

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL
REPORT NUMBER 409 OF
THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 17, 2007

To the Governing Council,
University of Toronto.

Your Committee reports that it held a meeting on Wednesday, October 17, 2007 at 5:00 p.m. in the Boardroom, Simcoe Hall, with the following members present:

Mr. John F. (Jack) Petch (In the Chair)
Professor David Naylor, President
Ms Diana A.R. Alli
The Honourable William G. Davis
Miss Saswati Deb
Ms Susan Eng
Dr. Shari Graham Fell
Professor William Gough
Professor Ellen Hodnett
Mr. Timothy Reid
Professor Arthur S. Ripstein
Ms Estefania Toledo
Mr. Robert S. Weiss

Non-Voting Member:

Mr. Louis R. Charpentier

Secretariat:

Mr. Henry Mulhall, Secretary
Mr. Matthew Lafond

Regrets:

Dr. Alice Dong, Vice-Chair

In Attendance:

Dr. Claude Davis, Chair, University Affairs Board and Member of the Governing Council
Professor Joan Foley, University Ombudsperson ¹
Professor Vivek Goel, Vice-President and Provost and Member of the Governing Council
Dr. Anthony Gray, Special Advisor to the President
Professor Michael R. Marrus, Chair, Academic Board and Member of the Governing Council
Mr. Richard Nunn, Chair, Business Board and Member of the Governing Council
Ms Nancy Smart, Judicial Affairs Officer ²
Ms Catherine Riggall, Vice-President, Business Affairs

¹ In attendance for agenda item 9 (b).

² In attendance for agenda item 14.

1. Reports of the Previous Meetings

Report Number 407 (June 14, 2007) and Report Number 408 (June 25, 2007) of the Executive Committee were approved.

2. Business Arising from the Reports of the Previous Meetings

There was no business arising from the reports of the previous meetings.

3. Minutes of the Governing Council Meeting of June 25, 2007

Members received for information the minutes of the Governing Council meeting held on June 25, 2007.

4. Business Arising from the Minutes of the Governing Council Meeting

There was no business arising from the minutes of the Governing Council meeting.

5. Report of the President

The President provided an update on the *Towards 2030* strategic initiative. Phase One, involving wide distribution and engagement, had been completed over the course of the summer. For example, several thousand electronic downloads to the website had been received from over 60 countries, and dozens of consultation sessions had occurred. A Faculty Town Hall had been held the previous week, and the Provost would lead the first of three Faculty Council consultations the following week. Phase Two, the task force phase with more formal calls for submissions on specific issues, was now underway. Individuals had agreed to serve as the Chairs and Vice-Chairs of the five Task Forces, and there had been an overwhelmingly positive response to the membership nominations and invitations. It was expected that the Task Forces would be established and at work within the next week, and the entire strategic initiative process was progressing close to the anticipated schedule.

The Committee moved *in camera* and was briefed by the President on a university relations matter.

The Committee returned to closed session.

6. Items for Confirmation by the Executive Committee

- (a) **Faculty of Medicine: Name Changes of the Department of Medical Genetics and Microbiology/Graduate Department of Molecular & Medical Genetics to the “Department of Molecular Genetics”**
(*Arising from Report Number 152 of the Academic Board [October 2, 2007]- Item 9*)

Professor Marrus reported that members of the Academic Board had been informed that the Department of Medical Genetics and Microbiology/Graduate Department of Molecular and Medical Genetics had asked to change its name to the “Department of Molecular Genetics”. Name changes often occurred in response to the evolution of academic disciplines, and in this case the new name would better reflect the research and teaching interests of the Department’s faculty members. Following discussion, the Board had approved the changes unanimously.

6. Items for Confirmation by the Executive Committee (cont'd)

- (a) **Faculty of Medicine: Name Changes of the Department of Medical Genetics and Microbiology/Graduate Department of Molecular & Medical Genetics to the “Department of Molecular Genetics”** (cont'd)

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE CONFIRMED THE DECISION OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD

THAT the name of the Faculty of Medicine Department of Medical Genetics and Microbiology/Graduate Department of Molecular and Medical Genetics become the “Department of Molecular Genetics”, effective immediately.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 152 of the Academic Board as [Appendix “D”](#).

