

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL
REPORT NUMBER 127 OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD

April 8, 2004

To the Governing Council,
University of Toronto.

Your Board reports that it held a meeting on Thursday, April 8, 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 4, 5 and 6 are recommended to Governing Council for approval, item 7 is presented for 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.

1. Report of the Previous Meeting

The report of the previous meeting, dated February 26, 2004, was approved.

2. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting

The Chair recalled that a member had asked questions about Report 105 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs at the last meeting and Chair of the Committee had undertaken to respond. The member had been given a response.

In response to a question from a member, the Chair confirmed that quorum was present.

3. Report Number 112 of the Agenda Committee

The report was received for information.

4. *Long-Range Budget Framework, Guidelines and Projections, 2004-05 to 2009-10*
(arising from Report Number 95 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

The Chair reported that the Agenda Committee had discussed the presentation of the next two items. Since the Board was receiving both the *Long-Range Budget Framework* for a new six-year planning period and the first budget report of the same period, the introduction for both items would overlap. The Committee had, therefore, asked Professor Goel to give a combined introduction of the next two items – the budget framework and the 2004-05 budget.

Following the presentation, Professor Gotlieb would report from the Planning and Budget Committee and move the motion for the budget framework. Following debate of the framework and a vote on the motion, Professor Gotlieb would report on the budget report and move that motion. Debate on the budget report would be followed by a vote on that motion.

4. *Long-Range Budget Framework, Guidelines and Projections, 2004-05 to 2009-10*
(cont'd)

Professor Goel gave his presentation on both this item and the Budget Report. A copy of his presentation is attached hereto as Appendix "A". The highlights of the budget framework were as follows:

- the current financial situation was not dissimilar to previous occasions, including that facing the University in 1919
- the multi-year budgeting was a useful tool which allowed for planning and for managing financial affairs in a fiscally responsible manner
- the long-range budget framework allowed larger variances during the intervening years as long as the last year had a balanced budget and the accumulated deficit did not exceed 1.5 percent of gross operating revenue
- the assumptions were the base case and did not contain significant revenue not already assured
- there were no changes to the enrolment assumptions; undergraduate intake would decrease slightly after the double cohort and graduate enrolment would increase modestly
- revenue assumptions included the continuance of current programs and replacement funding for the loss of revenue from a tuition freeze.

The President reported on the government announcement that had been made that morning which provided funding to offset the lost revenue from a tuition freeze. Funding would be provided at the rate of 1.4 percent of the increase in regulated tuition fees and 5.6 percent of the increase in de-regulated fees; whether that was based on each University's mix of students or on a system level was unknown at this time. There would be no replacement of the 30 percent of revenue from increased tuition fees that would have been set aside for student aid. The loss of \$4.5 million at this University for student support would be unfortunate. The government perhaps believed that without rising tuition fees the students would not need funding for student aid. Access to university might be affected as a result of the loss of this funding. Professor Goel clarified that the announcement about the replacement funding was for the first year of the tuition freeze only. It was the University's assumption that the funding would be base funding. The University would be advocating for base funding for the current and subsequent years.

Professor Goel continued with his presentation:

- tuition fees for international students would rise by 5 percent this year and subsequently rise to bring this revenue in line with that provided by domestic students; these students would be providing revenue at the rate of the national average of government funding per student plus the domestic students' tuition fees
- assumptions for expenses included a two percent increase in salaries and benefits after 2004-05, enrolment growth revenue would continue to be shared with the divisions and 30 percent of increased tuition revenue would be set aside if domestic tuition was increased
- the six-year projections showed that over the period revenue would increase by \$251 million while expenses increased by \$347 million; expense reductions were necessary to exit the planning period within the policy parameters
- the larger cost containment measures would be applied later in the six-year budget period to allow for planning and advocacy efforts in the earlier years
- revenue sources included 44 percent from government grants, 34 percent from tuition, 11 percent from divisional revenue and other sources 11 percent; expenses included 66 percent of funding to the academic divisions including \$30 million for academic planning initiatives and about \$51 million for enrolment growth funding, academic services received 6 percent, student assistance 9 percent, administrative expenses were 6.5 percent and all other costs were 13 percent
- significant increases in expenses included pension costs, a deferred maintenance fund and debt service on funding borrowed to undertake the capital expansion

4. *Long-Range Budget Framework, Guidelines and Projections, 2004-05 to 2009-10*
(cont'd)

- some expenses were increasing faster than inflation
- to keep the deficit within the policy guidelines, base budget expense reduction percentages would be incorporated in the budgets beginning with 2004-05 of 2, 2, 5, 2, 2, and 3 percent
- advocacy efforts to increase the level of government funding would, of course, continue throughout the planning period.

