

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

REPORT NUMBER 120 OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD

June 4, 2003

To the Governing Council,
University of Toronto.

Your Board reports that it held a meeting on Wednesday, June 4, 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 4, 5, 6 and 13(f) are recommended to Governing Council for approval, item 7 is presented for Executive Committee confirmation and the remaining items are reported for information.

A motion to adjourn no later than 6:30 p.m. was duly moved and seconded. The motion was carried.

1. Report of the Previous Meeting

The report of the previous meeting, dated May 8, 2003, was approved.

2. Business Arising

The Chair noted that there were two notices of motion given at the previous meeting. The Agenda Committee had dealt with them, as noted in the Report of its meeting – the next item on the Agenda. There was also a question about the use of “professor emerita” and this would be addressed in item 7. Finally, the Chair said that the member who had requested information on the budget of the equity offices had been given the data; if other members wished to receive a copy they should contact the Secretary.

3. Report Number 106 of the Agenda Committee

The report was received for information.

A member noted that information he had presented to the Agenda Committee regarding accessibility had been posted to the web. There was a page missing and the Secretary undertook to correct the document. The member wished to speak to the issue of accessibility and the Chair indicated he should do so under “Other Business”.

4. Capital Project: University of Toronto at Mississauga, Wellness Centre – Project Planning Report

(arising from Report Number 89 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Horton explained that this capital project was initiated by students at the University of Toronto at Mississauga to address their concern that there be an appropriate athletics facility. The proposed new centre would also better accommodate the planned increases in student population at that campus.

4. Capital Project: University of Toronto at Mississauga, Wellness Centre – Project Planning Report (cont'd)

The Planning and Budget Committee had discussed the project at length with a number of members expressing concern about the long-term financing. While they had no doubt that UTM was committed to an expansion which would see enrolment reach more than 11,000 by 2007, members had debated whether there was risk to relying on this enrolment holding in the steady state for the duration of the 25-year financing required to support this mortgage. Members had also asked what other commitments of this kind were underway at the University of Toronto at Mississauga and what the plans were in the event that the enrolment did not maintain the level expected.

Professor Horton said that members had been convinced of the strong support for the Wellness Centre among student leaders at the UTM campus, but one of the elements of the financing that had drawn their attention was the matter of the student levy. The levy had been considered in April 2002 and the initial amount of \$25 had been approved. However, under the process by which this recommendation had come forward it had not been possible at that time to approve the needed increase in the levy to \$150. That increase required further appropriate approval by the students at UTM sometime in the future, at which time the University Affairs Board would look forward to considering the proposed increase.

Professor Horton reported that the Provost had been able to assure the Committee that all currently available demographical data strongly supported the continuing enrolment expansion at UTM that was necessary to support the long-term financing of this facility. With that assurance, and with the assurance that there would be a \$500,000 limit on expenditure until the formal approvals of the increased levy was in place, the Planning and Budget Committee had approved this recommendation.

Professor Orchard, Vice-President and Principal of the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM), in seconding the motion, acknowledged the leadership of Mr. Overton, Dean of Student Affairs and Assistant Principal, Mr. Duncliffe, Director, Centre for Physical Education, Athletics and Recreation, and the students in bringing this proposal to fruition.

A member noted that this proposal cited 3 percent inflation for the student levy while the next item, a proposal concerning a student centre at the University of Toronto at Scarborough, referred to the Consumer Price Index which was assumed to be 2 percent. He asked the reason for the difference. Professor Orchard noted that the inflationary increase had been built into the student levy. Some of the funding would be used to cover the operating costs of the space. He noted that if the percentage produced surplus funds, they would be applied to the mortgage. Mr. Duncliffe commented that the 3 percent had been the best advice at the time.

A member observed that the word “wellness”, as used by the public, went beyond physical fitness and health. She suggested that not all students would take advantage of the athletic facilities and she asked whether there would be room for other student services that would make the term “wellness” more inclusive. Professor Orchard explained that the project was basically an athletics, recreation and wellness centre which would be part of a continuum of curricular, co-curricular and extracurricular activities at UTM. Student services were being brought together in a “one-stop” services model and they would share an indoor plaza with the health services and the wellness centre. He noted that UTM had been in discussion with possible partners for the project but that the discussion had not yet been successful.