- (b) **Faculty of Medicine: Name Change of the Department of Pharmacology to the “Department of Pharmacology and Toxicology”**

(Arising from Report Number 152 of the Academic Board [October 2, 2007]- Item 10)

Professor Marrus reported that, in a similar manner, the Department of Pharmacology had requested to change its name to the “Department of Pharmacology and Toxicology” in order to reflect better the focus of its undergraduate and graduate programs and the research areas of its faculty members. Following discussion, the Board had supported the change unanimously.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE CONFIRMED THE DECISION OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD

THAT the name of the Faculty of Medicine Department of Pharmacology become the “Department of Pharmacology and Toxicology”, effective immediately.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 152 of the Academic Board as [Appendix “E”](#).

7. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council

- (a) **School of Graduate Studies / Faculty of Arts and Science: Proposal for Master of Science and Doctor of Philosophy Degree Programs in Ecology and Evolutionary Biology**

(Arising from Report Number 152 of the Academic Board [October 2, 2007]- Item 6)

The Academic Board had been informed that the reorganization of the biological sciences in the Faculty of Arts and Science in 2006 had resulted in the formation of the Departments of Cell and Systems Biology (CSB) and Ecology and Evolutionary Biology (EEB). The programs being proposed in EEB aimed to provide more focused graduate studies that were well-aligned with student interest and demand, and there would be direct entry into the Ph.D. program.

7. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council (cont'd)

(a) School of Graduate Studies / Faculty of Arts and Science: Proposal for Master of Science and Doctor of Philosophy Degree Programs in Ecology and Evolutionary Biology (cont'd)

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation

THAT the proposal to establish the Master of Science (M.Sc.) and Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) programs in Ecology and Evolutionary Biology within the Faculty of Arts and Science be approved, effective September, 2008.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 152 of the Academic Board as [Appendix “A”](#).

(b) School of Graduate Studies / Faculty of Arts and Science: Proposal for Master of Science and Doctor of Philosophy Degree Programs in Cell and Systems Biology

(Arising from Report Number 152 of the Academic Board [October 2, 2007]- Item 7)

Professor Marrus reported that, in a similar manner, graduate programs were being proposed in Cell and Systems Biology (CSB). A member had asked how the Planning and Budget Committee had determined that the proposed programs involved no resource implications. Professor Gotlieb had replied that in the case of the proposed EEB and CSB programs, there would be reorganization of existing faculty, staff, and students, resulting in no significant budgetary changes within the departments. The Provost had added that budgetary impact was assessed in terms of whether there would be significant effects on other divisions or the University as a whole.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation

THAT the proposal to establish the Master of Science (M.Sc.) and Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) programs in Cell and Systems Biology within the Faculty of Arts and Science be approved, effective September, 2008.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 152 of the Academic Board as [Appendix “B”](#).

(c) School of Graduate Studies / Faculty of Arts and Science: Joint Master of Spatial Analysis Program (University of Toronto Department of Geography and Ryerson University) – Proposed Closure

(Arising from Report Number 152 of the Academic Board [October 2, 2007]- Item 8)

Professor Marrus reported that this joint program with Ryerson University had been established in 1999. Since then, the academic focus of the Department of Geography had changed and a number of core faculty involved with the program had left the University. Ryerson University was prepared to assume full responsibility for the program. In response to a question, it was clarified that there were currently no University of Toronto students enrolled in the program.

7. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council (cont'd)**(c) School of Graduate Studies / Faculty of Arts and Science: Joint Master of Spatial Analysis Program (University of Toronto Department of Geography and Ryerson University) – Proposed Closure (cont'd)**

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation

THAT the proposal from the School of Graduate Studies and the Faculty of Arts and Science to close the Joint Master of Spatial Analysis (M.S.A.) Program at the University of Toronto be approved, effective immediately.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 152 of the Academic Board as [Appendix “C”](#).