Professor Goel then turned to the budget for 2004-05:

- total revenue for 2004-05 was expected to increase by \$105.1 million but expenses were expected to rise by \$129.4 million
- among the increases in revenue was a \$40.9 million increase in tuition fee revenue; although there would be a fee freeze, the increased revenue was created by a larger number of students paying fees
- in summary, the budget was a prudent one with a realistic expense projection and no unduly optimistic revenue assumptions; the 2 percent budget reduction (\$10.5 million) would allow the delay of larger reductions, while planning and advocacy continued.

The Chair thanked Professor Goel for his presentation and invited Professor Gotlieb to present the *Long-Range Budget Framework* from the Planning and Budget Committee.

Professor Gotlieb said that the Committee had received a detailed presentation of the *Framework* from Professor Goel and that the members had had a lengthy discussion of the assumptions, dealing with them one by one. The administration had provided the answers to all queries and the members were comfortable recommending approval of the *Framework* document.

A member noted that international graduate students were a very important part of the graduate research effort. He asked if the proposed tuition fee increase applied to international graduate students. Professor Goel said that the increase would apply primarily to professional program and undergraduate students. The graduate funding package would cover tuition fees in any event.

A member asked about the history of administrative costs, currently shown as 6.5 percent. How did it compare to past levels? Professor Goel said that administrative support had been declining as a percentage of the budget because that sector did not receive significant revenue from enrolment growth. The budget had grown from \$1 billion to \$1.4 billion without significant increase in administrative support budgets. In response to the member's second question, Professor Goel said that the equity officers' budgets were primarily in the administrative budgets.

A member spoke in defense of administrative divisions. Although administrative divisions did not receive increased funding from enrolment growth, they were expected to provide services to an increased number of students. It was not possible to reduce the number of staff; they were providing essential services such as police or student services. As the number of students increased, without new funding, the level of service might decrease. The administrative staff were carrying the burden of the budget reductions. The first member noted that his original question had been for information purposes only. He agreed that these were difficult time for administration. The President noted that over the last 5 years, administrative costs had declined as a percentage of the operating budget. In other words, the academic divisions had received \$13 million more as a result of the administrative cost containments. Another member suggested that protecting the administrative staff was important. In departments, the loss of administrative staff had

4. *Long-Range Budget Framework, Guidelines and Projections, 2004-05 to 2009-10*
(cont'd)

led to downloading administrative functions to faculty members making them not as efficient or productive.

In response to a member's question about flow through of tuition increases, Professor Goel explained that, for example, as students change programs from the general first-year Arts and Science program to a commerce program in second year, the fee increased.

A member noted that the University was assuming a 2 percent increase in inflation and he wondered what would happen to the assumptions if the rate were higher. Professor Goel said that this was the best available economic forecast. It was not a major variable, and if it rose, as it was included on both the expense and revenue side, provisions would be made. The administration would bring new assumptions to governance, if necessary, annually.

A member asked about the effects of unexpected events such as the possible abolition of mandatory retirement. She also asked if zero-based budgeting had been considered. Current budgets seemed to provide funding for innovative new programs but not for sustaining older quality programs. Professor Goel reported that there has been some modeling of the effects that the abolition of mandatory retirement might have on the budget. With respect to zero-based budgeting, he said that a working group of principals and deans would be established to review the overall budget process. The current model of budget generation had been instituted when there had been largely one major source of revenue – government grants – and one major expense – salaries. Times had changed and new approaches should be assessed.

A member referred to the costs of energy as a driver of inflation. He said that the University consisted of a large number of old buildings in need of repair. For example, the Architecture building was soon to have a new roof. It could be insulated at the same time and lead to less energy consumption. A modest outlay in repairs could lead to substantial savings. Professor Goel agreed and said that there was funding set aside in the budget for deferred maintenance. The University would be looking at the utilities infrastructure to reduce costs. Professor Venter recalled that Ms Riggall had highlighted the issues in her report on deferred maintenance, *Crumbling Foundations*. He also referred to faculty initiatives such as the Environmental Protection Advisory Committee, led by Professor Byer, which was considering energy issues. He encouraged other faculty to undertake projects in this area.

