

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

REPORT NUMBER 106 OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD

May 3rd, 2001

To the Governing Council,
University of Toronto.

Your Board reports that it held a meeting on Thursday, May 3rd, 2001 at 4:15 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall. An attendance list is attached to this report. In this report, items 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 10, 11 and 14 are recommended to Governing Council for approval, items 4, 12 and 13 are for Executive Committee confirmation, and the remaining items are reported for information.

Chair's Remarks

Professor Emeritus Alan Mewett

The Chair noted with regret the death of Professor Emeritus Alan Mewett from the Faculty of Law. Professor Mewett had been an Acting Chair of the Academic Appeals Committee for the past six and a half years. His wisdom and expertise would be missed by the members of the Committee and by the Secretariat. The members of the Board observed a moment of silence in his memory.

Professor Vivek Goel

The Chair congratulated Professor Goel on his recent appointment as Vice-Provost, Faculty. Professor Goel would take up his new duties on July 1st, succeeding Professor Paul Gooch who would become President of Victoria College. The members joined the Chair in expressing their congratulations.

Professor Angela Hildyard

The Chair announced that Professor Angela Hildyard, currently Principal of Woodsworth College, had been appointed the new Vice-President - Human Resources effective July 1st. The members of the Board wished her well in her new position.

1. Report of the Previous Meeting

A member said that the item under Other Business did not reflect the point he had been trying to make. The Chair noted that the member had been ruled out of order and that the additions to the report that he was suggesting had been said while he was not recognized.

The report of the previous meeting, dated March 29th, 2001, was approved.

2. Business Arising Out of the Report

A member asked whether the material he had asked to be distributed under business arising at the last meeting had, in fact, been distributed. The Chair said that it had. The member asked whether there would be a report on the matter at the Faculty of Law later on the agenda. Professor Sedra indicated that he would make some brief remarks in his report.

3. Report Number 92 of the Agenda Committee

The Chair noted that this report was presented for information.

A member expressed his concern that the notice of motion on the greenhouses had not been brought to the Board so that the members could express their thoughts on the matter. He said that the Agenda Committee members had misjudged the matter and asked that the notice of motion be reconsidered.

On the member's notice of motion concerning accessibility, the Chair suggested the member raise the issue under Other Business

**4. Toronto School of Theology: Memorandum of Agreement - Amendments
(arising from Report Number 88 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs)**

Professor Allen presented the proposed recommendations from the Toronto School of Theology (T.S.T.), documentation for which is attached hereto as Appendix "A".

He recalled that the Doctor of Ministry, a professional doctorate program, had been awarded until a review in 1990, at which time the School of Graduate Studies (S.G.S.) had concluded that the program did not meet the requirements as set out for other professional doctoral degrees. The current program requirements had been reviewed by S.G.S., and its Council had approved the proposal for conjoint status of this degree, effective September 1, 2001.

Professor Allen noted that the Toronto School of Theology currently offered a three-year Master of Divinity degree. This was a post-baccalaureate degree similar to the Bachelor of Education, and it was designed for those seeking ordination. The T.S.T. was proposing to add three new basic degrees using the courses currently offered for the Master of Divinity but repackaging them to create two-year professional degrees for those not wishing to pursue ordination. The Master of Theological Studies would focus on the theoretical component of the Master of Divinity program. The Master of Pastoral Studies would have a pastoral focus which could accommodate a non-Christian stream. The Master of Arts in Ministry and Spirituality would be based on the Jesuit tradition rich in spirituality.

The second part of the motion would provide the same conjoint status for all Master of Religious Education degrees awarded by T.S.T. member institutions. Currently, only those awarded by Emmanuel College and the University of St. Michael's College had that status.

With respect to modifying the Memorandum of Agreement, he noted that the current version had been approved in 1994 for a 10-year period, with a provision for an interim review. The proposed amendments arose from the interim review. The new basic programs referred to above would be added to Schedule B. The proposed revisions to clause 10 would clarify the jurisdiction and procedures for academic discipline, and would allow T.S.T. students to be covered by the University of Toronto Tribunal. Schedule C, Section A6 had been modified to recover costs from T.S.T. for any discipline cases. Sections C1 and C2 in Schedule C had been amended to allow T.S.T. students to have access to the Career Centre and to pay the fee for that service.

