAT the project scope of renovation of six chemistry teaching laboratories and eleven biology teaching laboratories, and associated mechanical systems and preparation areas, be approved at a cost not to exceed \$4,300,000 with the funding sources as follows:

i) Provincial Government Funding	\$1,830,000
(previously identified as SuperBuild 2002)	
ii) Mortgage to be repaid from Enrolment Growth Funds	<u>\$2,470,000</u>
	<u>\$4,300,000</u>

7. Capital Project: University College Residence – Changes in Project Cost, Sources of Funding and a Change in Scope
(arising from Report Number 93 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Hillan recalled that the *Policy on Capital Planning and Capital Projects* required that the Planning and Budget Committee consider for approval in principle any significant change in project cost or a change in the project’s scope. There had been a small change of scope in this capital project and a marked change in project cost. The former was as a result of a request by the major donor that Ferguson Dining Hall be air-conditioned to provide for all-season functionality and accessibility. The latter arose out of what the Committee learned were unusual and inexplicable circumstances, wherein the tenders ranged from 19% to 35.4% higher than the pre-estimate that had been provided last year by the same company who had submitted the highest tender price.

She said that there had been considerable discussion about the large variance between pre-estimate and tendered prices, external support for and fund-raising successes related to the project, and the unlikelihood that costs would increase beyond this approval.

The Chair referred to a comment in the documentation:

...there exists a number of very important projects that should preferably be initiated in the near future and for which it is unlikely that external funding can be identified and secured. These projects include the modest renovation of the recently acquired Board of Education property at 155 College Street [for the Faculty of Nursing and departments within the Faculty of Medicine], the creation of the Multi-faith Centre on the St. George Campus and other important priority projects that will compete for the limited borrowing available.

7. Capital Project: University College Residence – Changes in Project Cost, Sources of Funding and a Change in Scope (cont'd)

He understood that the University had reached its limit on borrowing and he asked whether the University could undertake more capital projects in those circumstances.

Professor Neuman said that the issue of borrowing for capital projects was a complex one. Last spring, Mr. Chee, Vice-President, Business Affairs, had proposed a conservative estimate of borrowing capacity based on the University's net assets. Last year, the stock market had been such that the value of the University's assets had declined by \$400 million. The University could, of course, borrow more if it was willing to pay higher interest. Recently, the University had been able to finance a 40-year debenture at less than 6 per cent, a very good rate. In summary, she noted that the \$620 million borrowing ceiling was conservative, the net assets had improved and a preferential interest rate was available. In terms of capital projects, each was receiving careful scrutiny and the administration was asking whether the project could be done, whether it should be done and how would it be financed. Her office was working closely with Mr. Chee's office and a solid information base was being established. In this particular case, it was determined that the project could go ahead only if University College was able to raise more funds to support the project. The company who had provided the pre-estimate was unable to give an explanation of why the tenders came in far above the original estimate given by it. In response to a question, Professor Neuman said that the administration was not considering taking action against the company who gave the poor pre-estimate.

In response to another question about the funding status for the Multi-Faith Centre, Professor Neuman noted that the University had received a pledge from a donor in one faith on the condition that other faith groups also contribute. The University was seeking matching funds from the three other faiths involved. As a result of the process of scrutinizing the list of capital projects, the much reduced list still included the Multi-Faith Centre which was seen as a very important project.

Professor Perron, Principal of University College, noted that the new residence was an extremely important project for the College. It had galvanized the students, staff and alumni. Fundraising had more than doubled and efforts were focusing on a number of student services.

A member asked about the future of capital projects. Professor Neuman replied that the administration would be looking at the priorities as provided by the academic divisions. Projects would be rigorously reviewed in terms of what the University could do. Funding would be drawn together from a number of sources and would need to be secure before the project could proceed. The capital building program would not come to a halt but a new process was in place. It was not good enough to fund a project with a mortgage without thinking about how the mortgage would be paid.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDED

1. THAT the minor change of scope to the approved Project Planning Report for the new University College Residence to air-condition the Dining Hall and Drama Studio, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "E", be approved in principle.