A member, while recognizing the effort that had gone into drafting the budget framework, indicated his concern with the assumption that tuition fees for international students be increased by 5 percent. He was opposed to fee increases, particularly in this risky political situation. He recognized the need for increased revenue but he was concerned about the impact on international students. These students were not eligible for the student funding guarantee. The unexpected increase in fees might lead to more loans, not grants, and increased debt. He did not have an answer to the problem but he hoped that in a spirit of goodwill the tuition fee freeze could be extended to international students. Professor Goel explained that the increase would include the usual protections for students already in program. The students would receive financial support and there was funding for recruiting international students. Data from other universities indicated that the tuition fees at this University were among the lowest for international students. Revenue from domestic students was subsidizing the costs of international students. The Dean of Arts and Science spoke in support of the need to increase the fees. International students were important to the Faculty and at the graduate level there was no barrier to their integration in graduate study and research. At the undergraduate level, however, the situation vis-à-vis their education costs had gotten out of line. Revenues from domestic

4. *Long-Range Budget Framework, Guidelines and Projections, 2004-05 to 2009-10*
(cont'd)

students were being used to cover the costs of educating the international students. If the government provided the proper funding for international students there would not be a problem.

A member asked what percentage of the international students came from affluent countries. Professor Goel said that many of the undergraduate students came from affluent countries. The member who raised the issue said that he was encouraged by the discussion but he still had concerns.

A member recalled that the Prime Minister had made a statement that qualified students should not be denied a university education. He asked if there had been any provisions in the federal budget to support his comment. The President reported the creation of the Canada Learning Bonds program for families with incomes under \$35,000. They would receive a \$500 bond per child, born after 2003, that would grow by \$100 per year for 15 years to a total of \$2000. Another provision concerned the introduction of a grant for first-year, low income (under \$35,000) students. This grant would cover up to one-half of the cost of tuition up to a maximum of \$3000. He recalled that the provincial government had promised in its election platform to cover the costs of one-half of the cost of tuition for 10 percent of the bottom income students for four years. If both programs went ahead, full tuition would be covered for the most needy. He also hoped that there would be changes to the Ontario Student Assistance Program (OSAP). On the negative side, because of the tuition freeze, 30 percent of the fee increase revenue would not be available for student financial aid, a loss of \$4.5 million.

The Chair invited Professor George Luste, President of the University of Toronto Faculty Association, to address the Board. Professor Luste shared the concern about the financial situation of the University, particularly with respect to the problems arising from the pension plan deficit. It was currently amortized at \$26.5 million but he expected the deficit to become even larger in the next few years.

The Chair noted that there were large budget reductions called for in the *Framework* and he wondered whether the divisions could absorb them. Professor Goel explained that the divisions would be getting increased funding but not enough to cover the projected increased expenses. As such, the reduction measures should be more properly cast as cost containment measures. Without growth in the revenue, this process would be very difficult for some divisions. The divisions would not be able to do everything they want to. Over six years, 16 percent would have to be taken off the base if there were no increase in revenue.

A member said that the Board should be very clear about the impact of the cost containment measures. Without increased revenue, very difficult choices would be made. Some very good academic units might have to be closed. The University should focus its attention and advocacy efforts on finding new revenue sources. Another member explained that a 16 percent reduction without new revenues would mean that of the upcoming 195 retirements in his division, a quarter of the complement, the division would not be able to replace a single person. And yet the quality of the undergraduate and graduate programs had to be maintained and, if possible, improved. It would be very difficult.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the Long-Range Budget Framework, Guidelines and Projects, 2005-05 to 2009-10, pages 1-11 inclusive, dated March 2, 2004, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "B", be approved.

5. ***Budget Report, 2004-05***
(arising from Report Number 96 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Gotlieb said that the Committee had reviewed the budget over two meetings. On March 2nd, it had completed a careful review of that part of the budget not subject to reductions – the Contractual Obligations and Policy Commitments. On March 16th, it had reviewed the budget as a whole. The reports of the Committee gave the details of the debate. While the matter of tuition was in the jurisdiction of the Business Board, the Committee did hear from an international student, who addressed the assumption about raising the tuition fees for international students by 5 percent. At the conclusion of the debate, the Committee recommended approval of the Budget Report.