A member asked if a research thesis was a component of the Doctor of Ministry degree. Dr. Neelands responded that there had always been a research component. The change had been to require the examiners to be members of the graduate faculty.

4. Toronto School of Theology: Memorandum of Agreement - Amendments (cont'd)

A member asked how students in the Master of Arts in Ministry and Spirituality program would be evaluated on their knowledge of spirituality. Dr. Neelands indicated that the students would be tested on this in their courses and by the production of a thesis.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the proposal to restore to conjoint status with the University of Toronto the Doctor of Ministry degree in the Toronto School of Theology be approved.

THAT the proposal to grant the following degrees of member institutions of the Toronto School of Theology conjoint status with the University of Toronto be approved:

Master of Arts in Ministry and Spirituality (M.A.M.S.)
Master of Pastoral Studies (M.P.S.)
Master of Theological Studies (M.T.S.) and

THAT the degree of Master of Religious Education, awarded by any member institution of the Toronto School of Theology and not simply Emmanuel College or the University of St. Michael's College, have conjoint status with the University of Toronto.

THAT the penultimate sentence of Clause 10 (1994) be removed, and Clause 10 amended to read:

10. (i) All students admitted by or registered in T.S.T. and the Member Institutions in the programs listed in Schedule B annexed hereto in conformity with the admission regulations of T.S.T. and of the Member Institution concerned, as such regulations existed on 1 July 1994, or as they may from time to time hereafter be approved, after change, by the Member Institutions, T.S.T., and U of T, shall be thereby conjointly registered at the University of Toronto for academic purposes. The Member Institutions shall retain full responsibility for all non-academic aspects of the life of their respective students. [1989:c.9].
- (ii) It is understood that all students admitted by or registered in T.S.T. and the Member Institutions, whether in the conjoint programs listed in Schedule B annexed hereto or in any non-conjoint program of T.S.T. and the Member Institutions or any of them, shall be subject to the exclusive disciplinary jurisdiction of U of T in respect of academic matters. Each Member Institution will advise its students in writing of this jurisdiction and will procure them to adhere and submit thereto in writing. It is further understood that the U of T's Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters, as amended from time to time (the "Code"), will govern the exercise of such jurisdiction and may be amended by U of T hereafter, after consultation with T.S.T. and the Member Institutions. In applying the Code, the roles, rights and duties of the dean and the department chair shall be assumed and exercised by the dean or principal, as the case may be, of the Member Institution in which the student is registered.

THAT Schedule C be amended as attached hereto in Appendix "A" .

5. **Academic Priorities Fund: Allocation - University of Toronto Library**
(arising from Report Number 71 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Mock explained that the proposed allocation to the University of Toronto Library was in support of its *Raising our Sights* Plan. The U of T Library was ranked fourth among library systems in North America and first among libraries in publicly funded universities. This allocation would, among other things, help fund collaborative information technology initiatives and the creation of a Resource Centre for Academic Technology.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDED

THAT an APF allocation of \$1,580,000, in base funding and \$2,776,000 in one-time-only funding be approved in support of the *Raising Our Sights* plan of the University of Toronto Library.

Documentation is attached hereto as Appendix “B”.

6. **Academic Priorities Fund: Allocation - Office of the Vice-President and Provost and Office of the Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget**
(arising from Report Number 71 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Mock explained that the proposed allocations to the Offices of the Vice-President and Provost and the Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget were in support of the *Raising our Sights* plans of those Offices. Both offices had had significantly increased scope and responsibilities over the past eight years with no increase to funding or staff. This proposed allocation would allow the Offices to meet the need for effective and efficient planning through a period of capital expansion and unprecedented faculty recruitment. The allocation to Other Academic Costs would provide the correction to a budget that had not been adjusted in over twenty years and had been supported out of carryforward and contingency funds that were now exhausted.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDED

THAT the following allocations be approved from the Academic Priorities Fund

- \$154,375 in base in support of the *Raising Our Sights* plan of the Office of the Vice-President and Provost;
- \$203,622 in base and \$210,000 one-time-only in support of the *Raising our Sights* plan of the Office of the Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget; and,
- \$430,000 in base to adjust the budgets for the following “Other Academic Costs” funds: Advertising of Academic Positions in University Affairs; Academic Reviews; Decanal Searches; and, Research Support for Principals and Deans.

Documentation is attached hereto as Appendix “C”.