4. Capital Project: University of Toronto at Mississauga, Wellness Centre – Project Planning Report (cont'd)

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDED

1. THAT the Project Planning Report to establish the Wellness Centre at the University of Toronto at Mississauga, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix “A”, be approved in principle.
2. THAT the project scope for the Wellness Centre at UTM comprising a total of 4,810 nasm, of which 490 nasm are renovations to existing space, for a net increase of 6,700 gsm be approved.
3. THAT the funding arrangements for the Wellness Centre at UTM be approved at an estimated total project cost of \$23,500,000 to \$24,500,000 with funding as follows:
 - (i) A capped contribution of \$7,000,000 from the University of Toronto for the 50 cent match on each dollar raised through the student levy support,
 - (ii) A one-time-only contribution of \$1,000,000 from the University of Toronto at Mississauga,
 - (iii) A \$500,000 contribution to be secured from fund raising at the University of Toronto at Mississauga [UTM], and
 - (iv) A mortgage to be amortized over a period of approximately 25 years in the range of \$15,000,000 to \$16,000,000, with payments forthcoming from the planned student levy income. Student levy income would continue until such time as the mortgage is fully paid.

**5. Capital Project: University of Toronto at Scarborough, Student Centre – Project Planning Report, Change in Scope
University Infrastructure Investment Fund - Allocation
(arising from Report Number 89 of the Planning and Budget Committee)**

Professor Horton said that the Committee had reviewed this proposal and was pleased to learn that the change in scope, which normally would also be associated with an increase in cost, was based solely on reconfigured space and additional components that did not increase the overall estimated cost of the project. The Committee strongly supported this recommendation.

A member referred to the need for a \$1 million contribution to be secured from fund raising and asked what would happen if this was not achieved. Professor Neuman responded that the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC) would provide the funds from its enrolment growth funding.

A member noted that both this project and the Wellness Centre at UTM relied on funding from student levies over a protracted period of time. He asked whether this was a coincidence or a new method of funding capital projects. He was opposed to students' funding infrastructure projects. The Chair noted that the students at UTM had also helped fund their Student Centre. Professor Neuman said that she would not discern a trend. Students had helped to fund student activity space but not academic buildings.

A member said that both this proposal and the previous one included a risk analysis report. She asked whether such reports would become a standard part of capital project proposals from now on. Professor Neuman responded that, although risk analyses were prepared for every project, they had not been sent to the Board previously. She and the Vice-President,

**5. Capital Project: University of Toronto at Scarborough, Student Centre – Project Planning Report, Change in Scope (cont'd)
University Infrastructure Investment Fund – Allocation (cont'd)**

Business Affairs were drafting a new capital planning process so that each building would be reviewed in the context of the whole capital planning enterprise. Each capital project would be reviewed with respect to its academic priority and its fiscal feasibility. If there was a mortgage, all concerns about the University's ability to repay it would have to be satisfied before the project could proceed.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDED

1. THAT the addendum to Project Planning Report to establish the Student Centre at the University of Toronto at Scarborough, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "B", be approved in principle.
2. THAT the project scope for the Student Centre at UTSC be approved at a total project cost of \$13,923,000 with funding as follows:
 - (i) A capped contribution of \$3,748,695 from the University of Toronto for the 50 cent match on each dollar raised through the student levy support,
 - (ii) A one-time-only contribution of \$975,000 from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund [UIIF],
 - (iii) A \$1,000,000 contribution to be secured from fund raising at the University of Toronto at Scarborough [UTSC],
 - (iv) Cash contribution in the amount of \$1,250,000 from the Student Levy support already collected, and
 - (v) A mortgage to be amortized over a period of approximately 25 years in the amount of \$6,950,000 with payments forthcoming from the planned student levy income. Student levy income will continue until such time as the mortgage is fully paid.

6. Capital Project: Faculty of Arts and Science - Sidney Smith, Student Space – Project Planning Report
(arising from Report Number 89 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Horton reported that the Committee was supportive of this project that would provide urgently needed study and lounge space for students at the St. George campus.

In seconding the motion, Professor Sinervo said that the project was an important development for the Faculty in that it would provide badly needed activity space for students.

