

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL
REPORT NUMBER 122 OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD

September 25, 2003

To the Governing Council,
University of Toronto.

Your Board reports that it held a meeting on Thursday, September 25, 2003 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, 8, 9a and 9b are recommended to Governing Council for approval and the remaining items are reported for information.

Introductory Remarks

The Chair welcomed the members to the first meeting of the Academic Board for 2003-2004. He introduced Professor Brian Corman, the Vice-Chair of the Board, the President, Dr. Robert Birgeneau, and Professor Shirley Neuman, Vice-President and Provost and the Board's senior administrative assessor. Professor Neuman introduced the Deputy Provost, Professor Vivek Goel, the Associate Provosts, Professors Carolyn Tuohy and John Challis, and the Vice-Provosts Ronald Venter and Safwat Zaky.

The Chair focused his remarks on the functions and procedures of the Academic Board as outlined in the document of that name in the Board's handbook. He outlined the role of the Board's committees in bringing matters to the Board and the Board's possible courses of action in dealing with them. The Board would normally accept, reject or refer back matters to its Committees. He explained how the agendas were set and how members could add items to the agenda. He reviewed the procedural motions used to govern the conduct of the meetings and commented, in particular, on the procedures for giving and dealing with notices of motion. Finally, the Chair asked the members to adopt an atmosphere of "no surprises." He encouraged members to call the Secretary or him to discuss procedural questions prior to the meeting so that matters could be discussed in an orderly and collegial fashion.

Because of the size of the Board, members were also asked to stand and give their name when taking part in debate.

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

Vary the Agenda

The Chair reported that Professor Tuohy had to leave the meeting early and had requested that the Performance Indicators report be dealt with following the Provost's address. There was no objection to varying the order of the agenda.

1. Reports of the Previous Meetings

The reports of the previous meetings, dated June 4, 2003 and June 21, 2003, were approved.

2. Report Number 108 of the Agenda Committee

The report was received for information.

3. "The Coming Year": The Vice-President and Provost's Address

The Chair invited Professor Neuman to speak about the year ahead.

Professor Neuman said that she was pleased to report to the Board on the coming year.

Academic Plan

Professor Neuman reported that a major item of business this year would be the academic plan. The planning process to date had included the release of the green papers, followed by a great deal of consultation and an extensive feedback period, culminating with the preparation of the draft white paper plan. The latter had received further feedback from the President and other vice-presidents, the vice-provosts and assistant provosts, and finally from the principals and deans. Each had led to a re-drafting of the document. This process has ensured that the plan has benefited from robust critique. The white paper would be released to the community at the beginning of October. It would be posted as a draft on the Provost's website. The introductory section outlined the vision, the mission, values and goals of the University. There would be a series of companion papers on such topics as enabling teaching and learning (including experience inside and outside the classroom), enabling research, faculty and staff renewal, equity and diversity, resources, and academic planning at the department level. Comments would be accepted until the end of October, after which time, the academic plan document would enter governance at the December Planning and Budget Committee meeting and reach Governing Council on February 11. Governance would be asked to endorse the general directions in the academic plan.

The next phase of the process would take place at the divisional and departmental levels. This would be where the vision, the mission, values and goals of the University would be realized as this was where the research, teaching, curriculum development and appointments took place. Planning should be a process of rigorous self-scrutiny and self-assessment. Departments should ask the question of where the discipline would be in 10 years from now. They should also be having lateral conversations with relevant interdisciplinary programs. These lateral conversations should be seen as an opportunity to be proactive and future-oriented. Professor Neuman also strongly encouraged that conversations take place across departments and faculties. The planning process provided an opportunity to set goals and to outline strategies for reaching them. Departments would be expected to set clear benchmarks in order to be able to establish whether, over time, they were reaching their goals. Departments would be expected to assess what resources would be needed to reach their goals and how best to deploy the resources they currently had. At the Faculty level, the departmental plans would be aggregated and priorities would be set and resources deployed. The final stage would involve a review of faculty plans by the Provost and a report to governance. A new feature to emerge from this process would be a brief annual report from each department and faculty about the annual progress toward reaching the goals. These reports could be used to inform annual resource allocations.

