

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL
REPORT NUMBER 104 OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD

February 15th, 2001

To the Governing Council,
University of Toronto.

Your Board reports that it held a meeting on Thursday, February 15th, 2001 at 4:15 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall. An attendance list is attached to this report. In this report, items 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 are recommended to Governing Council for approval and the remaining items are reported for information.

1. Report of the Previous Meeting

The report of the previous meeting, dated January 11th, 2001, was approved.

2. Business Arising Out of the Report

Canada Research Chairs Program

The Chair recalled that at the last meeting, a member had asked how many of the Canada Research Chairs would be held by women. Professor Sedra reported that in the first round, the University had made 41 nominations, of which 40 were accepted. Of the successful candidates for the chairs, eight were women.

3. Report Number 90 of the Agenda Committee

The Chair noted that this report was presented for information.

**4. School of Graduate Studies: Master of Science in Occupational Therapy - Establishment
Faculty of Medicine: Bachelor of Science in Occupational Therapy - Discontinuation of Enrolment**

(arising from Report Number 82 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs and Report Number 67 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Gallop noted that this proposal for a new professional master's program in occupational therapy was part of the continuing evolution of this discipline at the University. The master's program would be 24 months in length and would require a four-year undergraduate degree for admission. The current bachelor's program would be phased out as the master's program was implemented. This proposal was consistent with developments in the discipline.

Professor Mock reported that in the short term, there would be a reduction in revenue of about \$75,000 for both this program and the program in physical therapy. The programs would admit fewer students to enable delivery of the master's programs with current resources. Because the students would be at the graduate level, they would generate increased basic income units (B.I.U.). But because of the corridor funding scheme, the increased number of B.I.U.s would not generate an increase in the government operating grant. In the long term, the

4. School of Graduate Studies: Master of Science in Occupational Therapy - Establishment
Faculty of Medicine: Bachelor of Science in Occupational Therapy - Discontinuation of Enrolment (cont'd)

University hoped that the government would provide funding for increased enrolment in these programs to meet critical health-care needs. The government's response to the Council of Ontario Universities' initiatives in this area should be clearer in about eight weeks. If full B.I.U. funding becomes a reality, the University planned to double enrolment in these programs within five years.

Asked to expand on the comment about full funding for this program, Professor Sedra explained that the University's operating grant was based on a corridor scheme calculated on a five-year rolling average of the number of B.I.U.s to which a university was entitled. Each program had a number of B.I.U.s attached to it, ranging from 1 B.I.U. for a student in an arts and science undergraduate program to 6 B.I.U.s for a student in a doctoral program. If the total B.I.U. count stayed within plus or minus three percent of the mid-point of this corridor, there was no change in the amount of the operating grant. If the number dropped below the corridor, the university lost some of its income. However, if the University went above its corridor, it did not receive additional income. At the current time, many universities were above the mid-point and were receiving no funding for these students. Complex negotiations between representatives of the Council of Ontario Universities (C.O.U.) and the government were in progress as part of the process to determine the method of funding the expected enrolment expansion. It has been proposed that every student be taken into account in the determination of the operating grant. He noted that the point was sometimes missed that if the enrolment increased, the University did not automatically receive increased funding. He was optimistic that full funding would be achieved.

A member referred to page 25 of the proposal where financial support for the new professional master's students was discussed. It mentioned Ontario Graduate Scholarships (O.G.S.) and U of T Fellowships. She understood that there was a policy in the drafting stages which would direct O.G.S.s to doctoral students. She suggested that this would decrease the amount of support available to students in these programs. Invited to respond, Professor Whiteside explained that several large faculties - Medicine, Arts and Science and Applied Science and Engineering - were reviewing the question of enrolment linked to full graduate student funding. These two programs currently before the Board were the largest professional master's programs in the Faculty of Medicine and the Faculty was supportive of them. It was planning to improve funding for doctoral students and to provide new sources of funding for the professional master's students in keeping with the recommendations in the Orchard Task Force Report on Graduate Student Financial Support. Professor Sedra reminded the Board that the funding recommendations in the Orchard report which guaranteed certain levels of funding were directed at doctoral-stream students. This, however, did not preclude finding the best support for professional master's program students. The member noted that it was difficult to find financial support for professional master's program students. Professor Sedra reminded the Board that these students were, like all students, eligible to take advantage of the University's Policy on Student Financial Support. The member responded that the funding would shift from merit-based to need-based and would have an effect on the programs' ability to attract the very best students.