(d) Capital Project: Project Planning Report – University of Toronto at Scarborough Balcony Enclosures
(Arising from Report Number 152 of the Academic Board [October 2, 2007]- Item 11)

Professor Marrus reported that this was a proposal to enclose two unused balconies in the Sciences Wing to provide space for sixteen new faculty and staff offices. The Board had been satisfied that the total estimated cost of \$3,614,900 was appropriate. Members had commented on the importance of maintaining the integrity of the appearance of the Sciences Wing building. The Assistant Vice-President, Campus and Facilities planning had noted that the Design Review Committee had twice reviewed the preliminary designs, and that the proposed project would provide a logical solution to the problem of limited space in the Sciences Wing building. Mr. Nunn reported that the Business Board had authorized the execution of the project, subject to the approval of the Project Planning Report by the Governing Council.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation

1. THAT the Project Planning Report for the Balcony Enclosures at the University of Toronto at Scarborough be approved in principle.
2. THAT the total project scope comprising approximately 455 gross square meters having a total project cost of \$3,614,900 be approved with funding to be provided from UTSC operating funds.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 152 of the Academic Board as [Appendix “F”](#).

(e) Declaration of Property as Surplus to the University’s Requirements
(Arising from Report Number 152 of the Academic Board [October 2, 2007]- Item 12)

Professor Marrus reported that the recommendation to declare the Dunlap Observatory lands surplus to the University’s requirements had been discussed thoroughly by the Academic Board. Members had been informed that the educational and scientific value of the facility had diminished due to urban encroachment and changes in technology, and they had supported the recommendation. Mr. Nunn reported that the Business Board had authorized the sale of the lands, subject to the approval of the declaration by the Governing Council that the lands were surplus to the University’s requirements.

7. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council (cont'd)**(e) Declaration of Property as Surplus to the University's Requirements (cont'd)**

A member asked whether the lands had been declared a heritage site. Ms Riggall stated that they were not currently designated as such, but that the Town of Richmond Hill could do so in the future. The member noted that such a designation would likely reduce the value of the lands. Ms Riggall agreed, and added that it would depend on the percentage of the parcel that was designated as a heritage site. Another member noted that the Business Board had been informed that the recommendation amounted to the conversion of one asset for another, that is the sale of the lands in order to create an endowment to establish the Dunlap Institute of Astronomy and Astrophysics. He asked whether the heritage designation would undermine that goal. Ms Riggall reiterated that the size of the endowment would be affected by the percentage of the lands designated as heritage property, but that the outcome for the University would be an enhanced academic program in support of its core mission of teaching and research.

A member advised that the University communicate thoroughly the issues involved with this recommendation, namely that there was a strong academic rationale for the proposal. It might also be useful to clarify that the University would not oppose the heritage designation of part of the property. The Provost agreed that appropriate communications focusing on the academic issues would be essential, and noted that balanced articles had already appeared in the local media. The Chair of the Department of Astronomy and Astrophysics had stated clearly at the meetings of the Planning and Budget Committee and the Academic Board that the scientific and research value of the facility had diminished in recent decades. The new Dunlap Institute would allow faculty and students to have access to some of the most advanced facilities such as the proposed Thirty-Meter Telescope. Public outreach programs accounted for a significant percentage of the current operating costs of the Observatory. The University also had another smaller observatory atop the McLennan Physics Building, and part of the mandate of the new Dunlap Institute would be to continue to provide public education programs. The Provost stated that the University would neither attempt to block heritage designation of the lands, nor put stipulations on how the site would be used. Rather, it had a fiduciary responsibility to maximize the return on the asset.

A member asked whether consideration had been given to use of the lands for either a fourth campus for the University or as the campus for new university. The Provost responded that these ideas had been considered, but that the University did not view the site as appropriate for such a development.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation

THAT the David Dunlap Observatory lands be declared surplus to University requirements.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 152 of the Academic Board as [Appendix "G"](#).

7. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council (cont'd)**(f) Capital Project: Project Planning Report – Expansion of the Rotman School of Management**

(Arising from Report Number 152 of the Academic Board [October 2, 2007]- Item 13)

Professor Marrus reported that this item was a proposal to expand the Rotman School of Management by a total of 13,280 net assignable square metres, with the space divided between the existing building and a new structure on Site 11. Some concerns had been expressed about the required relocation of the current occupants of Site 11, CIUT Radio and the Sexual Education and Peer Counselling Centre. Similarly, Massey College, which bordered Site 11 had expressed concerns about the effects of the project. The Dean of the Rotman School of Management had presented the case for the expansion of the School to the Board. Members had asked a variety of questions and had recommended approval of the project.

Mr. Nunn reported that the Business Board had had a similar discussion, touching on such issues as the determination of the allocation for relocation expenses, and the sources of funding for the project. The Board had authorized the execution of the project, subject to the approval of the Project Planning report by the Governing Council.

A member asked whether it had been finalized that the Executive Development Programs (EDP) would be located with the proposed Varsity Centre for High Performance Sport and Student Commons on Site 12. The Provost responded that it had been determined that the EDP could not be accommodated with the main project on Site 11. Site 12 was one of the alternatives being considered by the Project Planning Committee, but a final recommendation had not yet been made. Site 12 had already been assigned to the Varsity Centre for High Performance Sport and the Student Commons, and so the EDP would have to be integrated with those projects rather than displacing them. Part 4 of the motion recommended approval of the preliminary space program of the EDP, but did not recommend allocation of a site.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation

1. THAT the Project Planning Report for the Rotman School of Management Expansion be approved in principle.
2. THAT the project scope of approximately 7400nasm (15,000gsm) new construction and additional renovation of existing facilities be approved with a total project cost of \$91,800,000 to complete Phase One.
3. THAT Phase Two renovations to existing spaces be approved in principle.
4. THAT the preliminary space program for the Executive Development Programs and affiliated research centers be approved in principle for the provision of approximately 2800nasm (5600gsm) to accommodate these functions.
5. THAT long-term borrowing capacity, maximum of \$20 million, be allocated on a contingency basis to accommodate cash flow requirements.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 152 of the Academic Board as [Appendix “H”](#).

8. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units – Annual Report

Professor Marrus reported that this review process was a crucial component of accountability for the University, and the review of the reviews was a significant item of information for consideration by the Governing Council. The process had been refined in recent years, and accordance with the Accountability Framework for Reviews, the Agenda Committee had considered the Report of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs, as well as the Review Summaries. Following discussion, it had been determined that there were no matters that required the attention of the Academic Board.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

THAT the Reviews of Academic Programs and Units – 2005-06 be placed on the agenda of the Governing Council meeting of October 30, 2007.

9. Office of the University Ombudsperson

(a) Report of the Interim University Ombudsperson (July 1, 2006 – June 30, 2007), and Administrative Response

The Chair noted that the report of the Ombudsperson and the Administrative Response were presented annually to the Governing Council for information and for comment. The Executive Committee was being asked to endorse the Report, provided this year by the Interim Ombudsperson, Professor Ian MacDonald, and Response and to place them on the agenda of the next meeting of the Governing Council.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

THAT the Report of the Interim University Ombudsperson (July 1, 2006 – June 30, 2007) and Administrative Response be placed on the agenda of the Governing Council meeting of October 30, 2007.

(b) Interim Report of the University Ombudsperson (28 September 2007), and Administrative Response

The Chair noted that, under the new Terms of Reference for the Office of the Ombudsperson (approved on December 14, 2006) the Ombudsperson was also required to make an interim written report to the Executive Committee early in the governance year. This was the first such report by Professor Joan Foley that was before the Committee for its information.