It was duly moved and seconded,

1. THAT the revised Project Planning Report to address the enclosure of the overhang areas on the east and west side of Sidney Smith Hall Patio, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "C", be approved in principle.

6. Capital Project: Faculty of Arts and Science - Sidney Smith, Student Space – Project Planning Report (cont'd)

2. THAT the project scope to create 1200 gross square meters of student support / study space and washrooms within Sidney Smith Hall be approved at an estimated total project cost of \$3,100,000 - \$3,300,000 with full funding from the approved enrolment growth funds.
3. THAT the elevator installation identified within the broader scope of this Sidney Smith Hall Patio Enclosure project be undertaken at some future date when the funds, estimated at \$885,000, are available.

A member said that he supported the project but he understood that the number of net assignable square meters (nasm), when added to the University's current total, would put the University's allocation of nasm for student activity space at the low end of the guidelines established by the Council of Ontario Universities (COU). He asked if there were any future plans to bring the space allotment up to the COU guidelines. Professor Neuman reported that there was a group of students, led by the Students' Administrative Council, that was proposing a student centre for the St. George campus, much like those at UTM and UTSC. Her office had seen the report and had urged the students to reconsider the fiscal feasibility of the project.

A member said he supported the project but he was concerned that, although student societies were in need of space, there did not appear to be any plans to allot them space in this proposal. The space appeared to be empty. He asked whether there had been or would be consultation with students about the use of the space. Professor Sinervo said that the primary student consultation had taken place with the Arts and Science Students' Union (ASSU). He noted that the space was general purpose and that it would be built as flexible space that could be used as a study area and easily reconfigurable for student activities. The space would not be available for 16 months; planning for its use would continue during this time.

A member gave the following notice of motion

THAT members of University of Toronto elected student governments of SAC, APUS and GSU be represented on Facilities and Services.

A member who was the President of ASSU noted that there had been a meeting with the former Dean, Professor Amrhein, at which the previous member had not been present. These issues had been raised and the Dean had said that he could not promise space for ASSU and APUS. The space was basically to accommodate commuter students.

A member also voiced his support for this project but said that he wanted to raise the issue of student space and the involvement of students in planning that space. Although there was not a student levy to support this project directly, students had contributed to the cost through their fees. He was particularly concerned about the elevator and the fact that it would not be part of the project at this time but would be put off until funds were available. He wished to move a motion to amend the recommendation to include the elevator as part of the project. The Chair explained that the Board could not consider such an amendment and suggested that the proper course of action would be a motion to refer the matter back to the Planning and Budget Committee. A member asked whether the motion could be divided and the Chair ruled that referral back would be the preferred course of action.

6. Capital Project: Faculty of Arts and Science - Sidney Smith, Student Space – Project Planning Report (cont'd)

It was duly moved and seconded

THAT the matter be referred back to the Planning and Budget Committee to consider adding the elevator to the project at this time.

A member spoke in opposition to the motion, noting that the delay could endanger the whole project. Professor Sinervo noted that there was already an elevator in the building providing accessibility to the upper floors. The additional elevator was not an essential part of the project and thus had a lower priority. The project had been brought forward for consideration at this time with the understanding that the elevator would be installed when funding was available.

A member reported that the SAC committee on accessibility had budgeted all its funds for the next five years and there was no funding available to support this project.

The mover of the motion said that the referral back would not cause a delay and the recommendation could be returned to the Board in several weeks' time. There had not been a discussion with student representatives about the elevator as part of this project. He also believed that there would be added costs if the elevator was done at a later date instead of as part of the current project.

A member asked why, if the building was accessible, this particular elevator would have a higher priority than those needed in buildings that were currently inaccessible. Where were the priorities set for accessibility projects? Professor Neuman explained that the Vice-Provost had signaled in his memorandum that the elevator would be considered in the future when funding was available. The process for setting priorities for accessibility projects should not be taken over by the Board. It was part of the capital planning process that looked at academic priorities and the feasibility of various projects. There were a great many other buildings for which issues of accessibility needed attention.

The vote on the motion to refer back was taken. The motion failed.

The vote on the main motion was taken. The motion was carried.