7. **Academic Priorities Fund: Allocation - Faculty Recruitment**
(arising from Report Number 71 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Mock said that the University's high rate of faculty hiring was expected to continue for the remainder of this decade in what had become a highly competitive market. In addition to supporting this key priority in *Raising our Sights*, the allocation proposed would support a number of initiatives that had been undertaken to successfully attract top faculty to this University.

In response to a member's question, Professor Sedra indicated that the funding for the Provost's Advisor on Pro-Active Recruitment was provided in this last allocation of \$500,000 in base for support services.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDED

THAT the following allocations in support of Faculty Recruitment be made from the Academic Priorities Fund:

- \$1,238,809 one-time-only to cover the cost of funding for start-up packages already committed for 2000-01
- \$2,000,000 in base to create a fund to be distributed annually by the Provost to support start-up packages for new faculty
- \$1,000,000 in base to create a fund to be distributed annually by the Provost to provide support for academic appointments of "trailing" spouses
- \$500,000 in base to provide ongoing funding for support services to assist in faculty recruitment.

Documentation is attached hereto as Appendix "D".

8. **Academic Priorities Fund: Allocation - Council of Health Sciences and Social Work Deans - Interdivisional Initiatives**
(arising from Report Number 71 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Mock recalled that the Council of Health Sciences and Social Work Deans had submitted three proposals to assist in the development and enhancement of transdisciplinary and interfaculty activities in the health sciences and related disciplines. On the Provost's recommendation, the Planning and Budget Committee had agreed that approval be given to two of those requests: an allocation for interprofessional education and another for upgrading to the Health Sciences Writing Centre.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDED

THAT an Academic Priorities Fund allocation of \$342,150 in one-time-only funding be approved in support of inter-divisional initiatives proposed by the Council of Health Sciences and Social Work Deans.

Documentation is attached hereto as Appendix "E".

9. **Capital Project: University of Toronto at Mississauga, Centre for Applied Bioscience and Biotechnology - Users' Committee Report**
(arising from Report Number 71 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Mock explained that the Planning and Budget Committee had reviewed the Users' Committee report and had recommended approval in principle of a Centre for Applied Bioscience and Biotechnology in the South Building of the University of Toronto at Mississauga. Major capital funding had been received from the Canada Foundation for Innovation and the Ontario Innovation Foundation.

The Chair thanked Professor Krull for attending the meeting.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDED

(i) THAT the Users' Committee Report for the Centre for Applied Bioscience and Biotechnology, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "F", be approved in principle to allow for the construction of 330 nasms in the South Building at UTM. This will provide a new core research facility in biosciences and biotechnology at UTM, specifically comprising a high field NMR, a micro-array research and development facility and an automated DNA sequencer.

(ii) THAT the project scope as identified in the Users' Committee Report be approved at a cost of \$2,082,000 with funding from the Canada Foundation for Innovation and the Ontario Innovation Fund.

10. **Capital Project: Faculty of Medicine, Laboratory Centre for Disease Control Compliance for Level 3 Containment Facility - Users' Committee Report**
(arising from Report Number 71 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Mock noted that the current containment facility located on the fourth floor of the Medical Sciences Building had been designed to comply with 1980 guidelines for Level D laboratories. These guidelines had since evolved and in March of last year the Laboratory Centre for Disease Control had found the facility to not be in compliance with the 1996 updated guidelines for laboratory biosafety.

In response to a question, Professor Yip stated that there was a higher level of compliance than level 3 but level 3 allowed the facility to work with air-borne pathogens. He noted that the facility already existed on the fourth floor of the Medical Sciences Building and the project called for the renovation of that space to comply with current standards.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDED

THAT the Users' Committee Report for a Level 3 Containment Facility as defined by the Laboratory Centre for Disease Control, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "G" be approved in principle, including the space program and allocation in priority ranking as outlined in the Report at a total cost of \$1.6 million to be funded by the Faculty of Medicine, The Hospital for Sick Children and St. Michael's Hospital.

11. Canada Research Chairs Fund: Faculty of Medicine - Allocation
(arising from Report Number 71 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Mock commented that the University of Toronto financial model for Canada Research Chairs called for 126 to be awarded to the Faculty of Medicine over 5 years – 63 Tier I and 63 Tier II. This proposed allocation from the CRC Fund addressed the 23 Canada Research Chairs awarded to the Faculty of Medicine in September 2000. Seven were to be campus-based and 16 were hospital-based.