Professor Neuman indicated that a number of policy amendments and/or initiatives would arise from the plan. These would come separately to governance for consideration as appropriate.

3. "The Coming Year": The Vice-President and Provost's Address (cont'd)**Capital Projects**

Professor Neuman noted that there has been considerable capital expansion at the University that has demanded the allocation of major resources. The last year had seen the University's first consolidated capital budget drafted among the Provost, the Vice-President, Business Affairs, the Chief Capital Projects Officer and the Vice-Provost, Space and Facilities Planning. The Provost's Office and Business Affairs were working together, with the former looking at the fiscal feasibility of projects and the latter looking at the academic priority for the projects. Professor Neuman emphasized that the University's borrowing ability was not unlimited. This consolidated approach had led to a reduction in the number of capital projects on the capital plan list as projects were more clearly prioritized. She noted that there were a number of capital projects on the agenda for this meeting.

Long-range Budget Guidelines

Professor Neuman recalled that last year had been a difficult year in terms of budget preparation. A poor stock market resulting in reduced returns and a pension plan deficit had made the budget process even more challenging. This year was the end of the six-year long-range budget guidelines period and, by agreement, at this juncture the budget must be balanced and the accumulated debt could not be above a small percentage of the operating budget as set by Governing Council. Her intention was to bring the next set of long-range budget guidelines to the November meeting of the Planning and Budget Committee. One of the goals, as outlined in the academic plan, would be to raise the University's revenues by 20% plus inflation on the same student base over the next five years. She noted that if the provincial government restored the operating funds it provided per student to the national average it would result in a 25% increase to the operating budget. (Ontario was currently the province in Canada with the lowest operating funds per student.) However, due to the impending provincial election, she did not anticipate any major increase in funding this academic year.

Decanal Searches

Professor Neuman noted that this past year, in two cases, the usual cycle of an external review preceding the search for a new dean had not been maintained. The reviews for the Faculty of Information Studies and the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education at the University of Toronto had been completed at the same time as the search. As a result, the new deans would be given an extension to respond to the review. Four new searches were underway for deans in the Faculty of Arts and Science, the Faculty of Architecture, Landscape, and Design, the School of Graduate Studies (SGS) and the Faculty of Music. She noted that the review for SGS would include an examination of the effectiveness of the new administrative changes made to the School in 1998. In addition to the decanal searches, there would be a search for a new Director of the Transitional Year Program as well as a new Principal for University College, as a result of the impending retirement of Professor Perron.

Next year there would be searches or decanal reviews for the Faculty of Forestry, the Leslie Dan Faculty of Pharmacy, the Rotman School of Management and Innis College.

The members had no questions for Professor Neuman.

4. Performance Indicators for Governance, Annual Report, September 2003

This report had been circulated for information and members were invited to ask questions.

4. Performance Indicators for Governance, Annual Report, September 2003
(cont'd)

A member noted that on page 82, data were given on students with OSAP debt. He suggested that it would be useful to see data on the general indebtedness of students, including all sources of debt. Professor Tuohy responded that this issue had also been raised at the Governing Council meeting. The annual report of the Vice-Provost, Students, on student financial support, reported these data. That report was posted on the web.

A member commented on the list of faculty honours (page 42), noting that the list was incomplete and he asked what criteria had been used to draft the list of awards. Professor Tuohy responded that this was the first year the individual awards had been shown rather than an aggregate list. It was a work in progress and she welcomed comments about new additions to the list, particularly awards from international bodies.