7. Policy on Appointment of Professor Emeritus

Professor Neuman recalled that at the last meeting, some discussion concerning the use of “professor emerita” had occurred, centred on using gendered language and on grammatically correct Latin. She proposed an amendment to the policy that would allow the retiring professor to choose which title to use, professor emeritus or professor emerita.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the revised *Policy on Appointment of Professor Emeritus*, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix “D”, be approved.

8. Summer Executive Authority

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT between the last meeting of the Academic Board and the first meeting in the next academic session, proposals for approval of academic administrative appointments to be made under Summer Executive Authority be recommended to the President on behalf of the Academic Board by a subgroup consisting of the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Board, the Vice-President and Provost, and the student member of the Agenda Committee.

9. Items for Information

- (a) Report of the Vice-President and Provost
 - (i) SSHRC Fellowship Program

Professor Neuman reported that the federal government had established a new fellowship program for doctoral and master's students. Sixty percent of the funding was for the humanities and social sciences and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) had devised a process for distributing the fellowships. Applications must be received by the end of June. SSHRC had allocated fellowships to students at every university. Applications were sought from undergraduates entering graduate programs or first-year master's students who would be continuing their studies. Graduate chairs had to contact the students to encourage them to apply to their current university for the fellowships. For example, a student at another university who was coming to this University for graduate work had to apply through his/her undergraduate university. This would be a difficult process and the University wished to work with SSHRC to propose changes for next year.

In response to a question, Professor Neuman said that there would no problems meeting the deadline; Professor Marrus and his colleagues had established a process for dealing with this program.

- (ii) Decanal Searches

Professor Neuman noted that there had been two very successful decanal searches this year culminating in the appointment of Professor Jane Gaskell as Dean of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education at the University of Toronto and in the recommendation for the appointment of a new dean for the Faculty of Information Studies. The latter appointment would be considered later in this meeting. A third search, for the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Science, was underway. The Committee had been established and it had held three meetings. The members had met with former Dean Amrhein and the search consultant was looking internally, nationally and internationally for the best candidates.

A member commented that the Committee did not include a part-time undergraduate student among its members. The University had recently dis-established three-year degrees and now he had noticed a trend to exclude this constituency from important committees. He asserted that part-time students would not tolerate what he viewed as a trend to exclude them.

9. Items for Information (cont'd)

- (a) Report of the Vice-President and Provost (cont'd)
- (iii) Appointments and Status Changes / Appointment of Professors Emeriti

Professor Neuman drew attention to the list of appointments and status changes, including the appointment of one professor emeritus.

- (b) Items for Information in Report Number 102 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs

Members had no questions on this report.

- (c) Items for Information in Report Number 89 of the Planning and Budget Committee

Members had no questions on this report.

- (d) Report Number 279 of the Academic Appeals Committee

The Chair noted that he had had questions about the report to which he had received satisfactory answers. Members had no questions.

- (e) Quarterly Report on Donations over \$250,000, February, 2003 – April, 2003

A member asked who were the Associates of the University of Toronto Inc. A member responded that they were a group of alumni based in the U.S. who had incorporated to receive donations and give receipts.

A member asked how the value of gifts-in-kind was calculated. Professor Neuman said that such gifts were evaluated using a process set down by the government. The donor was given a receipt based on the evaluation.

10. Date of Next Meeting

The Chair noted that there was need to hold a special meeting of the Academic Board on Monday, June 23 at 4:10 p.m. The agenda would include: capital projects; clinical faculty matters; revised appointments policies; appointments, if any; and the discontinuation of a graduate department. This would be a very important meeting and he urged members to make every effort to attend.

11. Other Business

A member referred to the notice of motion he had given at the previous meeting and its disposition by the Agenda Committee. He had given documentation to the Committee and it had been posted to the web and the URL had been distributed to members of the Board so they could review it if they wished. He noted an error in the documentation which the Secretary would correct. He felt the issue of accessibility should be dealt with by this Board in a full and open discussion and not in a closed-session meeting of the Agenda Committee. The Chair explained that the notice of motion had been dealt with by the Agenda Committee, which had decided not to put his motion on the agenda. The Chair also noted that the member had given a similar notice of motion to Governing Council. That notice of motion would be dealt with by the Executive Committee. The Chair asked

11. Other Business (cont'd)

the member to be seated. The member recorded his dissatisfaction with the way the Board had dealt with this issue.