A member asked about the affiliated institutions and the appointment of status-only faculty. He believed that there was some misunderstanding outside the University on the matter of what was an academic unit and the different types of appointment. A member suggested that an academic unit was one capable of mounting an academic program. Professor Sedra explained that clinical appointments in clinical departments were status only. A member noted that although these appointments were not paid by the University, they were scrutinized carefully to ensure adherence to academic standards before they were made. Professor Sedra said that the University should have a policy on these types of appointments. At the moment, there was a policy vacuum in this area, but the issue would be addressed in the next academic year.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDED

THAT \$1.07 million (\$1.2 million minus \$127,000 indirect cost of 16% of salaries and benefits) be allocated from the Canada Research Chairs Fund to the Faculty of Medicine to cover the salaries and benefits and cluster support for the 7 campus-based chair-holders approved in the September 2000 CRC competition.

THAT \$2.2 million (\$2.3 million minus \$83,000 indirect cost of 6% of salaries and benefits) be allocated to the Faculty of Medicine in support of the 16 chair-holders based in Hospital/Research Institutes.

Documentation is attached hereto as Appendix “H”.

12. School of Graduate Studies: Collaborative M.Eng./M.A.Sc. Program in Welding Engineering - Closure
(arising from Report Number 71 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Mock noted that no students had registered in the collaborative M.Eng/M.A.Sc. program in Welding Engineering between the Universities of Toronto and Waterloo for the past five years. The signatories to the memorandum of agreement that established the program had agreed that it should be discontinued.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the Collaborative M.Eng/M.A.Sc. Program in Welding Engineering be discontinued, effective immediately.

Documentation is attached hereto as Appendix “I”.

13. School of Graduate Studies: M.A. Program in South Asian Studies - Cessation of New Admissions
(arising from Report Number 71 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Mock said that the recommendation to cease admission to the M.A. Program in South Asian Studies had no financial implications for the University and did not disadvantage students. Few students had registered in this program in the past few years and future students interested in South Asian Studies would be counseled to register in the appropriate collaborative program.

Professor Marrus, speaking as the Dean of the School of Graduate Studies, explained that the University was not ending its interest in this disciplinary area but was rather re-positioning itself by emphasizing the collaborative program rather than the dedicated master's program. He believed that there would be a considerable positive difference in the education and that the program would be re-invigorated. In answer to a question, he noted that the collaborative program was offered through the Graduate Department of History and the Centre for the Study of Religion. These departments would soon be joined by the Departments of Geography, Political Science and Fine Art.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT admission to the M.A. Program in South Asian Studies be suspended, effective September 2001.

Documentation is attached hereto as Appendix "I".

14. Policy and Procedures on Academic Appointments: Amendment - Athletics Instructor

Professor Gooch recalled that two years ago, when the University of Toronto Faculty Association (UTFA) and the University had agreed on new policies for the ranks of lecturers and senior lectures, the parties had recognized that there were some categories of academic appointments that would require separate policies. Athletics instructor was one such category. The proposed policies were the result of negotiations with UTFA and were approved by the UTFA Council on February 7th, 2001. He recommended that the policies be approved and incorporated in the *Policy and Procedures on Academic Appointments*.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDED

THAT the proposal for the rank of Athletics Instructor and Senior Athletics Instructor, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "J" be approved, effective July 1, 2001, and incorporated in the *Policy and Procedures on Academic Appointments*.

15. Items for Information**(a) Report of the Vice-President and Provost****(i) Government Funding**

Professor Sedra said that the administration was expecting the provincial government to make an announcement about funding in support of enrolment growth in the provincial budget which was scheduled to be delivered Wednesday, May 9th. He recalled that the Board had already seen the *Framework* for enrolment growth and the University was waiting to see if funding would be provided to support its plans to deal with the double cohort and the expected demographic increases in enrolment.

The University was also waiting for the annual announcement on the level of university operating funding. The budget had been considered at the previous Board meeting and had been based on the assumption that government funding would increase by two per cent a year for the next three years. That amounted to an increase of \$7 million annually. Professor Sedra noted that the University's expenses had, in fact, risen by four per cent a year, twice the rate of inflation.

(ii) Faculty of Law

Professor Sedra provided a brief report on this matter since the Faculty was still in the process of dealing with the students. Unfortunately, some students and/or their lawyers had spoken to the media about the penalties imposed. Other students had asked that their sanctions not be disclosed until after the examination period. He reported that all students had been interviewed. The Dean would decide on all penalties and communicate them by May 10th.