A member referred to data on doctoral completion rates, shown on page 20. The data focused on students who had entered doctoral programs in the early 1990s. He asked about data for later cohorts and, in particular, he wondered about the effect of the graduate funding packages on time to completion. He also asked if the debt-load data on page 81 included graduate students. Professor Tuohy said that the University was a "prisoner of time" with respect to this measure and could not produce data on later cohorts until the students had graduated and the data on time to completion could be collected and analyzed. She said that the administration would be monitoring the later cohorts. She expected that recent changes in supervisory practices and improvements in graduate student funding would also improve the time to completion. The Dean of the School of Graduate Studies (SGS) commented that SGS had recently undertaken a detailed survey of reasons why students in the 1992 cohort had failed to complete. He hoped to study in more detail the 1992 cohort and to repeat the survey for following years. In responding to the member's second question, Professor Tuohy indicated that the debt-load data were for first-entry programs only. Students in second-entry and graduate programs might have incurred debt at other institutions. These data were hard to obtain. Some data on this matter were collected through student surveys and were available in the Vice-Provost, Student's report on student financial support. A member suggested that a synopsis of those findings be added to the performance indicators report.

A member drew attention to the data on page 81 which indicated that, while the percentage of students from low-income backgrounds had increased between 1999 and 2002, this was not the case in second-entry programs in which tuition increases had been greater. He said that these data, taken with a low survey response rate, were cause for concern that the percentage could be even lower. Professor Tuohy said that a trend could not be interpreted from such small numbers and that the data would continue to be monitored. In response to a question, she said that the data came from annual surveys conducted since 1999 and interested members could contact the Vice-Provost, Students.

The President agreed with the concern about the difference between first- and second-entry programs in the percentage of students from low income families. He noted, however, that the income categories had not been adjusted for inflation, and that a \$50,000 income in 2002 was equivalent to about \$47,000 in 1999. He believed the data showed that the student aid program was increasing access from low income families.

The Chair congratulated Professor Tuohy on her report.

5. Capital Project: Change in Funding Sources
University of Toronto at Scarborough – Management Building
University of Toronto at Scarborough – Academic Resource Centre
(arising from Report Number 91 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Mock commented that the Planning and Budget Committee was required to advise on changes in funding sources for capital projects. The Committee had been happy to learn that the Academic Resource Centre and the Management Building at UTSC had been approved for SuperBuild funding.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

1. THAT the funding for the Academic Resource Centre at UTSC and the Management Building at UTSC be adjusted, as recorded below, to allow for a contribution from the SuperBuild 2002 funding to the University of Toronto in support of these two capital projects.
 - i. Replace \$4.66 million of the Enrolment Growth Fund allocation to the Academic Resource Centre at UTSC with \$4.66 million from the SuperBuild 2002 funds to be received by the University of Toronto.
 - ii. Replace \$9.8 million of the Enrolment Growth Fund allocation to the Management Building at UTSC with \$9.8 million from the SuperBuild 2002 funds to be received by the University of Toronto.
2. THAT the Enrolment Growth Fund allocations now unencumbered as a result of the SuperBuild 2002 fund allocation to these projects are to be directed to the three additional SuperBuild 2002 projects, namely the Arts Classroom at UTSC, the Academic Learning Centre at UTM and the Science Laboratory Upgrades at UTSC.

Documentation is attached hereto as Appendix “A”.

6. Capital Project: University of Toronto at Scarborough – Arts Classroom Building – Project Planning Report
Enrolment Growth Fund: Allocation
(arising from Report 91 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Mock explained that the Planning and Budget Committee considered and recommended on the approval of project planning reports for capital projects. This project had been considered sometime ago and, because of insufficient funding, it had been delayed in favour of the Management Building. It was now possible to proceed with the Arts Classroom Building. After considering this revised project planning report, the Committee unanimously recommended its approval in principle.

The Chair recalled that at the recent Governing Council meeting, Professor Youson had spoken of a space crunch at UTSC because of the increasing enrolment and the Chair asked if this project would address the problem. Professor Youson said that this project was very important in addressing the campus’s space needs.

