

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL
REPORT NUMBER 133 OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD

February 21, 2005

To the Governing Council
University of Toronto

Your Board reports that it held a meeting on Monday, February 21, 2005 at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall. In this report, items 5, 6, 7 and 8 are recommended to the Governing Council for approval and the remaining items are reported for information.

Present:

Professor W. Raymond
Cummins, Chair
Professor Brian Corman, Vice-
Chair
The Honourable Frank
Iacobucci, Interim President
Professor Vivek Goel, Vice-
President and Provost
Professor John Challis, Vice-
President, Research and
Associate Provost
Professor Ronald Venter, Vice-
Provost, Space and Facilities
Planning
Professor S. Zaky, Vice-Provost,
Planning and Budget
Professor Rona Abramovitch
Ms Holly Andrews-Taylor
Professor Gage Averill
Professor George Baird
Professor Clare Beghtol
Mr. Mark S. Bonham
Professor Ragnar Buchweitz
Mr. Shaun Chen
Ms Maple Chong
Professor David Clandfield
Professor David Cook
Professor Ronald Daniels

Professor Donald N. Dewees
Professor Miriam Diamond
Professor Guy Faulkner
Dr. Inez. Elliston
Professor Faith E. Fich
Ms Bonnie Goldberg
Professor Avrum Gotlieb
Professor Hugh Gunz
Professor Anthony A. Haasz
Ms Bonnie Horne
Professor Michael Hutcheon
Professor Yuki Mayumi Johnson
Professor Bruce Kidd
Professor Ronald H. Kluger
Dr. Joel A. Kirsh
Ms Lesley Ann Lavack
Professor James Lepock
Professor Diane Massam
Ms Susan C. McDonald
Ms Vera Melnyk
Professor John R. Miron
Professor Cheryl Misak
Professor David Mock
Professor Mariel O'Neill-Karch
Professor Susan Pfeiffer
Mr. Andrew Pinto
Professor Cheryl Regehr

Professor Jay Rosenfield
Professor Gareth Seaward
Professor J. J. Berry Smith
Miss Maureen J. Somerville
Professor Dennis Thiessen
Ms Oriel Varga
Professor Melissa S. Williams
Dr. Cindy Woodland

Non-voting Assessors:

Professor D. Farrar, Deputy
Provost and Vice-Provost,
Students
Professor A. Hildyard, Vice-
President, Human Resources and
Equity
Professor Edith Hillan, Vice-
Provost, Academic
Ms Catherine Riggall, Vice-
President, Business Affairs
Professor Kwong-loi Shun, Vice-
President and Principal,
University of Toronto at
Scarborough
Professor Carolyn Tuohy, Vice-
President, Government and
Institutional Relations

Mr. Louis Charpentier, Secretary of
the Governing Council

Absent:

Mr. Syed W. Ahmed
Professor Stewart Aitchison
Professor Derek Allen
Professor Sidney Aster
Professor James Barber
Dr. Mary Barrie
Ms Janice Bayani
Professor Mary Beattie

Mr. Senai Iman
Professor Jenny Jenkins
Professor Christina Kramer
Professor Robert Lewis
Professor Lori Loeb
Mr. William R.J. Lumsden
Professor John F. MacDonald
Mr. Joseph Mapa

Secretariat:

Mr. Andrew Drummond
Ms Cristina Oke, Secretary

Absent: (cont'd)

Professor Terry Blake
 Ms Lisa E. Boyes
 Professor Donald Brean
 Professor Rorke Bryan
 Professor Philip H. Byer
 Mr. Bruce G. Cameron
 Mr. Blake Chapman
 Professor Mary L. Chipman
 Professor Sujit Choudhry
 Professor George Elliott Clarke
 Professor Frank Cunningham
 Professor Luc F. De Nil
 Professor Raisa B. Deber
 Professor James Donaldson
 Professor Diane Doran
 Professor Robin Elliott
 Dr. Shari Graham Fell
 Professor Steven T. Fong
 Mr. Sean Forbes
 Mr. John Fraser
 Professor Eric Freeman
 Professor John J. Furedy
 Professor Jane Gaskell
 Professor Wayne Hindmarsh
 Ms Leigh Honeywell