A member referred to the notice of motion he had given at the previous meeting. He felt that it was important that the Board discuss the issue of employment equity. He believed it was wrong of the Agenda Committee to decide not to put the issue on the agenda for a discussion by the full Board. He said that the various constituencies would work better together if there was a process of inclusion. He said that it was important to have a positive discussion of employment equity. The Chair reminded the member that the Board had had a lengthy discussion of employment equity at its previous meeting. The Chair believed that the Agenda Committee had the confidence of the Board.

The Chair took the opportunity to thank the Provost, the other assessors, the Vice-Chair and the members of the Board for their counsel and support throughout the year. He noted that membership on the Board was a volunteer job, done over and above members' normal commitments. He was particularly grateful for members' attention to and careful execution of their duty. He also thanked the chairs and vice-chairs of the committees:

Professors Berry Smith and Alexandra Johnston from the Committee on
Academic Policy and Programs
Professors Avrum Gotlieb and Susan Horton from the Planning and Budget
Committee
Professors Ralph Scane and Edward Morgan and Assistant Deans Bonnie
Goldberg and Jane Kidner from Academic Appeals Committee.

Members thanked the Chair and student members who would not be returning next year.

The Board moved *in camera*

12. Academic Administrative Appointments

The following academic administrative appointments were approved:

FACULTY OF INFORMATION STUDIES

Professor Brian Cantwell Smith Dean from July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2008

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO AT MISSISSAUGA

Department of Biology

Professor George Espie Interim Chair from July 1, 2003 to
December 31, 2003

Professor Robert Baker Chair from January 1, 2004 to June 30,
2007

Department of French, German and Italian

Professor Michael Lettieri Chair from July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2009
(five-year term, with one year of leave
mid-term)

12. Academic Administrative Appointments (cont'd)

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO AT MISSISSAUGA (cont'd)

Department of Geography

Professor Ferencz Csillag	Chair from July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2006
---------------------------	--

Department of Management

Professor Hugh Gunz	Chair from July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2008
---------------------	--

Department of Philosophy

Professor Amy Mullin	Chair from July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2007 (three and a half year term, with a six month leave mid-term)
----------------------	---

Department of Psychology

Professor Alison Fleming	Chair from July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2006
--------------------------	--

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO AT SCARBOROUGH

Professor John Youson	Interim Principal from July 1, 2003 to December 31, 2003
-----------------------	---

Professor Neuman reported that Professor Alexandra Johnston had been appointed Acting Principal of Victoria College from July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004, during Professor David Cook's administrative leave.

13. Report of the Striking Committee

* 2002-03 member of the Board or Committee

a) Co-opted Membership of the Academic Board

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the following be appointed as co-opted members of the Academic Board for 2003-04:

Administrative and Professional Staff

*Ms S. McDonald (3 years)

Alumni

Mr. S. Morley
Ms M. Somerville

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

a) Co-opted Membership of the Academic Board (cont'd)

Students

Full-time Undergraduate

Mr. J. Cohen, Engineering

*Ms R. Fernandes, UTM

*Ms R. Ghosh, St. Michael's

Ms L. Honeywell, Innis

*Mr. M. Hycza, Medicine

*Mr. J. Paterson, Law

Ms T. Pazonis, Trinity

*Mr. N. Turk-Browne, UC

Part-time Undergraduate

*Ms M. Jackman, Woodsworth

*Ms C. Seymour, Woodsworth

Ms F. Turgeon, Woodsworth

Graduate

Mr. F. Belluardo, Italian

Ms A. Emam, Nutritional Science

Mr. J. Sousa, OISE/UT

b) Membership of Committees of the Board

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the following be appointed to committees of the Board for 2003-04:

i) Agenda Committee

Student

Mr. J. Paterson, f/t, Law

Teaching Staff

Professor J. MacDonald, Faculty of Medicine (Physiology)