4. **School of Graduate Studies: Master of Science in Occupational Therapy - Establishment**
Faculty of Medicine: Bachelor of Science in Occupational Therapy - Discontinuation of Enrolment (cont'd)

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the proposal for a Master of Science Program in Occupational Therapy (M.Sc.O.T.), as described in the submission from the School of Graduate Studies, dated March, 2000, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "A", be approved, effective July 1, 2001, and

THAT new enrolment in the Bachelor of Science in Occupational Therapy be suspended, effective July 1, 2001.

5. **School of Graduate Studies: Master of Science in Physical Therapy - Establishment**
Faculty of Medicine: Bachelor of Science in Physical Therapy - Discontinuation of Enrolment

(arising from Report Number 82 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs and Report Number 67 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Gallop commented that the evolution of this proposal is similar to that in occupational therapy. The 24-month master's degree program would require a four-year undergraduate degree for admission. As in the occupational therapy proposal, the existing second-entry three-year bachelor's program would be phased out as the master's program was implemented.

(Professor Mock commented on the resource implications in the previous item.)

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the proposal for a Master of Science Program in Physical Therapy (M.Sc.P.T.), as described in the submission from the School of Graduate Studies, dated May 18, 2000, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "B" be approved, effective July 1, 2001, and

THAT new enrolment in the Bachelor of Science in Physical Therapy be suspended, effective July 1, 2001.

6. **Enrolment Growth Fund and Academic Priorities Fund: Allocations**
(arising from Report Number 67 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Mock said that the Enrolment Growth Fund was the vehicle for passing along to the divisions new government grants for enrolment increases in targeted fields. Last Fall, this Board had recommended an allocation to the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering to fund enrolment increases in computer engineering, as well as certain related areas of engineering. The proposal before the Board was to support the Access to Opportunities Program (ATOP) enrolment increase in computer science programs in the Faculty of Arts and Science, both on the St. George and Mississauga campuses. The allocations were conditional

6. Enrolment Growth Fund and Academic Priorities Fund: Allocations (cont'd)

on the achievement of the new enrolment targets. The general operating expenses included the operating costs for the Bahen Centre for Information Technology, which would house the ATOP enrolment increase on the St. George Campus. In addition, a portion of the tuition-fee increase in computer science was to be reinvested in quality enhancements in that program. That funding was channeled through the Academic Priorities Fund.

A member noted that in the report of the meeting of the Planning and Budget Committee, Professor Sedra had commented in a discussion of enrolment expansion that operating funding would be "more difficult to find." He asked for clarification. Professor Sedra stated that the University would not increase its enrolment without appropriate funding. The discussion referred to was mainly about capital support which was one-time-only funding. Operating grant support was base funding and would have to be provided on an on-going basis and would, therefore, be harder to obtain.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the following allocations from the Enrolment Growth Fund be approved, subject to the Divisions meeting the increased enrolment targets:

1. To the Faculty of Arts and Science for expenses associated with ATOP expansion in computer science programs; \$2,460,453 in base funding.
2. To the University of Toronto at Mississauga for expenses associated with ATOP expansion in computer science programs; \$195,307 in base funding.
3. To Facilities and Services for operating costs associated with the Bahen Centre for Information Technology; \$306,000 in base funding.

THAT the following allocations from the Academic Priorities Fund be approved, subject to the Divisions meeting the increased enrolment targets:

1. To the Faculty of Arts and Science for expenses associated with ATOP expansion in computer science programs; \$706,927 in base funding.
2. To the University of Toronto at Mississauga for expenses associated with ATOP expansion in computer science programs: \$116,921 in base funding.

Documentation for this item is attached hereto as Appendix "C".

7. Canada Research Chairs Fund: Allocations
(arises from Report Number 67 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Mock recalled that the University, excluding the Faculty of Medicine and the related affiliated teaching hospitals and research institutes, had received an initial allocation of 121 Canada Research Chairs (C.R.C.). This proposal concerned the first 17 chairs, which were approved in the first year of the program -- 12 at the Tier I level (funding senior chairholders) and 5 at the Tier II level (funding more junior chairholders). The total cost of these 17 was \$3.7 million -- \$2.5 million in salary and benefits, including research supplements, \$900,000 in

7. Canada Research Chairs Fund: Allocations (cont'd)

cluster support, and \$300,000 to cover university-wide, indirect costs. Revenue from the government was \$2.9 million. However, fourteen Chairs were awarded to current faculty or (in one case) an unfilled funded position. Therefore, the University would be able to recover almost \$1.9-million in salaries.