**6. Capital Project: University of Toronto at Scarborough – Arts Classroom Building – Project Planning Report (cont'd)
Enrolment Growth Fund: Allocation (cont'd)**

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

1. THAT Project Planning Report for the Arts Classroom Building be approved in principle (a copy of the Executive Summary is attached hereto as Appendix “B”);
2. THAT the project scope, totaling some 5130 gross square meters, be approved allowing for the construction of the Arts Classroom Building with linkages to the Student Centre, Bladen Building and the Science Wing; and
3. THAT the funding arrangements, including furnishings and finance costs, for the Arts Classroom Building be approved at an estimated cost of \$20,380,000 with the funding as follows:
 - i. \$12,620,000 from the SuperBuild 2002 funding to be received by the University of Toronto, and
 - ii. \$7,760,000 from the Enrolment Growth Fund.

**7. Capital Project: University of Toronto at Mississauga – Academic Learning Centre – Project Planning Report
Enrolment Growth Fund: Allocation**
(arising from Report 91 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Mock noted that this project was another that had received approval for SuperBuild 2002 funding. The Committee was pleased to support this urgently needed facility at the University of Toronto at Mississauga.

A member congratulated the University on its recent success with gaining SuperBuild 2002 funding.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

1. THAT the Project Planning Report for the Academic Learning Centre at the University of Toronto at Mississauga be approved in principle (a copy of the Executive Summary is attached hereto as Appendix “C”);
2. THAT the project scope identified in the Project Planning Report, with new construction of approximately 5,317 net assignable square metres or to a maximum of 9,173 gross square metres, be approved at a total project cost of \$34,000,000. Funding sources for the project are as follows:

SuperBuild 2002	\$26.610 million
Enrolment Growth Fund	\$ 7.176 million
Students’ Library Enhancement Fund	\$ 0.214 million

3. THAT the site for the Academic Learning Centre be to the north of the Communication, Culture and Information Technology Building as identified in the UTM Campus Master Plan 2000.

8. *Ontarians with Disabilities Act: University of Toronto Accessibility Plan, 2003-04*
(arising from Report 91 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Mock explained that the Planning and Budget Committee's responsibilities included reviewing and recommending on approval of reports to external agencies that outlined new policy positions. The Committee had commended Professor Hildyard and others involved in the process that had led to this Plan. There had been a good discussion of the Plan at the meeting. Professor Mock drew attention to the Committee's report which noted that several suggestions for clarification had been accepted by Professor Hildyard.

A member commented that to his knowledge there were few deaf students at this University while York enrolled considerably more. He wondered why the difference and did deaf students know that York could provide better support. He noted that the Plan would address some of these issues but he said that it was not enough to correct deficiencies without letting the community at large know of the changes. He asked about the level of consultation and involvement of persons with disabilities in the drafting of the report. Professor Hildyard said that it was not enough to list goals in the report; the University must ensure that the goals were implemented and new goals developed. Through extensive consultation with the community, students, staff and faculty would know what was being achieved. She noted that a large group of students – those with disabilities both visible and invisible – had been involved in the process. Some had chosen not to have their names mentioned. She invited those with disabilities or colleagues of those with disabilities to participate.

A member congratulated Professor Hildyard and her colleagues on the Plan. He commented that the section on chemical and environmental sensitivities needed to be expanded. His second point concerned the universal design consultant. He asked whether the job would be overwhelming for one person and whether a committee might be better. Professor Hildyard said that she would take the matter under advisement.

A member said that she had been on earlier committees dealing with barriers. She was impressed with the progress being made in this report. The contents were very positive and she was comfortable with the directions being proposed.

A member expressed some unease with the list of attitudinal barriers on page 22. He appreciated the thrust of this section and he agreed that a number of the attitudes were clearly reprehensible. Others were not so clear and could lead to extensive discussions. He asked whether it was necessary to include the entire list. Professor Hildyard indicated that the list was taken from that provided by the Ontario Disabilities Directorate. The group working on the Plan believed that these attitudes were manifest in society and not necessarily at the University. Professor Goel affirmed that the Act included attitudinal barriers. The Chair suggested that the source of the list of attitudinal barriers could be added to the Plan. Professor Hildyard took the comment under advisement.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the University of Toronto *Ontarians with Disabilities Act* Accessibility Plan 2003-2004, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "D", be approved in principle.