*Professor P. Perron, Faculty of Arts and Science (French)

ii) Academic Appeals Committee

4 Chairs:

*Ms B. Goldberg

*Ms J. Kidner

*Professor E. Morgan

*Professor Emeritus R. Scane, Senior Chair

13. Report of the Striking Committee (cont'd)**b) Membership of Committees of the Board (cont'd)**

- *Professor C. Beghtol, Faculty of Information Studies
- Professor R. Elliott, Faculty of Music
- *Professor J. Furedy, Faculty of Arts and Science (Psychology)
- *Professor G. Kerr, Faculty of Physical Education and Health

iii) Committee on Academic Policy and Programs*Administrative and Professional Staff*

- *Ms V. Melnyk, Faculty of Arts and Science

Alumni

Ms M. Somerville, UTSC

Students

- Mr. F. Belluardo, grad, Italian
- Ms R. Fernandes, f/t, UTM
- *Ms R. Ghosh, f/t, St. Michael's
- Mr. M. Hyrcza, f/t, Medicine
- Ms M. Jackman, p/t, Woodsworth

Teaching Staff

- Professor R. Abramovitch, Transitional Year Program
- *Mr. S. Ahmed, UTSC (Management)
- *Professor D. Allen, Faculty of Arts and Science (Philosophy)
- Professor F. Fich, Faculty of Arts and Science (Computer Science)
- *Professor A. Haasz, Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering (Aerospace)
- *Professor W. Hindmarsh, Faculty of Pharmacy
- *Professor A. Johnston, Faculty of Arts and Science (English)
- Professor R. Kluger, Faculty of Arts and Science (Chemistry)
- Professor J. Lepock, Faculty of Medicine (Medical Biophysics)
- *Professor C. Regehr, Faculty of Social Work **Vice-Chair**
- *Professor R. Reisz, UTM (Biology)
- *Professor J. J. B. Smith, Faculty of Arts and Science (Zoology) **Chair**
- *Professor D. Thiessen, OISE/UT (CTL)
- *Professor A. Venetsanopoulos, Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering

iv) Planning and Budget Committee*Student*

- *Mr. N. Turk-Browne, f/t, UC

13. Report of the Striking Committee (cont'd)**b) Membership of Committees of the Board (cont'd)***Teaching Staff*

Dean R. Bryan, Faculty of Forestry
 Professor S. Choudhry, Faculty of Law
 Professor M. Diamond, Faculty of Arts and Science (Geography)
 *Professor A. Gotlieb, Faculty of Medicine (Lab. Med. & Pathobio) **Chair**
 *Professor E. Hillan, Faculty of Nursing **Vice-Chair**
 *Professor S. Horton, UTSC (Economics)
 *Dean D. Mock, Faculty of Dentistry
 *Principal I. Orchard, UTM
 Professor S. Pfeiffer, Faculty of Arts and Science (Anthropology)
 *Interim Dean P. Sinervo, Faculty of Arts and Science (Physics)

Additional members of the Agenda Planning Group

*Dean D. Mock, Faculty of Dentistry
 Professor S. Pfeiffer, Faculty of Arts and Science

c) Provost's Advisory Committee on the University of Toronto Library

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the following be appointed as the Board's representatives on the Provost's Advisory Committee on the University of Toronto Library for 2003-04:

Professor R. Deber, Faculty of Medicine (Health Policy, Management and Evaluation)
 *Professor M. O'Neill-Karch, Faculty of Arts and Science (French)

d) Discipline Appeals Board

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the following be appointed to the Discipline Appeals Board for 2003-04:

Students

Ms L. Honeywell, f/t, Innis
 Ms M. Jackman, p/t, Woodsworth
 Mr. J. Sousa, grad, OISE/UT

Teaching Staff

Professor J. Barber, Faculty of Social Work
 *Professor J. Browne, Faculty of Medicine
 *Professor L. Weinrib, Faculty of Law

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

e) Council of Ontario Universities - Academic Colleagues

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the President's Academic Colleagues on COU for 2003-2004 be:

Professor P. Perron, Faculty of Arts and Science (French)

Professor I. Orchard, University of Toronto at Mississauga (Zoology) (alternate)

f) Committee for Honorary Degrees

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the membership of the Committee for Honorary Degrees for 2003-2004, presented in the memorandum dated June 4, 2003, be approved.

The meeting adjourned at 5:40 p.m.