Professor Mock noted that this created a surplus of \$1.1 million in the Canada Research Chairs Fund. This unallocated balance would be required to top up government funding as more external appointments were made in subsequent rounds of C.R.C. competition.

A member noted that the use of unfilled positions was part of the C.R.C. funding model and asked whether these positions would be lost. Professor Sedra explained that in the first round of the C.R.C. program, the University had nominated a majority of internal faculty for the first 41 chairs. He noted that the funding provided for the Tier I or senior chairs was \$200,000 per year and for Tier II or junior chairs, \$100,000, remained unchanged over the five years of the program. There was no increase for such things as inflation or merit. In order to make the model work, one third of the appointments must be for internal candidates and two thirds for external candidates. Even then, the University would not be able to fund the appointment of that many new hires based on the funding received for the program; therefore, some funded but unfilled positions would be used and the \$65,000 that had been set aside for the salary and benefits of the new appointments would be used in the Fund model.

Professor Mock referred members to the examples of how the different costs associated with internal versus external appointments affected the C.R.C. Fund. These were given at the end of Professor Sedra's presentation to the Planning and Budget Committee, a copy of which was attached to the Committee's report.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT \$3.4 million be allocated from the Canada Research Chairs' Fund to cover the salaries and benefits, research allowance and cluster support for the first 17 Chair-holders approved in the September 2000 C.R.C. competition.

Documentation for this item is attached hereto as Appendix "D".

8. Medical and Related Sciences Discovery District: Proposal
(arising from Report Number 67 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Mock reported that the Planning and Budget Committee unanimously recommended that the University contribute \$5-million to a very exciting plan to develop a state-of-the-art, large-scale centre where University faculty and hospital researchers could commercially develop their discoveries in the health sciences and in a broad range of related sciences. The Medical and Related Sciences (MARS) Discovery District should serve as an innovation engine for the greater Toronto area, for Ontario, and indeed all of Canada. The MARS group was a not-for-profit corporation. Its initial funding had been provided by donations of at least \$1-million each from several benefactors. The minimum \$10 million provided by these donors would be matched by an additional \$10 million from the Ontario Innovation Trust.

Professor Mock explained that the MARS group was seeking to buy land at the southeast corner of University Avenue and College Street. That land had been put up for sale by the University Health Network. If the MARS group succeeded in buying the land, it would

8. Medical and Related Sciences Discovery District: Proposal (cont'd)

proceed to develop a new facility to accommodate start-up companies developing intellectual property in the medical and related sciences and firms that provide services to start-ups -- patent lawyers, venture capital firms and so on. The location of the MARS facility would be within easy walking distance of the University's Faculty of Medicine, four major affiliated teaching hospitals, the Faculties of Applied Science and Engineering, Law and Management, and numerous science and social science departments in the Faculty of Arts and Science, including the Chemistry, Physics, Mathematics, and Computer Science departments.

This would be the first research park located in the core of a major city on a subway line. Benefits to the University would be impressive. MARS would be attractive to faculty members who wanted to develop their intellectual property. It would assist the University's efforts to recruit and retain top faculty in a highly competitive environment. It would provide student internships and research opportunities, as well as employment opportunities for graduates, and it would provide increased opportunities for University researchers who are not interested in commercial development, including collaborations and use of facilities. Very importantly, the University's contribution to the establishment of the MARS Discovery District would demonstrate to government and the taxpayers a commitment to research and to technology-transfer that would provide a payback for their investment in research support. The outcome would be very positive --- encouraging the growth of funding for pure, curiosity-driven research.

Finally, Professor Mock commented that the establishment of the Discovery District would ensure the use of this neighbouring property for public purposes rather than, for example, private condominium development. A part of the facility could potentially be used to meet the University's space needs. It was proposed that the University borrow the \$5 million for its contribution, with repayment of the loan and interest from the University-wide share of revenues from royalties and sale of equity in "spin-off" companies. The President had set out certain terms and conditions for University support. These include Board representation and safeguards in case MARS was unable to acquire the land or unable to find a developer. The Business Board had also considered and supported this proposal. At that Board's next meeting, it would be asked to concur formally with the Academic Board's recommendation to the Governing Council.