A member noted the Ombudsperson's remark in the Report that "it was surprising ... to see how many students brought an issue to the Ombudsperson's office because they were reluctant – and sometimes afraid – to bring a matter to the attention of a department chair or dean, or even their own instructor" (p. 5). The Secretary of the Governing Council clarified that this reference was contained in the Report of the Interim Ombudsperson, the previous item on the Committee's agenda, rather than the Interim Report of the University Ombudsperson. Professor Foley commented that, in her brief experience in the position, this had occurred. Sometimes students were "testing the waters", raising the matter with the Ombudsperson as a follow-up, or simply wishing to communicate with someone without necessarily asking for action. The Provost noted that this remark applied only to a percentage of the 117 cases that

9. Office of the University Ombudsperson (cont'd)**(b) Interim Report of the University Ombudsperson (28 September 2007), and Administrative Response (cont'd)**

had come before the Interim University Ombudsperson. In an institution with some 70,000 students, many more such matters had been dealt with through normal processes where the student felt comfortable dealing with their instructor, department chair or dean. Nevertheless, there was an ongoing need to communicate effectively with students regarding the resources that were available to deal with such matters.

A member noted the reference in the Ombudsperson's Interim Report to the desire by two professional programs on the St. George Campus to establish local Ombudsperson positions to serve students in their respective programs, and asked if this was cause for concern. Professor Foley responded that she had begun discussions with individuals in these two departments about the nature of these proposed positions, and their reporting relationships. There was some question whether the title Ombudsperson was appropriate given that the positions could play an advocacy role, and would be accountable to a Vice-Dean within the Faculty. There was a need to communicate that the services of the University Ombudsperson were available to the students in question. The Provost agreed that it was important for academic units to provide information to their students regarding the availability of the services of the University Ombudsperson. The use of the term Ombudsperson for a position at the divisional level was a cause for concern given that such a position could not have the independence of a University Ombudsperson with a reporting relationship to the Governing Council.

10. Towards 2030: Task Force on Governance**(a) Mandate**

The Chair noted that members had received the Terms of Reference for the Towards 2030 Task Force on Governance in their agenda packages. The document contained themes that had been discussed at the consultation session for the Executive Committee and Board Chairs on September 26, 2007. It included an outline of the current context within which the Task Force was being established, as well as a historical review of the establishment and evolution of the Governing Council over the previous 35 years. Both the mandate and membership of the Task Force required Governing Council approval. It was agreed that the Committee would consider each of these in turn, moving *in camera* to discuss the proposed membership.

A member asked if governance best practices that had developed in recent years in the corporate sector would be considered by the Task Force for their applicability to a large public university. For example, most corporate boards now had nominations committees to provide guidance on the types of individuals and skills appropriate for board membership. There were experts within the University who could be consulted regarding these best practices. A member cautioned against the creation of a nominations committee which might appear to interfere with the role of the Provincial Government in appointing the Lieutenant Governor in Council members of the Governing Council. The first member clarified that such a committee would not be intended to pre-empt the Provincial Government's role, but rather to facilitate the appointment process by identifying the skills and backgrounds that would be appropriate for governors. The Chair noted that the proposed Chair of the Task Force was very knowledgeable about corporate governance best practices, and that these would certainly be considered during its deliberations. The Secretary of the Governing Council added that there was a considerable body of current literature on the applicability of corporate governance best practices to the post-secondary sector, and that the Task Force would be provided with a selection of this material.

10. Towards 2030: Task Force on Governance (cont'd)

(a) Mandate (cont'd)

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

THAT the proposed mandate of the Towards 2030 Taskforce on Governance be recommended to the Governing Council for approval.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

IT WAS RESOLVED

THAT, pursuant to sections 28 (e) and 33 of *By-Law Number 2*, consideration of items 10 (b) take place *in camera*, with the Board Chairs and Vice-Presidents admitted to facilitate the work of the Committee.

(b) Membership

The Committee discussed the proposed membership of the Task Force during an *in camera* session.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

THAT the proposed membership of the Towards 2030 Task Force on Governance be recommended to the Governing Council for approval; and

THAT, pursuant to Section 38 and 40 of *By-Law Number 2*, the recommendation be considered by the Governing Council *in camera*.

The Committee returned to closed session.

11. Reports for Information

Members received the following reports for information.