Professor M. Marrus
 Professor Roger L. Martin
 Professor Mark McGowan
 Mr. Raza M. Mirza
 Ms Carole Moore
 Professor David Naylor
 Mr. Kedar Patil
 Professor Paul Perron
 Ms Salma Rawof
 Professor James A. Reilly
 Professor Robert Reisz
 Professor Richard Reznick
 Ms Marvi H. Ricker
 Professor John Scherk
 Professor Anthony N. Sinclair
 Professor Pekka Sinervo
 Professor Brian Cantwell Smith
 Professor Lisa Steele
 Ms Arjuna Thaskaran
 Mr. Leo Trottier
 Professor Rinaldo Wayne
 Walcott
 Professor Tas Venetsanopoulos
 Professor Judy Watt-Watson

In Attendance:

Dr. Beata FitzPatrick, Assistant
 Vice-President and Director,
 Office of the President
 Mr. Howard Tam, Vice-President,
 University Affairs, Students'
 Administrative Council
 Professor Paul Thompson, Director,
 Institute for the History and
 Philosophy of Science and
 Technology

1. Report of the Previous Meeting

A member requested that the Report be revised to add the following sentence:

The member stated that, in her view, the University did not have a specific policy on the ethical conduct of research in aboriginal communities.

Report Number 132 of the meeting held on January 13, 2005, was approved as amended.

2. Business Arising Out of the Report

In reference to a statement on page nine of Report Number 132¹, a member noted that not all students at the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM) and the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC) supported the levies for student centres on those campuses.

3. Report Number 117 of the Agenda Committee (February 7, 2005)

The report was received for information. Professor Gotlieb requested that he be listed on the Report as having sent his regrets. There were no questions.

¹ 'Professor Venter also noted the support of students at the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM) and at UTSC for the recently-constructed student centers on those campuses.'

4. Report of the COU Academic Colleague

The Chair reminded members that, each year, the Academic Board appointed an Academic Colleague and an alternate to the Council of Ontario Universities (COU). The Academic Colleague and the President represented the University at COU meetings. For 2004-05, the Academic Colleague was Professor Paul Thompson, and the alternate was Professor Ian Orchard.

Professor Thompson reported on his activities to date as Academic Colleague. He explained that meetings had been held on October 14 and 15, 2004, December 9 and 10, 2004, and February 3 and 4, 2005. Academic Colleagues met late in the afternoon on the first day of meetings, held a breakfast meeting on the second day, and then attended the Council meeting from 9:30 am to 1 pm. The Academic Colleagues provided a faculty perspective towards the issues before the Council. A number served on Council Committees and Task Forces.

Among the initiatives of Academic Colleagues was the development of discussion papers on issues of importance to faculty. One recently-released paper, *The Mission of the University*² by Professor George Fallis of York University, addressed issues of how universities were maintaining their autonomy, the 21st century democratic mission of universities, and the role of the professor as public intellectual.

Recent key issues considered by the COU included:

- framing a response to the Postsecondary Education Review (Rae Review)
- developing a media campaign on the social value of education
 - Web-site: <http://www.thinkontario.com/>
- developing performance indicators to demonstrate that additional financial support from the government has made a difference
- participating in the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)
- eliminating Mandatory Retirement
- increasing funding for graduate enrolment

A member asked whether the performance indicator indices being developed by COU would be comparable to those used by the University of Toronto. Professor Tuohy replied that the joint working group on performance indicators had not yet met, but that COU would be developing aggregate measures that would be different from those used by the University.

A member asked whether COU was looking at the balance between older and young faculty members in its consideration of the ending of mandatory retirement. Professor Thompson replied that the matter was complex and COU was considering an extensive number of issues. President Iacobucci added that COU did not wish to move too hastily on this matter, given the complexities involved.

The Chair asked how the advocacy work of COU was funded. Professor Thompson replied that the COU was funded by membership fees from the universities of Ontario.

The President expressed his thanks and appreciation to Professor Thompson for his work at COU and for representing the University so well. The Chair thanked Professor Thompson for his report.

² <http://www.cou.on.ca/bin/publications/speeches.cfm>

5. Statement of Commitment Regarding International Students

Professor Smith reported that the Vice-Provost, Students had informed the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs that the *Policy on Foreign Students* had been revisited with a view to updating it. Most of the new Statement reflected the thrust of the old policy and also reflected the University's strengthened commitment to improving the scholarship environment for international students.

Most of the discussion had focused on two areas that were outside the Committee's purview: the graduate funding guarantee and the tuition model for international students. It was clarified that the main criterion for admission would continue to be academic merit, as described in the *Policies and Principles for Admission to the University of Toronto*.³ The motion had carried unanimously.