In response to a question, Professor Sedra indicated that some students had asked that they not be told of the decisions at this time and for compassionate reasons, the University had agreed. Some students had been allowed to postpone writing their exams.

A member noted that it was not just the students who were culpable and he asked if there were any steps being taken to reprimand the law firms. Professor Sedra said there were not.

A member recalled that he had asked for information on the use of the LSAT tests in the Faculty of Law. He said that some felt there were systemic problems at the Faculty. He believed that three faculty had left because of corporatization and inaccessibility, especially financial inaccessibility.

(iii) Department of Psychiatry

Professor Sedra reported on the matter concerning an appointment made in an affiliated teaching hospital, the Centre for Addiction and Mental Health (C.A.M.H.). The offer of appointment to Dr. Healy had later been rescinded. Dr. Healy had also been offered a status-only appointment in the Faculty of Medicine; this offer had also been withdrawn. The President had asked for a report on the search process through the Dean of the Faculty of Medicine. Dr. Healy alleged that he had never been informed of the reasons for the withdrawal of the appointment. A copy of the detailed reasons had been provided by C.A.M.H. and given to both Dr. Healy and the Provost. Professor Sedra said that the allegations in the media that a drug company had influenced the decision to rescind the appointment were unfounded. The position which Dr. Healy had been offered was clinical director of the Centre's mood and anxiety disorders program.

15. Items for Information (cont'd)**(a) Report of the Vice-President and Provost** (cont'd)

A member accepted the fact that an institution affiliated with the University made the appointment and then withdrew it and the details would be confidential. However, from the newspapers, it appeared that the institution gave the candidate help with immigration matters but following a lecture given by Dr. Healy, it rescinded the offer. He agreed that the University could not ask about the terms of the appointment but it could enquire why an institution affiliated with it acted in an apparently unprofessional manner. Professor Sedra did not wish to leave the impression that the University thought nothing wrong had happened; on the contrary, the University was concerned that an offer had been made and then withdrawn. Both the University and C.A.M.H. regretted what had happened. This situation did not arise often and had not arisen in the eight years he had been Provost. The University did enquire into what happened, asking for a chronology of events through the Dean of Medicine and forwarding a detailed letter to Dr. Healy. The President re-iterated that the University had expressed its displeasure but not through the press.

Another member agreed that it would harm the University's reputation to deal with offers in such a manner. Offers were believed to be made in good faith but now the possibility of rescinding them had been raised. He believed the incident reflected badly on the University. He suggested that the process be clarified, particularly concerning rescinding an offer, and that each academic unit be informed.

A member asked about the relationship with the Toronto School of Theology and what that meant in terms of its faculty. Professor Gooch said that the faculty were not part of the University's faculty, but that under the Memorandum of Agreement, they were required to observe the Policy and Procedures on Academic Appointments and academic freedom. Dr. Neelands confirmed that there were no religious tests used in hiring the faculty.

(iv) Appointment of Vice-Provost, Faculty

Professor Sedra welcomed Professor Goel as the new Vice-Provost, Faculty beginning July 1, 2001. Professor Goel would be replacing Professor Gooch who was moving to Victoria University to become President on July 1, 2001

(v) Appointments and Status Changes

A number of appointments and status changes were presented for information.

(b) Employment Equity Annual Report, 1999-2000

Professor Tuohy introduced this report for information, noting that the covering memorandum listed the highlights of the report. The Academic Board received the report because of its interest in academic policies. The Business Board also received the report because administrative staff fell within its jurisdiction. She said that the administration was encouraged by the statistics concerning new appointments. The challenge was to maintain a workforce that was representative of the pools of qualified individuals available for recruitment. Some success had been achieved but there was more to do. In response to a question, Professor Tuohy reported that there had been follow-up with departments to ensure consistency in the time period covered by the survey of chairs.

15. Items for Information (cont'd)**(b) Employment Equity Annual Report, 1999-2000** (cont'd)

A member referred to the information on exits from the faculty which showed that a number of women left the University in the early stages of their careers. She asked if there were any programs in place to help retain faculty. Professor Tuohy noted that the women constituted a smaller proportion of those who left than their representation among new hires. Invited to respond, Professor Abramovitch indicated that a number of faculties had set up mentorship programs for their new faculty members.