A member referred to a letter addressed to President Birgeneau and Dean Gaskell from the University of Toronto Employees, Associations and Unions (UTEAU) concerning the proposed budget cut of 15 percent to be applied for 2004-05 to the OISE/UT budget. A paragraph in the letter referred to the human costs of administrative staff cutbacks as the quick fix to deficits. He said that layoffs destroyed lives, broke up families and ruined communities. The actual workload for the remaining staff increased. He asked how many staff members would lose their jobs. He said that the quality of education would suffer. With respect to the increase in tuition fees for international students, he did not agree with the argument put forward for justifying the increase; it pit one group of students against another. Professor Goel responded that revenues University-wide were increasing by \$251 million; expenses were, however, increasing by a larger amount. It was expected there would be a re-alignment of jobs. Staff reductions, when necessary, were made primarily through attrition of vacancies, not layoffs. On the international student tuition fee issue, he re-iterated that guarantees were in place for in-program students.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the Budget Report, 2004-05, dated March 16, 2004, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix “C”, be approved.

6. **School of Graduate Studies: Proposal for a Joint Collaborative Doctoral Program in Ancient Greek and Roman History with York University**
(arising from Report Number 107 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs and Report Number 95 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Smith said that the Committee considered a proposal for a joint doctoral program with York University in the area of Ancient Greek and Roman History. The Department of Classics at this University and the Graduate Program in History at York proposed to make available one of the largest and best concentrations of specialists in the field in North America. The new joint program would be far better than its individual parts. Administrative costs in the form of release time for the director of the program would alternate between the two universities. Members of the Committee had been concerned about the potential for excessive traveling between the universities and were assured that this would be kept to a minimum.

Professor Gotlieb, reporting on the planning and resource implications, on behalf of the Planning and Budget Committee, noted that the expected increased enrolment in the Department of Classics could be accommodated within the Department’s approved growth targets and the administrative costs of the program would alternate between the two universities and could be met within existing budgets.

6. School of Graduate Studies: Proposal for a Joint Collaborative Doctoral Program in Ancient Greek and Roman History with York University (cont'd)

A member asked whether there was a potential for disproportionate enrolment at one university and a possible drain on its resources. The Dean of the School of Graduate Studies and the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Science responded that the program would be an elite one with a small enrolment that would be monitored carefully by its directors. It was noted that currently graduate students were allowed to take courses at other institutions and their thesis supervisors could also be from another university.

A member expressed his enthusiasm for joint programs with other universities. It was a great way to strengthen the University's programs. Professor Goel agreed that it was an example of innovation that his Office would be looking for in the divisional planning process. On their own, the individual units would not reach the international standard that they could as a joint program.

A member commented on the disparity of graduate student funding between this University and York University. Professor Goel replied that the students would be admitted by one or the other of the universities and the policies of their home university would apply.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the proposal for a Joint University of Toronto – York University Collaborative Doctoral Program in Ancient Greek and Roman History as specified in the letter and attached proposal from the School of Graduate Studies, dated January 30, 2004, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "D", be approved.

7. Faculty of Medicine: Constitution Amendments

The Chair said that Dean Naylor was not able to be present at this meeting. He welcomed Mr. David Keeling, who had been the Chief Administrative Officer of the Faculty when the constitution changes were being prepared.

A member understood that the efficient operation of the Faculty Council had been curtailed because the current structure was unwieldy. He also understood that the faculty and the students were supportive of the new structure as proposed. However, he was concerned by the magnitude of the changes. There would be a 50 percent reduction in the number of faculty on Council and 37 percent fewer student members. He was sympathetic of the need for change as he had knowledge of another division's council which was not functioning well in his opinion. The Faculty of Medicine proposed disbanding the Faculty Assembly of nearly 5,000 members because it was difficult to obtain quorum. A method for dealing with faculty issues that would have been taken care of by the Assembly had been proposed. He thought the changes would set a precedence and a full debate was needed. He proposed a review of the process at the end of the first year. Professor Goel thanked the member for giving notice of this comments. They had been discussed with the Dean. He noted that the Faculty prided itself on constantly reviewing its procedures. The intent of the changes had been to make the governance of the Faculty more democratic. The Faculty Assembly of 5,000 was required to meet twice a year. It had been struck in the past in response to issues of those days, and when the number of faculty members was much smaller. New procedures for having faculty issues brought to the attention of the Council had been provided. There were currently 230 members on Council; quorum was hard to attain. Professor Goel indicated that the Dean

7. Faculty of Medicine: Constitution Amendments (cont'd)

would be pleased to report to the Board on progress in implementing the new system at the end of two years. The member thanked Professor Goel for that assurance.

