

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

REPORT NUMBER 157 OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD

June 3, 2008

To the Governing Council,
University of Toronto

Your Board reports that it held a meeting on Tuesday, June 3, 2008 at 10:10 a.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall at which the following were present:

Professor Brian Corman (In the Chair)	Dr. Christena Chruszez	Professor Hy Van Luong
Dr. Alice Dong, Vice-Chair of the Governing Council	Mr. Joe Cox	Dr. Gillian MacKay
Professor David Naylor, President	Professor Alister Cumming	Professor Brenda Y. McCabe
Professor Vivek Goel, Vice-President and Provost	Professor Charles Deber	Professor Douglas McDougall
Professor Cheryl Misak, Deputy Provost	Professor Guy Faulkner	Professor John R. Miron
Professor S. Zaky, Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget	Professor Meric Gertler	Professor Faye Mishna
Professor Derek Allen	Ms Bonnie Goldberg	Ms Michelle Mitrovich
Professor Cristina Amon	Dr. Shari Graham Fell	Professor David Mock
Professor George Baird	Ms Pamela Gravestock	Professor Sioban Nelson
Professor Clare Beghtol	Ms Emily Gregor	Mr. Kaspar Ng
Ms Marilyn Booth	Professor Rick Halpern	Professor Susan Pfeiffer
Professor John W. Browne	Professor Ellen Hodnett	Ms Judith Poe
Professor Brian Cantwell Smith	Miss Jemy Mary Joseph	Mr. Paul Ruppert

Regrets:

Professor Stewart Aitchison	Mr. John A. Fraser	Professor Linda Northrup
Professor Varouj Aivazian	Professor Jane Gaskell	Professor Donna Orwin
Mr. Taufik Al-Sarraj	Professor Robert Gibbs	Mr. Roger P. Parkinson
Professor Christy Anderson	Professor Avrum Gotlieb	Professor Janet Paterson
Professor Jan Angus	Professor Hugh Gunz	Professor Doug W. Reeve
Professor Gage Averill	Professor Russell Hartenberger	Professor Cheryl Regehr
Professor Sylvia Bashevkin	Professor Wayne K. Hindmarsh	Professor Jolie Ringash
Professor Katherine Berg	Mrs. Bonnie Horne	Professor Yves Roberge
Dr. Terry Blake	Miss Milka Ignjatovic	Dr. Wendy Rotenberg
Professor Ragnar Buchweitz	Professor Brad Inwood	Mr. Joshua Rubin
Mr. Ryan Matthew Campbell	Mr. James Janeiro	Miss Pamela Santora
Mr. Mitchell Chan	Professor Yuki Mayumi Johnson	Miss Lorenza Sisca
Ms Tiffany Chow	Professor Gregory Jump	Professor Tattersall Smith
Mr. Aaron Christoff	Dr. Allan S. Kaplan	Professor Ron Smyth
Professor John Coleman	Professor Michael R. Marrus	Professor Lorne Sossin
Professor David Cook	Professor Roger L. Martin	Dr. Robert S. Turnbull
Professor Elizabeth Cowper	Professor Audrey Laporte	Professor Njoki Wane
Mr. Ken Davy	Dr. Lesley Ann Lavack	Dr. Donald A. Wasylenki
Professor Luc F. De Nil	Professor Robert Levit	Mr. Yang Weng
Professor Miriam Diamond	Professor Lori Loeb	Professor Catharine Whiteside
Professor Dickson Eyoh	Professor Michael Molloy	Dr. Cindy Woodland
	Ms Carole Moore	Mr. Ahmed Yousif
	Professor Mayo Moran	

Non-voting Assessors:

Professor Angela Hildyard, Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity
 Mr. David Palmer, Vice-President, Advancement
 Ms Catherine Riggall, Vice-President, Business Affairs
 Ms Elizabeth Sisam, Assistant Vice-President, Campus and Facilities Planning

In Attendance:

Mr. Neil Dobbs, Deputy Secretary of the Governing Council
 Mr. Bruce Dodds, Director of Utilities and Buildings Operations

In Attendance (cont'd)

Ms Sheree Drummond, Assistant Provost
 Professor Fred Graham, Church Music, Emmanuel College.
 Dr. Anthony Gray, Special Advisor to the President
 Mr. Matthew Lafond, Committee Secretary, Office of the Governing Council
 Ms Helen Lasthiotakis, Director, Policy and Planning, Office of the Vice-President and Provost
 Professor Jens-Erik Mai, Vice-Dean, Faculty of Information Studies
 Professor Peter Pauly, Vice Dean, Research and Academic Resources, Joseph L. Rotman School of Management

In Attendance (cont'd)

Ms Nancy Smart, Judicial Affairs Officer
 Ms Karel Swift, University Registrar
 Ms Linda Vranic, Director, Operations, Office of the Vice-President, Research and Associate Provost
 Mr. Joe Weinberg, Chief Administrative Officer, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education
 Reverend S. Peter Wyatt, Principal, Emmanuel College

Secretariat:

Ms Mae-Yu Tan

In this report, items 7, 8 and 9 are recommended to the Executive Committee for confirmation, items 5, 6, 10, 11, 12 and 13 are recommended to the Governing Council for approval. The remaining items are reported for information.

The Chair welcomed members to the meeting, noting that Dr. Alice Dong, Vice-Chair of the Governing Council, was in attendance. He relayed Professor Marrus' regret at being absent from the Board's final meeting of the year.

1. Approval of Report Number 156 of the Meeting held on April 24, 2008

Report Number 156 of the meeting held on April 24, 2008 was approved.

2. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting

There was no business arising from the Report.

3. Reports Number 145 (May 5, 2008) and Number 146 (May 20, 2008) of the Agenda Committee

The Chair drew members' attention to Report Number 146 (May 20, 2008) which contained the discussion of the Reviews of Academic Programs and Units on pages 1 and 2. He noted that the review process was a crucial component of accountability for the University. The Agenda Committee had determined that there were no matters in Part 1 of the 2006-07 reviews that required the attention of the Board; Part 2 of the reviews would be considered by the Agenda Committee in the Fall, 2008. The Chair added that the summaries of the reviews and the administrative responses were available on the Governing Council website, linked to the agenda of the Academic Policy and Programs (AP&P) meeting held on April 1, 2008.

4. Report from the Vice-President and Provost

In the interest of time, given the lengthy agenda before the Board, Professor Goel declined to provide a report and instead invited the President to speak on the *Towards 2030* planning process.

Towards 2030

The President informed members of the Board that he wished to present several key issues that had emerged from the work of select *Towards 2030* Task Forces. Due to time constraints, he would not speak to items such as resources, St. George campus organization, or student recruitment and experience. As well, he would not remark on the Task Force on Governance; its Phase I Report had been recently discussed and accepted by the Governing Council at its meeting of May 21, 2008 and Governors would provide oversight of the continued governance review process.

The President briefly outlined the events that had occurred since the release of the *Towards 2030* discussion document one year ago. During Phase I, the document had been widely circulated, with many presentations made to the University community. Over forty Town Hall sessions, faculty council meetings, and special lectures had then been held during Phase II, and five Task Forces had subsequently been created with a mandate to explore specific long-term institutional objectives. As a result of extensive consultations, the Task Forces had received scores of submissions. Suggestions, recommendations and feedback of all types had been sent to the Task Forces through the *Towards 2030* website, by email, or in person. Over the last few weeks, all the Task Forces had submitted their reports to the President, and he was currently preparing a final synthesis document for review by governors followed by general distribution. The President reported that, while there was debate about specific details and short-term plans, the overall long-term directions proposed by the Task Forces were receiving broad support. The President also suggested that these long-term strategic directions would not come as a surprise to most members of the academic community.