7. **Capital Project: University College Residence – Changes in Project Cost, Sources of Funding and a Change in Scope** (cont'd)

2. THAT the revised funding arrangements, including furnishings and finance costs, for the University College residence expansion be approved at an estimated cost of \$28,000,000 with the funding as follows:
- (i) \$10,000,000 from donations received and pledged from externally secured contributions,
 - (ii) An additional \$1,500,000 to be secured from additional external fund-raising by University College.
 - (iii) \$1,485,000 contribution from the UC residence ancillary
 - (iv) \$800,000 contribution provided by the UC food service ancillary
 - (v) \$50,000 allocation from the University Investment Infrastructure Fund in support of space for the Drama Program.
 - (vi) A mortgage in the amount of \$14,165,000 to be amortized over a period of 25 years and to be repaid by University College from residence revenues and the UC ancillary.

8. **Faculty of Medicine: Proposal to Disestablish the Undergraduate Department of Anatomy and Cell Biology**
(arising from Report Number 93 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Hillan said that the Committee recommended on the disestablishment of departments. There were no financial implications to this proposed disestablishment and the Committee had had no questions.

A member asked why the Department was being disestablished. Professor Zaky responded that the faculty and staff from this Department had moved to other departments such as Surgery and those departments had taken over the teaching activities for anatomy and cell biology. The Department no longer existed as such. In answer to a member's question, it was noted that there were no undergraduate students taking programs in this department. The Department had supported the Doctor of Medicine and other programs in the Faculty which its members would continue to do from within other departments.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the Undergraduate Department of Anatomy and Cell Biology be disestablished effective January 1, 2004.

Documentation is attached hereto as Appendix "F".

9. **Items for Information**

- (a) Report of the Vice-President and Provost
 - (i) Long-Range Budget Guidelines

Professor Neuman said that the new provincial government was in the process of defining its higher education strategies. The Quality Assurance Fund was still in place and appeared to be stable. The administration believed that there would be replacement funding for funding lost due to the tuition freeze but the formula for such funding was not known. She also noted that the government was contemplating a review of formula funding. If the University did not receive any new funding, it would be in financial difficulty. However, strategies to deal with any shortfall were being considered and they would probably be implemented in the middle years of the new six-year plan.

9. Items for Information (cont'd)

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

(i) Long-Range Budget Guidelines (cont'd)

The Budget Guidelines would be presented to the Planning and Budget Committee in March.

(ii) Appointments and Status Changes / Appointment of Professors Emeriti

The above item was presented for information. There were no questions.

(b) Items for Information in Report Number 93 of the Planning and Budget Committee

Professor Hillan had no comments on the information items and members had no questions.

(c) Report Number 104 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs

Professor Smith had no comments on the information items.

A member, referring to the report from the Office of Teaching Advancement, said that he had heard from a number of graduate students of the good work being done by this Office.

(d) Reports Number 283 to 288 of the Academic Appeals Committee

The reports was presented for information. There were no questions.

(e) Report of Donations over \$250,000, August to October, 2003

This report was presented for information. There were no questions.

10. Date of Next Meeting

The Chair noted that the next regular meeting of the Board would be held on February 26, 2004.

11. Other Business

A member asked whether the budgets for the equity offices would receive the same budget cuts as the academic units. Professor Hildyard noted that the administrative units were assigned the same percentage budget cuts as the academic units. However, the equity offices were not all within the same budget envelope. Implementation of budget cuts was the responsibility of the relevant division head. She reported that Professors Farrar and Goel and she would be reviewing the structure of the equity offices; bringing them together might be one option. The member said that bringing them together would add to the transparency. A member asked whether this question bordered on micromanagement. The original member noted that the academic and administrative units were fundamental units of the University and in times of financial troubles, transparency concerning budget reductions was important.

A member asked if the Disestablishment of the Department of Anatomy and Cell Biology would be a consent agenda item at Governing Council. The Chair responded that that decision was one that would be considered by the Executive Committee.

12. Academic Administrative Appointments

The following academic administrative appointments were approved:

FACULTY OF ARCHITECTURE, LANDSCAPE, AND DESIGN

Professor George Baird Dean from July 1, 2004 to June 30, 2008

FACULTY OF ARTS AND SCIENCE*Department of Botany*

Professor Rowan Sage Acting Chair from January 15, 2004 to June 30, 2004

SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

Professor Sandra Acker Associate Dean, Division II, from January 15, 2004 to June 30, 2007

FACULTY OF MEDICINE*Department of Medical Genetics and Microbiology*

Professor Brenda Andrews Interim Chair from February 2, 2004 to June 30, 2004

Department of Physical Therapy

Professor Katherine Berg Chair from July 1, 2004 to June 30, 2009

TRANSITIONAL YEAR PROGRAMME

Professor Rona Abramovitch Director from July 1, 2004 to June 30, 2009 (re-appointment)

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO AT SCARBOROUGH*Department of Computer and Mathematical Sciences*

Professor John Scherk Interim Chair from February 1, 2004 to June 30, 2004

Department of Social Sciences

Professor John Miron Interim Chair from January 15, 2004 to June 30, 2004

The meeting adjourned at 5:40 p.m.