A member asked about the procedures for bringing specific faculty issues to the attention of Council. Mr. Keeling noted that the procedures were outlined in the by-laws of the Faculty and included a three-step resolution process that provided for submission to the Speaker and Dean, the possibility of a special meeting of Council, and finally, if still unresolved, the issue could be submitted to the Provost and the Academic Board for final resolution. A member asked about clarification of a specific provision of the process and the Chair noted that the by-laws could be amended by the Faculty Council.

A member congratulated the Faculty in devising a governance structure that was responsive to change. When it was seen that the structure was not working well, the Faculty had undertaken to make changes to improve it. Good governance was a goal of the *Stepping UP* planning process.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

The constitution of the Faculty of Medicine, as amended dated November 10, 2003.

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

8. Items for Information

(a) Report of the Vice-President and Provost

(i) Academic Planning

Professor Goel reported that the academic planning process was continuing. Central initiatives were being discussed. Principals and Deans had recently met to discuss the establishment of the teaching academy. Methods of allocating the \$30 million Academic Initiatives Fund were being reviewed. The academic divisional plans were expected to be submitted in the summer and recommendations for allocations would be considered in the fall.

(ii) Clinical Faculty

Professor Goel recalled that last year at this time, clinical faculty issues had been before the Board. The immediate issue of funding arrangements had been implemented last year by the practice plans and hospitals independent of the University. Dispute resolution procedures, the other issue brought to the attention of the Board, had been put in place but the University did not have a defined role in issues of academic freedom. The issue of academic freedom for clinical colleagues had been of interest to the University but there was no clear idea of how the University's role in this process would be served. There was a vote underway by the clinical faculty as to whether they wished to be governed by the policies proposed by the Clinical Faculty Task Force or represented by the University of Toronto Faculty Association. The University would respect the results of the vote. It was expected to be completed by mid-April.

8. Items for Information (cont'd)

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

(iii) University Professors Selection Committee: Membership

The membership of the Selection Committee was provided for information.

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

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

(b) Items for Information in Reports Number 95 and 96 of the Planning and Budget Committee

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

(c) Items for Information in Reports Number 106 and 107 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs

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

9. Date of Next Meeting

The Chair noted that the next regular meeting of the Board would be held on May 6, 2004.

The Board moved *in camera*.

10. Academic Administrative Appointments

The following academic administrative appointments were approved:

FACULTY OF APPLIED SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING

Professor Steven Thorpe	Vice-Dean, Undergraduate from July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2008
-------------------------	---

FACULTY OF ARTS AND SCIENCE

Professor Anne Lancashire	Vice-Dean, Academic from July 1, 2004 to June 30, 2008
---------------------------	--

Centre for Medieval Studies

Professor Andrew Orchard	Director from July 1, 2004 to June 30, 2009
--------------------------	---

Department of French

Professor Janet Paterson	Chair, extension to June 30, 2004
--------------------------	-----------------------------------

Department of Mathematics

Professor John Bland	Chair from July 1, 2004 to June 30, 2010 (term is for 5 years, includes one year of research leave)
----------------------	---

10. Academic Administrative Appointments (cont'd)*Department for the Study of Religion*

Professor John S. Kloppenborg	Acting Chair from July 1, 2004 to December 31, 2004
-------------------------------	---

Department of Spanish and Portuguese

Professor Stephen J. Rupp	Chair, extension to June 30, 2004
---------------------------	-----------------------------------

SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

Professor Umberto De Boni	Associate Dean, Division IV, Life Sciences from July 1, 2004 to June 30, 2005 (re-appointment)
---------------------------	--

FACULTY OF MEDICINE

Department of Medicine

Professor Wendy Levinson	Chair from July 1, 2004 to June 30, 2009
--------------------------	--

FACULTY OF MUSIC

Professor Gage Averill	Dean from July 1, 2004 to June 30, 2011
------------------------	---

FACULTY OF PHARMACY

Graduate Department of Pharmaceutical Sciences

Dr. Rob Macgregor	Chair, extension to June 30, 2005
-------------------	-----------------------------------

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE

Professor Ian Radforth	Vice-Principal from July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004 (extension)
------------------------	---

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO AT MISSISSAUGA

Professor Cheryl Misak	Dean from April 8, 2004 to June 30, 2008
------------------------	--

The meeting adjourned at 6:05 p.m.