9.a. Policy and Procedures on Academic Appointments: Revisions

Professor Goel recalled that in June, 2002, Governing Council had approved in principle the *Framework for a New Structure for Academic Administration of the Three Campuses*. In light of the new framework and the expanding enrolment at UTM and UTSC, the existing administrative structures had proven to be unsuitable. Campus-based departments with university-wide graduate departments had been formed. Vice-President positions for the two campuses had been created and constitutions changed. The appointments policies must also be revised. Because the policies were “frozen” under the agreement with the University of Toronto Faculty Association (UTFA), the changes to both policies had been discussed with UTFA. The consultation with UTFA had resulted in stronger policies. Professor Goel referred members to the Letter of Understanding, included in their documentation. The letter covered such topics as monitoring of workloads, comparability of salaries and mandatory training sessions for academic administrators. Because frozen policies were not considered on a frequent basis, the University and UTFA had taken the opportunity to update some sections, including the addition of “emerita” in the professor emeritus section and the revised definition of “teaching staff”.

Professor Goel explained that the Policy and Procedures on Academic Appointments covered the appointment of all faculty including lecturers and senior lecturers, probationary reviews and laid out the process for obtaining tenure. To enable the *Framework*, it had been necessary to provide a role for the tri-campus graduate chairs in the appointments, probationary reviews and tenure processes. Where the campus chair and the graduate chair were not the same, the tenure committee would be expanded by one person. Amendments were also proposed to the process governing cross-appointments.

Invited to comment, Ms Pöe said that the changes had the full endorsement of UTFA.

A member referred to section 18.iii on page 11 which stated that “all faculty appointed to a tenure-stream position shall hold a non-budget cross-appointment to an appropriate graduate department.” He asked whether that meant that faculty appointed to graduate-only departments needed cross-appointments to other graduate departments. Professor Goel said that this was the wording in the old policy. He noted that section 19 provided a route for graduate-only appointments.

A member noted that the policy referred to a faculty member’s teaching ability. He suggested that it would be more appropriate to refer to teaching performance. (Section 15.iii)

A member noted that the composition of a second tenure committee should resemble that of the first but not include any members from the first tenure committee. Professor Goel again noted that that was a part of the original policy and remained unchanged. The President selected the members of the second committee.

A member commented that there was some confusion in the language between the use of appointment and cross-appointment. He also asked why section 3, page 2 referred only to the Faculty of Arts and Science (St. George campus) and cooperation with UTM and UTSC. Professor Goel again noted that the points raised referred to language that was in the policy before and remained unchanged. “Appointment” referred to primary appointment. The Faculty of Arts and Science was the only Faculty mentioned since the bulk of the work at the two campuses was in arts and science. The next phase of discussions on tri-campus implementations would look to coordinate work in other divisions.

9.a. Policy and Procedures on Academic Appointments: Revisions (cont'd)

A member noted that a number of tenure committees had already been struck using the old rules. Would the divisions have to reconstitute the committees after Governing Council approved the changes? Professor Goel explained that for this academic year, the committees would be composed under the old policy. Going forward, faculty members appointed under the old policies would have the option to have the tenure committee composed under the new rules. This practice would be explained in the implementation document to accompany the policy.

A member asked whether student membership on the committees had been considered. Again, Professor Goel said that the focus for these changes had been the enabling of the tri-campus framework. He suggested that the points that had been raised, including student membership, could be considered in the next full round of negotiations with UTFA concerning this policy.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the *Policy and Procedures on Academic Appointment*, revised dated September 10, 2003, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "E", be approved.

9.b Policy on the Appointment of Academic Administrators: Revisions

Professor Goel explained that the changes to this policy concerning the ability of the chairs at UTM and UTSC to report to a Dean who in turn would report to the Vice-President and Principal. The revisions also included a process for searching for the tri-campus graduate chairs.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the *Policy on the Appointment of Academic Administrators*, revised dated September 10, 2003, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "F", be approved.