A member expressed support for the *Statement*, and encouraged the University administration to impose a freeze on tuition for international students.

A member asked for clarification of the difference between a 'policy' and a 'statement'. Professor Farrar replied that the document had been entitled a 'statement' after consultation with the Secretary of the Governing Council.⁴ Professor Smith added that the new statement did not change the intent of the previous policy.

The member emphasized that the University should recruit students from as many places as possible. Professor Farrar replied that the University was committed to recruiting international students from as many places as possible. The specific reference to recruitment had been removed from the new statement because it was considered to be self-evident.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDED

THAT the proposed Statement of Commitment Regarding International Students, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "A", be recommended to Governing Council for approval, replacing the Policy on Foreign Students approved by the Governing Council on June 25, 1987.

6. Canada Research Chairs (CRC) Program: New Financial Model

Professor Gottlieb explained that the proposed new financial model was intended to address the lack of indexation of the funds awarded by the federal government, to simplify the administration of the funds, and to provide a clear basis for the sharing of costs between the divisions and the central administration. This model was consistent with that used within the Faculty of Medicine. Effective May 1, 2005, a CRC award would be administered as a research account in the name of the appropriate faculty member. The central CRC Fund would be dismantled and transfers that had been made since the beginning of the program would be returned to divisional base budgets. At the Planning and Budget Committee meeting, a member had asked if the total amount of

³ <http://www.utoronto.ca/govcncl/pap/policies/admit.html>

⁴ Secretary's Note: A 'Statement' normally reflects broad principles, while a 'Policy' would normally include both broad principles and expectations for implementation and reporting.

6. **Canada Research Chairs (CRC) Program: New Financial Model (cont'd)**

salaries and benefits for faculty would be transferred to the divisional base budget. Professor Zaky had indicated that the amount being transferred would equal the amount provided to the division over the course of the CRC program. The motion had passed unanimously.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDED

That the new funding model for Canada Research Chairs, as described in the memorandum from the Vice-President and Provost dated December 20, 2004, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix “B”, be approved.

7. **Capital Project: Bahen Centre for Information Technology (BCIT) – Project Closure Report**

Professor Gottlieb reminded members that the Bahen Centre for Information Technology (BCIT) project had been one of the first projects in the current Capital Plan. The proposal was to close the account on the original capital project and to establish a BCIT Closure Project under the Accommodation and Facilities Directorate (AFD). Planning and Budget Committee members had raised some questions, including the following:

- How did the BCIT Closure Project relate to the Capital Project for the Department of Mathematics which involved the completion of the sixth floor of the BCIT?

Professor Venter had explained that the two projects were separate, although heating and cooling of the building would be addressed in each project.

- Was the 40% increase in the original cost typical for such projects?

Professor Venter had replied that the scope of the project had changed substantially as the design was completed. He had also noted that the project had been undertaken prior to the creation of the positions of Vice-Provost, Space and Facilities Planning and of Chief Capital Projects Officer, and before the approval of the current *Policy on Capital Projects and Capital Planning*.

The motion had passed unanimously.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDED

1. THAT the revised and final total project cost for the Bahen Centre for Information Technology [BCIT] which is required to be increased from \$108,811,00, the cost previously approved by the Governing Council, to \$112,189,469, be approved.

7. Capital Project: Bahen Centre for Information Technology (BCIT) – Project Closure Report (cont'd)

2. THAT full closure be brought to the BCIT capital project as a result of the earlier mortgages, established for the Faculty of Arts & Science and the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering in 2003, plus the following mortgage and cash contribution to address all remaining costs associated with the project:
 - i) A mortgage in the amount of \$960,000 to be amortized over 20 years or less and to be repaid from the operating budget of the Office of the Vice-President Business Affairs
 - ii) A cash contribution in the amount of \$960,000 to be paid from the 2004/05 operating budget of the Office of the Vice-President and Provost.

Documentation is attached hereto as Appendix “C”.

8. Capital Project: Centre for Health Improvement and System Performance (CHISP), 155 College Street – Project Planning Report

The Chair informed members that, if this recommendation was approved by the Board, it would be considered at a special meeting of the Governing Council being held on Thursday, February 24, 2005.

Professor Gotlieb explained that, at the time of the approval of the project in May, the estimated project cost had been \$ 24.14 million. Exploratory design work undertaken over the summer had identified problems that had resulted in an expanded project scope and a revised estimated project cost of \$28.14 million.