Mission and Mandate

The President focused on one of the strategic questions faced by the University – whether it should continue to advance its mission of being an excellent research-intensive university that offered both graduate and undergraduate programs of significant breadth and depth, or whether a fundamental shift in approach was necessary. He stressed the clear consensus that, notwithstanding the difficult research funding environment in which the University and its peers operated, the University should continue to sustain its scholarly mandates. It was clear that the University of Toronto had a responsibility to its stakeholders and to the Canadian public to advance its unique role in postsecondary education, particularly with respect to its preeminent position in research, its graduate and professional offerings, and its very rigorous undergraduate programs.

Referring to the expected changes in demographics and rising university participation rates, the President noted the importance of developing and intensifying the University's distinguishing role. It was anticipated that there would be enormous growth in university demand in the Toronto region, with an additional 40,000 to 60,000 students seeking to enroll over the next few years. Within four years of an undergraduate wave, there would be a secondary wave of students pursuing graduate and professional education, particularly with the growing recognition of the importance of advanced degrees. The University currently provided 16% of the undergraduate but 30% of the doctoral places in Ontario, and it would face pressure in the future for further graduate expansion. Even with some reduction in undergraduate enrolment on the St. George campus, modest growth on the east and west campuses would enable the University to maintain at least its current capacity for undergraduate education. Meanwhile, given its distinguishing

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

Mission and Mandate (cont'd)

characteristics, the University could logically focus on meeting the anticipated growth in demand for graduate places, as well as improving the quality of undergraduate education.

A University on Three Campuses

The President informed members that tri-campus matters had arisen frequently during *Towards 2030* discussions. There had been debate with respect to several possible models of campus structure for the University of Toronto including: three integrated but distinct campuses, all with comprehensive missions; the University's former model composed of the St. George campus, with two distinct undergraduate colleges (Scarborough and Erindale); or three fully independent universities. The President then outlined four constraints on these models. First, the University had twenty-three collective agreements. The University of California was an example of a multi-campus institution with a single overarching framework for human resources and collective bargaining. Complexities resulting from such a framework would not be quickly unraveled. Second, a move towards a model such as that in place at Ohio State University, with undergraduate feeder colleges and two-year programs at the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC) and the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM), would be a move backwards. A strong collegium had long since developed at UTM and UTSC and its aspirations could not be ignored. Third, institutional resources were a considerable constraint. Several interesting *Towards 2030* proposals had suggested that specialized roles for UTM and UTSC be examined. Unfortunately, unlike many American private institutions, the University lacked the resources necessary for such a development, and there were limits to what the Province of Ontario could support. Fourth, asymmetries in campus-specific resources exist, and it would not be possible to compensate across the two newer campuses for many decades of development on the central campus. However, as a matter of fairness, some of the differences in resource levels would need to be addressed if the east and west campuses were to reach their potential.

The President explained that two false dichotomies should be avoided. First, it was not necessary to decide immediately whether or not the University would eventually become three independent institutions. As the campuses developed, they might become more differentiated. Provided that unnecessary barriers to eventual autonomy were not erected, long-term development could occur in different directions. The second false dichotomy was that of campus-by-campus planning versus tri-campus planning. In *Renewal 1987*, President Emeritus George Connell had expressed the importance of moving away from unitary planning and moving towards independent development with campus-by-campus consideration. The President said that today, both approaches could co-exist. The long-term intent was to create a regional tri-campus system with stronger identity and greater autonomy for each campus. Cautioning that the quality of students admitted to undergraduate and graduate programs must not be compromised, he noted that efforts must be made to maintain the University's reputation, ensuring consistency with respect to the qualities that defined a University of Toronto degree at all levels. In this regard, the Task Force deliberations strongly indicated that it was possible to have both diversification and synergy. Tri-campus collaboration in areas of importance to the University, such as its graduate programs, would be critical.