10. Items for Information

(a) Report of the Vice-President and Provost

(i) Calendar of Business 2003-04

The Chair drew members' attention to the calendar of business, noting that it was an important document that showed the Board's business for the year. Although it would change and be updated over time, members could determine when matters in which they were particularly interested would be coming forward.

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

(iii) Post-65 Appointments

The above two items were presented for information. There were no questions.

10. Items for Information (cont'd)

(d) Report on Approvals under Summer Executive Authority (cont'd)

Knowledge Media Design Institute

Professor Gale Moore	Interim Director from July 1, 2003 to September 1, 2003
----------------------	---

Professor Gale Moore	Director from September 1, 2003 to June 30, 2008
----------------------	--

OISE/UT

Professor Glen Jones	Associate Dean, Graduate Studies from July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2008
----------------------	---

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO AT MISSISSAUGA*Department of Anthropology and the Study of Religion*

Professor David Smith	Interim Chair from July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004
-----------------------	--

Department of Mathematical and Computation Sciences

Professor Ian Graham	Interim Chair from July 1, 2003 to December 31, 2003
----------------------	--

Professor Kumar Murty	Chair from January 1, 2004 to June 30, 2007
-----------------------	---

The following are reported for information:

Tenure/Promotions**FACULTY OF MUSIC**

Professor Darryl Edwards	Associate Professor with tenure, effective July 1, 2003
--------------------------	---

Professor Emeritus**FACULTY OF APPLIED SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING***Department of Mechanical and Industrial Engineering*

Professor Derek McCammond	Effective July 1, 2003
---------------------------	------------------------

Institute for Aerospace Studies

Professor P.A. Sullivan	Effective July 1, 2003
-------------------------	------------------------

10. Items for Information (cont'd)

- (d) Report on Approvals under Summer Executive Authority (cont'd)

II. Matters approved under the Governing Council's Summer Executive Authority

There were two matters approved under the Governing Council's provisions for summer executive authority that would, in the normal course of events, have come to the Board for approval through the Planning and Budget Committee.

**(a) Property: Acquisition of 3057 Mississauga Road North
Enrolment Growth Fund: Allocation for Purchase of 3057 Mississauga Road North**

(i) THAT the offer to purchase 3.02 acres of property at 3057 Mississauga Road North in Mississauga, and the building on that property, for an amount not to exceed \$1 million, be approved; and

(ii) THAT \$1 million be allocated from the Enrolment Growth Fund to fund the purchase of 3.02 acres of property at 3057 Mississauga Road North in Mississauga.

(Note: The Business Board approves the acquisition of property, the Academic Board approves the allocation of funding.)

(b) Capital Project: Open Space Plan, King's College Circle Precinct, Phase I – Additional Funding

(i) THAT the proposed increase in the scope of the King's College Circle, Phase I project, to enhance the quantity of yard walls and increase the amount of trees and plants to be installed, be approved, at a cost of \$700,000, increasing the budget for Phase I from \$4.6 to \$5.3 million,

Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering	\$200,000
Donations received	\$500,000, and

(ii) THAT the Vice-President – Business Affairs be authorized to complete the execution of the King's College Circle, Phase I project, at a cost not to exceed \$5.8 million.

A number of items were approved under summer executive authority that would have been approved by the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs and reported to the Board for information. These include:

OISE/UT: Human Development and Education Program - Name Change

THAT the name of the Human Development and Education Program of the Department of Human Development and Applied Psychology, be changed to the Developmental Psychology and Education Program, effective September 2003.

School of Graduate Studies: Clinical Epidemiology MSc Program, Non-thesis Stream

THAT the proposal for a non-thesis stream in the Clinical Epidemiology MSc Program, as described in the submission by the School of Graduate Studies, be approved, effective September 2003.

10. Items for Information (cont'd)

- (d) Report on Approvals under Summer Executive Authority (cont'd)

Joseph L. Rotman School of Management: Executive MBA Program – Change in the Testing Admission Requirement

THAT the testing admission requirement of the Executive MBA Program be changed from the GMAT to a tailored quantitative skill test, effective June 1, 2003, be approved.