Members of the Planning and Budget Committee had raised a number of questions including the status of the parking facility and the basis on which contingency amounts were decided. Professor Goel had noted that the site at 256 McCaul Street, including the adjoining parking lot, was the largest open site on the campus after the Varsity site.⁵

A member asked whether student space was included in this capital project. Professor Venter replied that he could not provide the detailed numbers at the meeting, but would be pleased to make available to the member the complete details of the proposed space program for the project.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDED

1. THAT the expanded scope for the Center for Health Improvement & System Performance [CHISP] project at 155 College Street to address the additional

⁵ Secretary’s Note: Members of the Planning and Budget Committee were informed by Mr. Bisanti that the demolition of the parking facility had been an Accommodation and Facilities Directorate (AFD) project, which had been completed. The lot was now paved, and would be landscaped. With respect to the determination of contingency amounts, members were informed by Mr. Bisanti that amounts set aside for contingencies were based on past experience and general industry practice.

8. Capital Project: Centre for Health Improvement and System Performance (CHISP), 155 College Street – Project Planning Report (cont'd)

infrastructure needs, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix “D”, be approved in principle;

2. THAT the objective of addressing the infrastructure and deferred maintenance needs of the building be approved in principle;
3. THAT the funding for the project be approved at an estimated total project cost of between \$28,000,00 and \$28,140,000 from the following sources:
 - (i) \$11,192,000 to be financed by an internal loan (mortgage), amortized over twenty years, to be repaid from the operating budget of the Faculty of Medicine, and
 - (ii) \$12,947,000 to be financed by an internal loan (mortgage), amortized over twenty years, to be repaid from the operating budget of the Faculty of Nursing, and
 - (iii) \$4,000,000 from the one-time-only fund identified in the 2004-05 operating budget of the Office of the Provost for academic projects seriously restricted by shortcomings in infrastructure and deferred maintenance.

9. Report from the Vice-President and Provost

(a) Ontario – A Leader in Learning: Postsecondary Review Report (Rae Report)

The Provost invited the President to report on the recently-released Rae Report. The President stated that the report was balanced, considered and comprehensive. He believed strongly that the report should be implemented in its entirety. The President emphasized the importance of all universities uniting to obtain public support for post-secondary education. The provincial budget was expected in late April. The allocation of funding within various envelopes was crucial.

(b) Budget Report

Professor Goel informed members that the 2005-06 Budget Report would be considered by the Planning and Budget Committee on March 8, 2005. No major changes from the previous projections were planned. The Provost noted that a number of items included in the Rae Report had been built into the budget projections. He repeated the importance of the need for the province to implement all of the Rae Report recommendations.

A member asked whether the cuts that had been included in the six-year forecast would be implemented. Professor Goel replied that the 2% cut for 2005-06 would likely be unchanged. The planned 5% cut for 2006-07 might be revised if circumstances changed.

(c) CUPE 3902, Section 3

The Provost informed members that the University and CUPE 3902 were currently negotiating a first contract for stipendiary and sessional instructors. This group of instructors ranged from individuals who had taught one or two courses for several years, to individuals who taught one or two hours a week for a limited period of time.

9. Report from the Vice-President and Provost (cont'd)**(d) University of Toronto Faculty Association (UTFA) Negotiations**

The Provost reported that items being negotiated by the University and UTFA included mandatory retirement and salaries and benefits for 2005-06.

(e) Stepping UP

The Provost advised members that the communication strategy for Stepping UP had been implemented. A supplement had been included in the February 7 issue of *The Bulletin*, and the University of Toronto Magazine would be addressing academic planning in its next issue. A member congratulated Professor Goel on the communication strategy.

(f) Academic Initiatives Fund (AIF)

The Provost noted that the second round of allocation requests were being reviewed.

(g) National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)

The Provost reminded members that the first set of survey results would be presented to the University Affairs Board on February 22, 2005.

(h) Redevelopment of Varsity Lands

The Provost indicated that a series of information meetings were being scheduled. Members of the Governing Council and its Boards and Committees had been invited to an information session on March 1, 2005. A town hall meeting for students had been scheduled for March 7, 2005. A meeting with the external community was being held at the end of March.

(i) Freedom of Speech Update**(i) Arab Students' Collective: Israel Apartheid Week**

The Provost recalled that, in early February, the Arab Students' Collective had organized an event entitled 'Israel Apartheid Week'. The University had been under a great deal of pressure to cancel the event, but it allowed the event to be held, in accordance with the *Statement on Freedom of Speech*.⁶ He commended the members of the University community who had organized and participated in the event, as well as those who had organized and participated in the Israel Fest, which had been held at the same time, for having behaved in a respectful manner.