Secretary
April 12, 2004

Chair

Present:

Professor W. R. Cummins, Chair
 Professor B. Corman, Vice-Chair
 Professor R. J. Birgeneau, President
 Professor V. Goel, Interim Vice-
 President and Provost
 Professor J. Challis, Vice-President
 Research and Associate Provost
 Professor R. Venter, Vice-Provost,
 Space and Facilities
 Professor S. Zaky, Vice-Provost,
 Planning and Budget
 Professor R. Abramovitch
 Professor D. Affonso
 Mr. S. Aggarwal
 Mr. S. Ahmed
 Professor D. Allen
 Professor G. Allen
 Professor T. Blake
 Professor P. Byer
 Professor P. Catton
 Professor S. Choudhry
 Professor D. Clandfield
 Mr. J. Cohen
 Mr. B. Davis
 Professor L. De Nil
 Professor R. Deber
 Professor M. Diamond
 Professor J. Donaldson
 Dr. I. Elliston
 Ms A. Emam
 Dr. S. Graham Fell
 Professor F. Fich
 Mr. S. Forbes
 Professor J. Furedy
 Ms B. Goldberg
 Professor D. Goring
 Professor A. Gotlieb
 Professor H. Gunz
 Professor A. Haasz
 Professor E. Hillan
 Professor W. Hindmarsh
 Ms B. Horne
 Mr. M. Hyreza
 Ms M. Jackman
 Professor J. Jenkins
 Professor A. Johnston
 Professor B. Kidd
 Professor R. Kluger
 Ms L.A. Lavack
 Professor M. Marrus
 Professor D. Massam
 Ms S. McDonald
 Ms V. Melnyk
 Professor I. Orchard
 Ms T. Pazonis

Professor S. Pfeiffer
 Mr. C. Ramsaroop
 Professor J. Reilly
 Professor L. Richards
 Professor J. Rosenfield
 Professor B. Sampson
 Professor J. Scherk
 Professor B. Sherwood Lollar
 Professor P. Sinervo
 Professor J. J. B. Smith
 Miss M. Somerville
 Mr. J. Sousa
 Professor D. Thiessen

Non-voting Assessors:

Professor D. Farrar, Vice-Provost,
 Students
 Professor C. Tuohy, Vice-President,
 Government and Institutional
 Relations
 Professor R. Venter, Vice-Provost,
 Space and Facilities Planning

Secretariat:

Ms S. Girard, Secretary
 Ms C. Oke

Absent:

Professor S. Aster
 Professor J. Barber
 Dr. M. Barrie
 Professor N. Bascia
 Professor D. Beach
 Professor M. Beattie
 Professor C. Beghtol
 Mr. F. Bellaurdo
 Mr. M. Bonham
 Professor R. Bryan
 Professor N. Camerman
 Professor M. Chipman
 Professor F. Cunningham
 Mr. C. Davis
 Ms M. De Jesus
 Professor R. Elliott
 Ms R. Fernandes
 Mr. J. Fraser
 Professor E. Freeman
 Professor J. Gaskell
 Professor R. Geist
 Ms R. Ghosh
 Professor M. Gotlieb
 Professor P. Halpern

Ms L. Honeywell
Professor S. Horton
Professor M. Hutcheon
Professor M.Y. Johnson
Professor G. Kerr (on leave)
Professor B. Langille
Professor J. Lepock
Professor R. Lewis
Professor L. Loeb
Professor J. MacDonald
Professor R. Martin
Professor M. McGowan
Professor C. Misak
Professor D. Mock
Ms C. Moore

Mr. S. Morley
Professor D. Naylor
Professor M. O'Neill-Karch
Professor P. Perron
Professor C. Regehr
Professor R. Reisz
Ms C. Seymour
Professor K.-L. Shun
Professor A. Sinclair
Professor B. C. Smith
Ms F. Turgeon
Mr. N. Turk-Browne
Professor T. Venetsanopoulos
Professor M. Williams

In Attendance:

Dr. B. FitzPatrick, Assistant Vice-President and Director, Office of the President
Mr. D. Keeling, former Chief Administrative Office, Faculty of Medicine
Ms J. Leishman, Gerstein Science Information Centre, University of Toronto Library
Professor G. Luste, President, University of Toronto Faculty Association
Ms J. Poë, Vice-President, Grievances, University of Toronto Faculty Association