A member asked whether the University had agreed to terms with the MARS group and he expressed some concern about financially supporting a private organization. Dr. Munsche reported that there was agreement in principle but the final wording was not yet approved. He said that the funding would not be provided until the agreement was approved. Professor Sedra noted that it was not a private company but rather a not-for-profit organization.

Another member asked whether any of the directors had affiliations with pharmaceutical companies. He was thinking in particular of Dr. Evans. He also asked the location of this project. Professor Sedra referred to the list of directors. Dr. Evans had had, at some point in his career, an interest in a pharmaceutical company but Professor Sedra did not know his current situation. Dr. Evans was rather known to the University as a president emeritus and a person whose interest in the University's academic integrity was unquestioned. The MARS project hoped to obtain the property on the south-east corner of University Avenue and College Street.

The member expressed his concern that this proposal would set a bad precedent. There had been problems in the past with corporate involvement and he cited the Apotex matter. The University would be borrowing public money to invest in a private corporate venture. In his view, this funding would be outside the control of the Governing Council. The University

8. Medical and Related Sciences Discovery District: Proposal (cont'd)

would be subject to commercial pressure, making it difficult to do basic scientific research. He believed it was a mistake to do research on corporate terms. Academia should stand on its own; research was the hallmark of the University. He suggested the University could use the same amount of money and provide graduate student support or build its own "think tank" centre without corporate involvement. He said this proposal would impede the University's progress.

A member responded to these comments, noting that there already was a deep thinking academy away from corporate involvement - the University of Toronto. He fully supported this initiative which would provide an incubator facility for the products of research and which was very important to many colleagues. The funding would come from a bank, not public funds, and it would be repaid with royalties and proceeds realized from the very kind of work it would be supporting. It would meet the needs of scientists and social scientists by setting up excellent facilities without using public funds. It was separate from the University but it would be very useful in helping the University to attract and keep talented faculty. Although it would not be useful for all colleagues such as those in the humanities and some social sciences, it made a great deal of sense for the University. He reminded members that Dr. Evans had been instrumental in establishing the Canada Foundation for Innovation and the member did not view him as a corporate mogul. He agreed in general with some of the previous member's concerns about links with corporate sponsors but not with his conclusions.

A member said that the benefits to the University were clearly set out in the report of the Planning and Budget committee and he believed it would support curiosity-driven research. He asked why the hospitals were not involved and whether a tenth director would be appointed. Professor Mock said that the University's contribution would demonstrate willingness to participate in such a venture. University involvement would help raise the profile of the undertaking. Professor Sedra noted that the University Health Network was undergoing a redevelopment phase and was involved in financing its own plans. It was also on the other side of the transaction - it was selling the land the MARS group hoped to buy. He believed that the dynamics of the group of hospitals was such that they had decided not to join the project but with the University's presence, the participation of the hospitals would be encouraged. Finally, although medicine was an important part of this venture, it was not limited to medicine.

Several members endorsed the remarks made in support of the project. A member pointed out the opportunities for graduate student participation in research and noted that new guidelines on intellectual properties would protect graduate student interests in inventions.

A member asked about University representation on the Board and the possibility of its dilution if the size of the Board was enlarged. Secondly, he referred to the suggestion in the Planning and Budget Committee report that the \$5 million be borrowed from the endowment fund. Dr. Munsche said that part of the negotiations included the provision that University representation on the Board would not be diluted from the current two of ten. Professor Sedra responded to the question about borrowing from the endowment. He said that the endowment was now managed by the University of Toronto Asset Management Corporation and its mandate was to obtain the maximum return on the endowment. It would not be in the best interest to loan the University funding for this purpose. Other institutions had used endowment funds for other purposes and had regretted doing so.

A member said that not all students were concerned about this proposal and he expressed his wholehearted support. Bringing the results of basic research to the market place did not stop the basic research. Another member noted that the location of the proposed project provided great opportunities for synergy with University faculty. He believed that the University ought

8. Medical and Related Sciences Discovery District: Proposal (cont'd)

to commercialize the products of pure research; to do otherwise would be irresponsible.