(ii) Institute for Knowledge Innovation and Technology (IKIT) at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE/UT)

The Provost informed members of concerns that had been raised regarding a research project being carried out by the Institute for Knowledge Innovation and Technology (IKIT) at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE/UT). The research, which was funded by an Initiative on the New Economy (INE) collaborative research grant from the Social Sciences

⁶ <http://www.utoronto.ca/govcncl/pap/policies/frspeech.html>

9. Report from the Vice-President and Provost (cont'd)

(i) Freedom of Speech Update

(ii) Institute for Knowledge Innovation and Technology (IKIT) at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE/UT)

and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) involved a number of partners, one of which was Atlantis, a Canadian engineering firm specializing in simulation-based training. Facts about the research had been distorted in statements by various groups. The *Statement on Freedom of Speech* included the principle that ‘all members of the University must have as a prerequisite freedom of speech and expression, which means the right to examine, question, investigate, speculate, and comment on an issue.’

A member commented that he had attended a recent meeting of the OISE/UT Faculty Council at which the research project was discussed. Campus police were present, and individuals had not been allowed to bring signs into the meeting room. A number of those present had felt threatened by the police presence. Professor Goel reminded the member that the *Policy on Disruption of Meetings*⁷ included the provision that, if there was reason to believe that a meeting sponsored by the University or one of its divisions would be disrupted, reasonable steps could be taken to avert disruption.

10. Appointments and Status Changes

Members received for information a number of appointments and status changes.

11. Reports for Information

(a) Report Number 112 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs (January 12, 2005)

A member voiced her concern about the increases to the overhead rate schedules that was reported under item 9: *Vice-President, Research and Associate Provost: Overhead Rate Schedule* on page 7 of Report Number 112.⁸ In her view, the increase in the overhead rate on industrial and government department grants from 15% to 40% was not a good idea. She stated that, in her opinion, research grants supported the key missions of the university: teaching and research. To divert funds away from the core activities was not appropriate. Overhead deducted from research grants directly decreased the number of graduate students and post-doctoral fellows that could be supported.

The member directed three questions to Professor Challis:

1. Would other major Canadian research universities be changing their overhead rates to the same level?
2. Would the Office of the Vice-President, Research and Associate Provost provide detailed information about indirect costs to justify the assertion that the overhead

⁷ <http://www.utoronto.ca/govcncl/pap/policies/disrupt.html>

⁸ The Policy on Research Contracts and the Recovery of Indirect Costs of Research, available at <http://www.utoronto.ca/govcncl/pap/policies/recont.html>, authorizes the Vice-President, Research to make adjustments to the overhead rates from time to time in response to changing circumstances.

11. Reports for Information (cont'd)**(a) Report Number 112 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs (January 12, 2005) (cont'd)**

rate should be 40% to cover additional costs of research supported by basic research grants?

3. Would the Office of the Vice-President, Research and Associate Provost agree to engage in open and widespread consultation and revise overhead rates (either up or down) in response?

Professor Challis replied that the University currently received approximately 20% from the federal government's Indirect Cost Program. Canadian universities were working to increase the federal government's Indirect Cost Program to 40%. The University of Toronto was moving progressively toward recovering all of the indirect costs from its research sponsors. To this end, the overhead rates charged on industrial and government department grants would be increasing by 5% per year, reaching 40% in 2009. Professor Goel added that actual indirect costs were closer to 60%. The difference between the actual costs and the overhead charges was being met by the University's operating budget.

Another memo echoed the concerns that had been raised, and asked what kind of analysis had been undertaken to determine the increase in the overhead rate schedule, and what consultation had been undertaken with faculty. Professor Challis replied that the previous overhead rates resulted in the University subsidizing research for industry. A member asked what impact the increase in overhead rate schedules would have on graduate students. Professor Challis replied that the increase would allow the University to provide the best possible research environment.

A member asked whether the public or private sector was being subsidized by the University, and what the impact of such a subsidy was. The President replied that the increase reflected the substance of indirect cost recovery. He acknowledged the concerns that had been raised concerning the process by which the rates had been increased. The President undertook that the administration would gather the relevant data and consult more broadly on further increases.