- (e) Quarterly Report on Donations May - July, 2003

This report was presented for information in accordance with the Provost's Guidelines on Donations.

11. Date of Next Meeting

The Chair noted that the next regular meeting of the Board would be held on November 13, 2003.

12. Other Business

There was no other business.

13. Academic Administrative Appointments

There were no academic administrative appointments at this time.

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

Secretary
September 29, 2003

Chair

Present:

Professor W. R. Cummins, Chair
 Professor B. Corman, Vice-Chair
 Professor R. J. Birgeneau, President
 Professor S. Neuman, Vice-President
 and Provost
 Professor J. Challis, Vice-President,
 Research and Associate 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
 Mr. S. Ahmed
 Professor D. Allen
 Professor G. Allen
 Professor S. Aster
 Professor J. Barber
 Professor C. Beghtol
 Dr. T. Blake
 Mr. M. Bonham
 Professor P. Byer
 Professor N. Camerman
 Professor S. Choudhry
 Professor D. Clandfield
 Mr. J. Cohen
 Professor L. De Nil
 Professor M. Diamond
 Professor J. Donaldson
 Dr. I. Elliston
 Ms A. Emam
 Dr. S. Graham Fell
 Ms R. Fernandes
 Professor F. Fich
 Mr. S. Forbes
 Professor E. Freeman
 Professor J. Gaskell
 Professor R. Geist
 Ms R. Ghosh
 Professor D. Goring
 Professor M. Gotlieb
 Professor H. Gunz
 Professor A. Haasz
 Professor P. Halpern
 Professor W. Hindmarsh
 Ms B. Horne
 Professor S. Horton
 Professor M. Hutcheon
 Mr. M. Hycza
 Ms M. Jackman
 Professor J. Jenkins
 Professor M.Y. Johnson
 Professor A. Johnston

Professor B. Kidd
 Professor R. Kluger
 Professor B. Langille
 Ms L.A. Lavack
 Professor R. Lewis
 Professor M. Marrus
 Professor D. Massam
 Ms S. McDonald
 Ms V. Melnyk
 Professor C. Misak
 Professor D. Mock
 Ms C. Moore
 Professor M. O'Neill-Karch
 Professor I. Orchard
 Mr. J. Paterson
 Ms T. Pazonis
 Professor S. Pfeiffer
 Mr. C. Ramsaroop
 Professor C. Regehr
 Professor R. Reisz
 Professor L. Richards
 Professor J. Scherk
 Mrs. C. Seymour
 Professor A. Sinclair
 Professor P. Sinervo
 Professor B. C. Smith
 Professor J. J. B. Smith
 Ms M. Somerville
 Mr. J. Sousa
 Mr. N. Turk-Browne
 Professor T. Venetsanopoulos
 Professor M. Williams
 Professor J. Youson

Non-voting Member:

Mr. L. R. Charpentier

Non-voting Assessors:

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

Secretariat:

Ms S. Girard, Secretary
 Ms S. Rosatone

Absent:

Dr. M. Barrie	Professor A. Gotlieb
Professor N. Bascia	Professor G. Kerr (on leave)
Professor D. Beach	Professor E. Hillan
Professor M. Beattie	Ms L. Honeywell
Mr. F. Bellaurdo	Professor J. Lepock
Professor R. Bryan	Professor L. Loeb
Professor P. Catton	Professor J. MacDonald
Professor M. Chipman	Professor R. Martin
Professor F. Cunningham	Professor M. McGowan
Mr. B. Davis	Mr. S. Morley
Mr. C. Davis	Professor D. Naylor
Dr. R. Deber	Professor P. Perron
Professor R. Elliott	Professor J. Reilly
Mr. J. Fraser	Professor B. Sampson
Professor J. Furedy	Professor B. Sherwood Lollar
Ms B. Goldberg	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
Professor C. Guberman, Status of Women Officer
Ms M.A. Mavrinac, Librarian, UTM
Professor P. Pauly, Rotman School of Management