A member noted that (a) the Report did not show its authors, (b) the discipline group that did not hire women in proportion to their representation in applicant pools was not specified in the covering memo, and (c) while data on the number of men and women were hard data, there were problems with the data for visible minorities since the data were based on self-identification. He also asked if there was any punishment for not hiring in proportion to the representation in the pools. Professor Sedra said there was encouragement but no punishment. Professor Abramovitch noted that Report had been written by Ms Sonja Greckol for the Employment Equity Committee, as indicated on page 9. The discipline group to which the member referred was shown in Table 13 of the Report and consisted of Anthropology, Botany, Classics, Community Health, English, French, Linguistics, Other Languages and Sociology. Professor Abramovitch agreed that self-identification was imprecise which was why a Chair's survey was also conducted. Although the latter could also be labeled imprecise, it was felt both surveys were better than one or the other.

A member used an overhead to show the decline in the number of professors at all levels with disabilities over the past five years. He said that many buildings remained physically inaccessible. In his opinion, this was not a side issue; it would make the task of hiring those with disabilities difficult. He referred to a report from Pennsylvania State University of a plan to enhance diversity. He asked that the report be distributed. The report called for such things as curriculum diversity, a new Vice-Provost for Educational Equity and a progress report on fostering diversity. He believed it gave a feeling of equity. He recalled that at the Academic Board meeting in November 1998, the Arts and Science Students Union and the Students' Administrative Council had listed 13 demands in connection with equity issues. He asked that the administration review these points. The President said that this University could be proud of its record compared to that of Penn State.

A member asked why the question of minority representation was limited to certain groups. Professor Sedra indicated that there were four groups listed the federal contractors legislation, namely, women, visible minorities, people with disabilities and aboriginal people.

A member commented on the definition of disabled. In some cases, if the proper accommodation was given to people with disabilities so that they could do the job, they might not be considered disabled and might not identify themselves as such in this context. Maybe the numbers were declining because accommodation was being made.

A member noted that good progress had been made in this area since his arrival at the University, particularly in the area of gathering data. The data showed that the University was hiring across a broad spectrum.

A member noted that the employment of aboriginal people needed to be further explored.

15. Items for Information (cont'd)

- (c) Items for Information in Report Number 88 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs

Professor Allen had no further comments to make on the report.

- (d) Items for Information in Reports Number 70 and 71 of the Planning and Budget Committee

Professor Mock drew attention to the School of Continuing Studies' Budget and Strategic Plan 2000-2004 discussed in Report Number 70.

- (e) Report Number 255 of the Academic Appeals Committee

This report was presented for information.

- (f) Report of Degrees Awarded

This report was distributed at the meeting and was presented for information.

16. Date of Next Meeting - June 7, 2001**17. Other Business**

In response to a member's question, Professor Mock referred to the Report Number 71 of the Planning and Budget Committee in which Professor Sedra had undertaken to provide the Committee with the report from a task force currently studying the issue of physical accessibility on campus. Both the report and the administrative response would be provided for discussion as soon as possible.

The meeting moved into closed session.

18. Academic Administrative Appointments

The following academic administrative appointments were approved:

Faculty of Arts and Science

Professor Mariel O'Neill-Karch	Associate Dean, Humanities from January 1, 2002 to June 30, 2002
--------------------------------	--

Department of Astronomy

Professor W. H. (Bill) Clarke	Acting Chair from July 1, 2001 to June 30, 2002
-------------------------------	---

Department of Classics

Professor Brad Inwood	Acting Chair from April 1, 2001 June 30, 2001
-----------------------	---

Department of Physics

Professor Henry van Driel	Chair from July 1, 2001 to June 30, 2005
---------------------------	--

18. Academic Administrative Appointments (cont'd)

Faculty of Forestry

Professor Rorke Bryan Dean from July 1, 2001 to June 30, 2005
(re-appointment)

Faculty of Medicine

Department of Speech-Language Pathology

Professor Luc De Nil Chair from July 1, 2001 to June 30, 2006

Faculty of Social Work

Professor Emeritus Lilian Wells Acting Associate Dean from July 1, 2001
to June 30, 2002

Professor Sedra reported for information the re-appointment of Dr. Mary Barrie as the Director of the School of Continuing Studies for a new four-year term, beginning July 1, 2001

The meeting adjourned 5:55 p.m.

Secretary
May 4, 2001

Chair