(b) Report Number 113 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs (February 2, 2005)

Professor Smith reported that the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs had received the annual Report on Student Financial Support, 2003-04 from the Vice-Provost, Students. The Committee had been pleased to confirm that the University's commitment to student financial assistance was being met.⁹ A member noted the concern that had been raised in the discussion of item 5: *Vice-Provost, Students: Report on Student Financial Support, 2003-04* with respect to the decline in the proportion of young men pursuing University study. A member commented that this was a world-wide issue of concern. Professor Goel reminded members that the admissions process was merit based.

⁹ The *Policy on Student Financial Support* (<http://www.utoronto.ca/govcncl/pap/policies/stufinan.html>) includes the principle that 'no student offered admission to a program at the University of Toronto should be unable to enter or complete the program due to lack of financial means'.

11. Reports for Information (cont'd)**(b) Report Number 113 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs (February 2, 2005) (cont'd)**

In recent years, the quality of female applicants had risen, while the number of male applicants had declined. Professor Farrar added that the University's admissions policy was 'blind' to everything but merit. An increase in male applicants required intervention in the school system. A member referred to the success of several outreach programs that had been introduced by the University, and suggested that such programs be expanded.

A member asked whether financial assistance was available for part-time students who were not eligible for financial support from the Ontario Student Assistance Program (OSAP). Professor Farrar replied that the Noah Meltz Program for Financial Assistance was available to part-time undergraduate students.

(c) Report Number 101 of the Planning and Budget Committee (January 25, 2005)

Members received this report for information. There were no questions.

(d) Report Number 294 of the Academic Appeals Committee (January 31, 2005)

The Chair informed members that the Report included the membership and terms of reference for the Sub-Committee to Review the Guidelines for Academic Appeals within Divisions. He invited the Chair of the Sub-Committee, Ms Bonnie Goldberg, to describe the sub-committee and its work.

Ms Goldberg thanked the individuals who had agreed to serve on the Sub-Committee. The Sub-Committee was charged with determining whether or not the *Guidelines for Academic Appeals Within Divisions*, a document that had remained unchanged since 1977, met the current needs of the University and the academic divisions. She indicated that the Sub-Committee would consult broadly in the course of its work, and welcomed submissions to the Sub-Committee by the March 18 deadline.

A member asked why the motion directing the Sub-Committee to consult with the Students' Administrative Council (SAC), the Association of Part-time Undergraduates (APUS), and the Graduate Students' Union (GSU), had been defeated. Ms Goldberg replied that the Academic Appeals Committee did not wish to restrict the groups with whom the Sub-Committee consulted.

12. Date of Next Meeting

The Chair reminded members that the next meeting of the Board was scheduled for Thursday, April 7, 2005 at 4:10 p.m.

13. Other Business**(a) Elections**

The Chair reminded members that nominations had re-opened for six teaching staff seats on the Academic Board: 1 in Arts & Science, 1 in Applied Science and Engineering, 1 at OISE/UT, and 3 in the Faculty of Medicine. Nominations had also re-opened for one teaching staff seat on the Governing Council, in the OISE/UT constituency. He asked members to support the election process by standing for re-

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

election, encouraging colleagues to stand for election, and voting in the elections in their constituency.

(b) Information Session on the Varsity Site Development

The Chair reminded members of the information session on the Varsity site development which would be held on Tuesday, March 1, from 12:30 to 2 p.m. in the Council Chamber, 2nd floor, Simcoe Hall.

On motion duly moved and seconded, the Board moved *in camera*.

14. Academic Administrative Appointments

The following academic administrative appointments were approved:

FACULTY OF ARTS AND SCIENCE**Department of Economics**

Professor Arthur Hosios

Chair

July 1, 2005 to June 30, 2010

FACULTY OF MEDICINE

Professor Jay Rosenfield

Associate Dean, Undergraduate Medical Education

July 1, 2005 to June 30, 2010

Institute of Medical Science

Professor Ori Rotstein

Director

July 1, 2005 to June 30, 2006 (Extension)

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO AT MISSISSAUGA

Professor Charles Jones

Acting Vice-Principal, Academic and Dean

January 1, 2006 to June 30, 2006

Department of Management

Professor Mikhel Tombak

Acting Chair

January 1, 2006 to June 30, 2006

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO AT SCARBOROUGH

Professor Elizabeth Cowper

Interim Vice Principal, Academic Resources

March 1, 2005 to June 30, 2005

Professor Charles Dyer

Vice Principal, Academic Resources

July 1, 2005 to June 30, 2010

The meeting adjourned at 5:55 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

March 3, 2005