Another member said that as a graduate student he too was very positive about this opportunity. He asked for further clarification of the benefits to graduate students and the amount of risk involved. Dr. Munsche said that the details of how much of the original contribution would be returned to the University depended on the stage in the process at which the problems arose. These details would be spelled out in the agreement. He noted that MARS had already bid on the land and that the process had a short time-frame. The University would not make its contribution until the bidding was complete. The group had already had preliminary discussions with potential developers. With respect to the graduate students, Professor Sedra commented that exciting research was being conducted by graduate students. There were guidelines to protect the students interests and when there was potential for commercial success, graduate students would participate in the rewards.

A member noted that the name included medicine and related sciences. He wondered how the other faculties such as Management or Applied Science and Engineering fit in. Professor Sedra stated that there would be no difference in how a development opportunity would be treated based on its Faculty of origin. The MARS project would help support the commercialization of research from any part of the University.

A member returned to his comments on the problems with corporate involvement. He said that the aim of the University was not to develop intellectual property. He suggested that students were leaving the University because of financial difficulties. He said that it was difficult to get grants for basic theoretical research; an applicant must be able to show the potential impact of what was to be pursued. He believed that there should be opportunities for basic research.

A member noted the lack of a business model. Was this a leap in the dark or was there a plan? Professor Sedra responded that there was no detailed business plan but it was also not a leap in the dark. The University was being asked to help kick-start this exciting proposal by participating and providing \$5 million.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDED

THAT, subject to final agreement between the University and the MARS Discovery District being essentially consistent with the terms and conditions set out on the second page of Professor Robert J. Birgeneau's letter of December 4, 2000 to Dr. John R. Evans,

THAT the University contribute \$5 million to the Medical and Related Sciences (MARS) Discovery District, a not-for-profit organization, to be used to acquire strategically located lands at or close to the intersection of University Avenue and College Street for development into multiple use, multi-technology facilities complementary to the academic mission of the University, borrowing the funds to do so, and

THAT, effective the date of the financing of the gift, the University's net revenues from (a) royalties and (b) the sale of equity in "spin-off" companies be applied against the borrowing charges and the repayment of the debt.

Documentation for this item is attached hereto as Appendix "E".

9. Items for Information

(a) Report of the Vice-President and Provost

i) Faculty of Law: Article in *Ultra Vires*

Professor Sedra referred to an article in the Faculty's newspaper which concerned a number of first-year students who had misrepresented their marks when they were asked to provide this information by potential employers. The administration was in the first stages of investigation and he said that the process would be fair and follow due process. The individuals involved would be notified first of any findings and then the Faculty. Professor Sedra undertook to keep the Board informed.

A member noted that the matter concerned the representation of material not on the transcript and he cautioned the members against making it a big issue. The transcript represented the official statement. When students received demands for the marks they responded. He did not believe the situation was a big problem. There were economic issues related to the procedures. He suggested the students be helped and that the University remain calm.

A member who was a law student said that the problem concerned the December test results which were unofficial. Law firms asked for the results and the students supplied them. He suggested it was a professional ethics problem and he asked that aspersions not be cast on the Faculty because of a few misguided individuals.

ii) Provost's Office: Restructuring

Vice-Provost, Faculty

Professor Sedra was pleased to report that Professor Paul Gooch had been appointed President of Victoria University. Although he, personally, would be sad to lose Professor Gooch as Vice-Provost, he knew the University of Toronto would be the beneficiary of his tremendous leadership qualities as he guided the federated university through the exciting period ahead.

Professor Sedra reported that he had set up an advisory group to find a new Vice-Provost. Although Professor Gooch's title had been Vice-Provost, Professor Sedra would propose that the new individual be the Vice-Provost, Faculty to be in line with Professor Ian Orchard's title which was Vice-Provost, Students. The new Vice-Provost would be concerned with faculty matters from hiring, through reviews, promotions and tenure proceedings. Recruitment was an expanding area; the University would be hiring approximately 2000 new faculty members in the next ten years. The individual would be responsible for ensuring excellent hiring practices through increased support services to divisions. The position would be linked to the new Vice-President - Human Resources and the two would be expected to work closely in this area.

Vice-Provost, Space and Facilities Planning

Professor Sedra recalled that last year a task force, chaired by Professor Ronald Venter, had been established to make recommendations on how the University planned and executed its capital projects. The result was a report that said that the University needed to do better. A new position, Vice-Provost, Space and Facilities Planning, has been created, moving the responsibility for capital projects from Professor McCammond's overcrowded portfolio. Governing Council has approved the appointment of Professor Ronald Venter as the new Vice-Provost. Professor McCammond would continue to be responsible for the budget and academic computing.