Enrolment

The President acknowledged the extensive amount of work that had been carried out by the Task Force on Long-Term Enrolment Strategy. The Vice-Chair of the Academic Board, Professor Brian Corman, had chaired that Task Force and together with the other members had played a critical role in compiling much valuable information.

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

Enrolment (cont'd)

The President stated that, in his view and that of many others, the University's enrolment strategies should highlight its research intensity and breadth and depth. He noted that Ontario's (and, indeed, Canada's) proportion of graduate students on a per-capita basis was low: compared to the United States, Canada awards approximately 50% fewer masters degrees and 30% fewer doctoral degrees per-capita. As well, the University had a relatively low proportion of graduate students relative to its peer institutions, both public and private, some of whom had as much as 50% graduate enrolment. The Province recognized that graduate enrolment was the key to an innovation-based economy and had started to increase support for graduate enrolment. As mentioned earlier, it was anticipated that there would be greater interest from students in earning graduate credentials over the long-term and ongoing interest from the Province in supporting such growth.

Another factor that would influence University enrolment planning was the size of the campuses. The St. George campus was crowded, while the UTM and the UTSC campuses had some room to grow. As well, there were ever-present financial considerations which would impact enrolment. It would be difficult financially to create room for graduate growth, and resources would continue to be blended between graduate and undergraduate education. In order to continue to serve the University's graduate students well, there was considerable need for a greater number of external scholarships and research grants and it remained vital for the federal government to recognize and provide better coverage of the institutional costs of research.

A few enrolment scenarios could be envisioned. One was the current distribution with 26% graduate students on the St. George campus and radically lower numbers (2% to 4%) of graduate students on site at the other two campuses. Another alternative was to increase the number of graduate students on the St. George campus as well as at UTM and UTSC. Much of the growth would be in the masters or professional masters stream in the latter instances. To achieve dramatic graduate growth on the St. George campus, a significant reduction in undergraduate enrolment would be necessary, but might well be unaffordable. While the extent of an undergraduate enrolment decrease could be widely debated, the reality was that some reduction would be beneficial to the quality of undergraduate education on the St. George campus. The UTM and the UTSC campuses could compensate by increasing their undergraduate enrolments so that net neutrality would be achieved. As a system, the University would be in a good position. In addition, with graduate enrolment figures rising to well above 30%, the St. George campus would then be more in line with its peers. This scenario of graduate intensification and containment of undergraduate enrolment at the St. George campus with modest undergraduate growth and selective graduate growth at UTM and UTSC had found wide resonance across the University.

Resources

The University had many sources of funding. Tuition today represented over 30% of its revenue base and the per-student grant provided by the Provincial Government represented less than 50%. Unfortunately, the per-student funding in Ontario remained among the lowest in the country, and per-capita funding of higher education was dead last. Other sources of revenue included benefactions and ancillary revenues. Salary and benefits accounted for the majority of the University's expenditures. In general, settlements with employee groups had risen at rates well above inflation. The reported levels of across-the-board settlements did not capture the whole story, because employee groups would also receive progress-through-the-ranks (PTR) increases and grid step increases. Across Ontario, the growth in university salaries and benefits had outpaced inflation for some time, even as revenues had not kept pace. For example, assuming minimal growth in per-student grants (45% of all core revenues), ongoing 4% to 5% growth in

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

Resources (cont'd)

tuition (comprising, say, 35% of core revenue), and 4% to 5% growth in other revenue sources, the university would be able to fund annual increases for employees at a level no more than 2.5% (0.55 x 4.5). Since current increases, including PTR and grid steps, were running above 4%, it would be very hard to avoid rising student-faculty ratios or student-staff ratios.

Various solutions to this dilemma had been considered.

First, the status quo could be maintained. Detailed projections had shown that even if the provincial grant rose with inflation, tuition grew at 2.2% above inflation, salary and benefits increased at 2.5% above inflation, and the endowment increased at 2% above inflation, by 2030 there would still be an increase in the student-faculty ratios on the St. George, UTM and UTSC campuses to 42:1, 61:1 and 58:1 respectively. Such a scenario was untenable.