Secretary
June 5, 2003

Chair

Present:

Professor W. R. Cummins, Chair
 Professor B. Corman, Vice-Chair
 Dr. T. Simpson, Chair, Governing Council
 Professor R. J. Birgeneau, President
 Professor S. Neuman, Vice-President and
 Provost
 Professor V. Goel, Vice-Provost, Faculty
 Professor D. McCammond, Vice-Provost,
 Planning and Budget
 Professor R. Abramovitch
 Professor D. Affonso
 Mr. S. Ahmed
 Professor D. Allen
 Professor C. Beghtol
 Mr. M. Bonham
 Professor N. Camerman
 Professor M. Chipman
 Professor S. Choudhry
 Professor D. Cook
 Professor F. Cunningham
 Professor R. Deber
 Professor S. Desser
 Professor M. Diamond
 Professor D. Edwards
 Dr. I. Elliston
 Dr. S. G. Fell
 Professor E. Fiume
 Ms R. Ghosh
 Ms B. Goldberg
 Professor A. Gotlieb
 Professor A. Haasz
 Professor W. Hindmarsh
 Professor S. Horton
 Professor M. Hutcheon
 Mr. M. Hyrcza
 Professor A. Johnston
 Professor A. Jones
 Professor B. Kidd
 Professor R. Kluger
 Professor M. Marrus
 Ms V. Melnyk
 Mr. D. Melville
 Professor C. Misak
 Professor D. Mock
 Mr. E. Ohayon
 Professor I. Orchard
 Mr. J. Paterson
 Mr. C. Purchase
 Mr. C. Ramsaroop
 Professor C. Regehr
 Professor R. Reisz
 Professor L. Richards
 Professor B. Sampson
 Mr. R. Sanders
 Professor P. Sinervo

Professor J. J. B. Smith
 Professor D. Thiessen
 Mr. N. Turk-Browne
 Professor L. Wilson-Pauwels

Non-voting Assessors:

Professor D. Farrar, Vice-Provost, Students
 Professor R. Venter, Vice-Provost, Space and
 Facilities Planning

Secretariat:

Mr. N. Dobbs
 Ms S. Girard, Secretary

Absent:

Professor G. Allen
 Professor S. Aster
 Professor B. Baigrie
 Professor J. Barber
 Dr. M. Barrie
 Professor N. Bascia
 Professor D. Beach
 Professor M. Beattie
 Professor B. Benhabib
 Professor M. Berkowitz
 Ms H. Brabazon
 Professor R. Bryan
 Mr. G. Chan
 Mr. A. Chapnick
 Professor D. Clandfield
 Professor R. Daniels
 Professor L. De Nil
 Professor J. Donaldson
 Professor C. Dyer
 Professor M. Eichler
 Ms R. Fernandes
 Mr. J. Fraser
 Professor E. Freeman
 Professor M. Fullan
 Professor J. Furedy
 Professor R. Geist
 Professor L. Girolametto
 Professor M. Gotlieb
 Mr. B. Greenspan
 Professor H. Gunz
 Dr. G. Halbert
 Professor P. Halpern
 Mr. A. Hamoui
 Mr. D. Herbert
 Professor E. Hillan
 Professor E. Hodnett
 Ms B. Horne
 Professor L. Howarth

Mr. J. Hunter
Ms M. Jackman
Professor G. Kerr
Professor J. Lepock
Dr. M. Letarte
Professor L. Loeb
Professor J. MacDonald
Professor R. Martin
Ms S. McDonald
Professor M. McGowan
Ms C. Moore
Professor D. Naylor
Professor M. O'Neill-Karch

Professor P. Pennefather
Professor P. Perron
Professor K. Rice
Mr. V. Sekhar
Mrs. C. Seymour
Professor B. Sherwood Lollar
Professor P. Thompson
Professor V. Timmer
Professor C. Tuohy
Professor T. Venetsanopoulos
Ms S. Walker

In Attendance:

Mr. K. Duncliffe, Director, Centre for Physical Education, Athletics and Recreation,
University of Toronto at Mississauga
Dr. B. FitzPatrick, Assistant Vice-President and Director, Office of the President
Ms L. Lewis, Assistant Provost and Special Assistant to the Vice-President and Provost
Mr. M. Overton, Dean of Student Affairs and Assistant Principal, University of Toronto at
Mississauga
Ms J. Snow, University Library
Ms M. Somerville, Chair, College of Electors