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, Deputy Provost and Vice-Provost, Faculty
 Professor C. Tuohy, Vice-President, Policy Development and Associate Provost
 Professor R. Abramovitch
 Professor D. Affonso
 Mr. S. Aggarwal
 Professor D. Allen
 Professor G. Allen
 Professor M. Beattie
 Mr. M. Bonham
 Professor P. Byer
 Professor P. Catton
 Professor S. Choudhry
 Professor D. Clandfield
 Mr. J. Cohen
 Mr. C. Davis
 Ms M. De Jesus
 Professor L. De Nil
 Professor R. Deber
 Professor M. Diamond
 Professor J. Donaldson
 Professor R. Elliott
 Dr. I. Elliston
 Ms A. Emam
 Professor F. Fich
 Professor J. Furedy
 Professor J. Gaskell
 Ms R. Ghosh
 Professor A. Gotlieb
 Professor A. Haasz
 Professor P. Halpern
 Professor E. Hillan
 Professor W. Hindmarsh
 Ms L. Honeywell
 Ms B. Horne
 Professor S. Horton
 Professor M. Hutcheon
 Mr. M. Hyreza
 Professor M.Y. Johnson
 Professor A. Johnston
 Professor B. Kidd
 Professor R. Kluger
 Ms L.A. Lavack
 Professor R. Lewis
 Professor L. Loeb
 Professor M. Marrus

Professor D. Massam
 Ms S. McDonald
 Ms V. Melnyk
 Professor D. Mock
 Ms C. Moore
 Professor M. O'Neill-Karch
 Professor I. Orchard
 Ms T. Pazonis
 Professor P. Perron
 Professor S. Pfeiffer
 Mr. C. Ramsaroop
 Professor C. Regehr
 Professor J. Reilly
 Professor R. Reisz
 Professor L. Richards
 Professor J. Rosenfield
 Professor J. Scherk
 Professor B. Sherwood Lollar
 Professor K.-L. Shun
 Professor A. Sinclair
 Professor P. Sinervo
 Professor B. C. Smith
 Professor J. J. B. Smith
 Miss M. Somerville
 Mr. J. Sousa
 Mr. N. Turk-Browne
 Professor T. Venetsanopoulos
 Professor M. Williams

Non-voting Member:

Mr. L. R. Charpentier

Non-voting Assessors:

Professor D. Farrar, Vice-Provost, Students
 Professor A. Hildyard, Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity
 Professor R. Venter, Vice-Provost, Space and Facilities Planning
 Professor S. Zaky, Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget

Secretariat:

Ms S. Girard, Secretary
 Ms C. Oke

Absent:

Mr. S. Ahmed
 Professor S. Aster
 Professor J. Barber
 Dr. M. Barrie
 Professor N. Bascia

Professor D. Beach
Professor C. Beghtol
Mr. F. Bellaurdo
Dr. T. Blake
Professor R. Bryan
Professor N. Camerman
Professor J. Challis
Professor M. Chipman
Professor F. Cunningham
Mr. B. Davis
Dr. S. Graham Fell
Ms R. Fernandes
Mr. S. Forbes
Mr. J. Fraser
Professor E. Freeman
Professor R. Geist
Ms B. Goldberg
Professor D. Goring

Professor M. Gotlieb
Professor H. Gunz
Ms M. Jackman
Professor J. Jenkins
Professor G. Kerr (on leave)
Professor B. Langille
Professor J. Lepock
Professor J. MacDonald
Professor R. Martin
Professor M. McGowan
Professor C. Misak
Mr. S. Morley
Professor D. Naylor
Professor B. Sampson
Ms C. Seymour
Professor D. Thiessen
Ms F. Turgeon

In Attendance:

Ms S. Drummond, Assistant Provost and Special Assistant to the Vice-President and
Provost
Dr. B. FitzPatrick, Assistant Vice-President and Director, Office of the President