- (a) Report of Approvals Under Summer Executive Authority
- (b) Calendar of Business 2007-08
- (c) Report Number 151 of the Academic Board (June 4, 2007)
- (d) Report Number 152 of the Academic Board (October 2, 2007)
- (e) Report Number 158 of the Business Board (June 21, 2007)
- (f) Report Number 159 of the Business Board (September 4, 2007)
- (g) Report Number 143 of the University Affairs Board (May 29, 2007)

The Chair noted that three approvals under Summer Executive Authority had been necessary since the end of the 2006-07 governance year. One item had fallen under the Terms of Reference of the Executive Committee, for two appointments to the Business Board and University Affairs Board respectively. The Chair also drew the attention of members to the consolidated Calendar of Business for the Governing Council and all its Boards and Committees. This document was posted on the Governing Council website and was regularly updated throughout the year. It was an important planning tool, and provided an overview of virtually all matters that would come before governance.

12. Date of the Next Meeting

Members were reminded that the next regular meeting of the Executive Committee was scheduled for Monday, November 26, 2007 at 5:00 p.m.

13. Other Business

The Chair reported that two speaking requests had been received for the October 30, 2007 meeting of the Governing Council. Mr. Ted Chiasson, Chair of the Hart House Revolver Club and Ms Kim Senior, Chair of the Hart House Rifle Club had asked to address Council regarding the Interim Report of the University Ombudsperson. The Secretary noted that this Report was not on the agenda of the Governing Council, but rather had been received for information by the Executive Committee. After discussion, it was agreed that the speaking requests would be denied.³

There was no other business.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

IT WAS RESOLVED

THAT, pursuant to sections 28 (e) and 33 of *By-Law Number 2*, consideration of items 14 and 15 take place *in camera*, with the Board Chairs and Vice-Presidents admitted to facilitate the work of the Committee.

³ Secretary's Note: The two speaking requests were subsequently withdrawn.

In Camera Session

14. Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters: Recommendations for Expulsion

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

THAT the recommendation for expulsion contained in the Memorandum from the Secretary of the Governing Council dated October 17, 2007 (Agenda Item 14 [a]), be placed on the agenda for the October 30, 2007 meeting of the Governing Council; and

THAT the recommendation for expulsion contained in the Memorandum from the Secretary of the Governing Council dated October 17, 2007 (Agenda Item 14 [b]), be placed on the agenda for the October 30, 2007 meeting of the Governing Council; and

THAT pursuant to Sections 38 and 40 of By-Law Number 2, these recommendations be considered by the Governing Council *in camera*.

15. External Appointments

(a) McLaughlin Centre Oversight Committee

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

THAT George E. Connell be reappointed to the McLaughlin Centre Oversight Committee for a one-year term, effective immediately until October 31, 2008 or until his successor is appointed; and

THAT Chaviva Hosek be appointed to the McLaughlin Centre Oversight Committee for a one-year term, effective immediately until October 31, 2008 or until her successor is appointed; and

THAT Alan Hudson be reappointed to the McLaughlin Centre Oversight Committee for a two-year term, effective immediately until October 31, 2009 or until his successor is appointed; and

THAT Robert Prichard be reappointed to the McLaughlin Centre Oversight Committee for a one-year term, effective immediately until October 31, 2008 or until his successor is appointed.

15. External Appointments (cont'd)

(b) University of Toronto Press (UTP)

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

THAT the following individuals be appointed members and directors of the University of Toronto Press, effective immediately, for terms to continue until the 2008 Annual General Meeting, or until their successors are appointed:

Mr. Frank Anderson
Ms Dominique Barker
University Professor Emeritus Martin Friedland
Mr. Hart Hillman
Mr. Brent Houlden
Ms. Carole Moore
Professor Heather Murray
Mr. David Oxtoby
Mr. Roger Parkinson
Ms. Catherine J. Riggall
Mr. James Robinson
Mr. Daniel Soper
Mr. John Yates

THAT Mr. Roger Parkinson be appointed as Chairman of the Board of the University of Toronto Press, effective immediately, for a term to continue until the 2008 Annual General Meeting, or until his successor is appointed.

The Committee returned to closed session.

The meeting adjourned at 6:45 p.m.

Secretary
October 24, 2007

Chair