9. **Items for Information** (cont'd)

(a) **Report of the Vice-President and Provost** (cont'd)

Finally, Professor Sedra noted that the Deputy Provost, Professor Carolyn Tuohy, would be working half-time with the President on matters of academic policy

iii) Application Data

Professor Sedra reported that preliminary data showed that the number of applications had increased by 2.5 percent over last year and that the University's share of the first choice selection had increased also. He said that the data looked very good and the University continued to attract the best students.

iv) Budget 2001-2002

Professor Sedra reported that there continued to be a number of outstanding issues that made the drafting of the budget difficult. There were several matters that remained unsettled including funding for enrolment expansion which could total \$100 million in steady state, the funding announcement concerning the operating grant for next year, and the federal government's intentions with respect to funding the indirect costs of research. The administration would proceed to develop assumptions and model the budget on those assumptions. He planned to bring the budget to the April meeting of the Academic Board. If the assumptions proved to be out of line when the awaited announcements were made, he would prepare a supplementary budget for approval in the fall. At the present time, there were several items causing concern including the rising gas prices which could add several million dollars to the budget and the rising cost of benefits for faculty and staff.

Professor Sedra noted that during the summer and fall, work would begin on formulating new long-range planning and budget guidelines for the next six-year planning period.

A member said that the University had been the beneficiary for a number of years of excellent budget planning. This year, there appeared to be a great deal of uncertainty. He asked whether the administration had considered delaying the budget. He also asked if the administration had received any signals about the operating grant or funding for enrolment expansion. Professor Sedra thanked the member for his comment and agreed that the planning exercise had been well done. He noted that the Business Board would receive at its meeting next Monday an operating fund forecast that showed the University was very close to its budgeted position. He said that the uncertainties were similar to those of the past except for the enrolment expansion funding. The administration had decided to go ahead with the budget preparation and correct it later if necessary. The funding announcement was expected in May. With respect to expansion funding, he had referred to the government-C.O.U. task force in an earlier item. It had completed its work and was recommending that every B.I.U. be funded. The University expected to see the government's response by May or June. The federal government had not produced its usual spring budget because of the election and a new budget was not now expected until the fall. There could, however, be an announcement at any time on the matter of support of indirect research costs but he thought it unlikely to be this year.

(b) **Items for Information in Report Number 85 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs**

Professor Gallop had no comments to make on this report.

9. Items for Information (cont'd)

- (c)
- Items for Information in Report Number 67 of the Planning and Budget Committee

Professor Mock had no comments to make on this report.

10. Date of Next Meeting - March 29, 2001**11. Other Business**

A member noted that at the last meeting he had spoken about the LSAT testing. The Chair responded that the Agenda Committee had discussed this point but decided that the member was flagging an issue. He invited the member to provide the Committee with further details of his concern.

The meeting moved into closed session.

12. Report of the Striking Committee

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT Professor Avrum Gotlieb be appointed vice-chair of the Planning and Budget Committee, effective March 1st and until June 30th, 2001.

13. Academic Administrative Appointments

The following academic administrative appointments were approved:

Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering

Professor Anastasios Venetsanopoulos Dean from July 1, 2001 to June 30, 2006

Faculty of Arts and Science

Professor Wendy Rolph

Vice-Dean, Academic from July 1, 2001 to December 31, 2002 (extension)

Department of Classics

Professor Alexander Jones

Acting Chair from February 1, 2001 to June 30, 2001 or until the appointment of a new Chair

Department of French

Professor Brian Merrilees

Acting Chair from January 1, 2001 to June 30, 2001 (leave replacement)

13. Academic Administrative Appointments (cont'd)

Faculty of Medicine

Professor Cecil Yip

Vice-Dean, Research from July 1, 2001 to June 30, 2002 or until a successor is found, whichever comes first (extension)

Faculty of Nursing

Professor Dyanne Affonso

Dean from July 1, 2001 to June 30, 2008

In introducing the recommendations for the new deans, Professor Sedra thanked Professor Donner for the outstanding work she had done as Dean of Nursing for the past two years. Her acceptance of the short-term appointment had allowed a thorough search process to be completed. Professor Michael Charles had been Dean of Applied Science and Engineering for eight years, including several extensions while the search process concluded. Professor Charles was complimented on the excellent work he had done in moving the Faculty forward both academically and financially.

The meeting adjourned at 5:50 p.m.

Secretary
February 16, 2001

Chair