Second, if the Provincial per-student grant were increased by approximately 28% to the national average of the other nine provinces, and if it continued to grow at the rate of inflation, with all other factors remaining constant, initially a number of new faculty could be hired and the student-faculty ratio could be lowered to 21:1. However, even at that level of funding, by 2030 the University's student-faculty level would have increased back to 32:1. Improving the level of the Provincial grant in isolation would not address the University's funding shortfalls. Other sources of revenue would need to be considered.

There was a clear case for pursuing a mixed model in which the Provincial grant would gradually increase to the national average and grow at the rate of inflation, the endowment would grow to \$3-billion by 2030, compensation would increase by no more than 2% above inflation to maintain competitiveness in the labour market, and tuition and student aid would rise in parallel. Such a model would result in a sustainable and reasonable student-faculty ratio of 21:1. Furthermore, that ratio was based on counting only the permanent teaching staff on payroll. Models taking account of the full range of faculty contributing to the teaching mission generated much lower ratios.

Next Steps

The President would discuss the next steps in the proposed *Towards 2030* processes with the Executive Committee at its meeting on June 16, 2008, and would give a presentation to the Governing Council on June 23rd. The synthesis report would be circulated once it was completed, and governance approval in principle for the framework and strategic directions would be sought, possibly at a Governing Council meeting in early September 2008.

Discussion

A member asked whether it was feasible to achieve the projections for increased tuition and grant support from the Government cited in the presentation. The President replied that it was too early to tell. Every president on the Council of Ontario Universities had repeatedly stated that a fundamental adjustment of the grant was required in order to achieve the high quality of education that was needed. Tuition increases would need to be offset by student aid provided by both the Government and the University. The President noted that there was skepticism with respect to achieving quality goals solely through tuition revenue and the University was unwilling to compromise access. As such, significant pressure was being placed on the Provincial Government with regard to the levels of both the grant and student aid, coupled with the message that self-regulation of tuition alone would be insufficient in addressing universities' needs.

5. Federation Framework Agreement with the Federated Universities

The Chair explained that the Federation Framework Agreement with the Federated Universities had been considered by the Planning and Budget Committee (P&B) on May 14, 2008. If approved by the Board, the proposal would be considered for approval by the Governing Council on June 23, 2008.

Professor Mock stated that a review of the operation of the *Memorandum of Agreement* (MOA), between the University of Toronto and the Federated Universities had recommended that the MOA be separated into three separate documents reflecting the different purposes it served - a federation agreement with each Federated University; a statement on the role, rights, responsibilities, and accountabilities of the Colleges; and operating agreements with each Federated University with regard to services, accountability reporting, and funding.

The proposed funding model would provide a more meaningful link to the services provided and was more consistent with the University's new budget model. The net result would be an increase of approximately \$1.45 million to the total funding to the Federated Universities over a three-year period, funded by the Faculty of Arts and Science and University-wide cost bins. Those increases reflected the true costs of space, enhancements for administration and information technology, and support for the student experience. In return, the Federated Universities had committed to developing improved accountability metrics. The proposed Federation Framework Agreement was being brought forward for approval as a template to supersede the current MOA.

Professor Mock informed members that at the P&B meeting, Professor Goel had responded to a question about the relationship between the University and the Colleges of the Federated Universities. He had assured the Committee that the Agreement reflected the University's continued collaboration on issues such as admission and recruitment.

Invited to comment, Professor Goel said that the MOA had represented a historic moment in the nature of the relationship with the Federated Universities. He elaborated that the strength of the entire University was based on a unique collaboration among the four institutions that had contributed to its founding. The University of Toronto, Victoria University, University of Trinity College, and the University of St. Michael's College had been and continued to be independent institutions. For well over a century, a federation among the four institutions had existed, resulting in a sum greater than its parts.

The framework that was outlined in the existing MOA had been in place for over forty years. It had evolved over time and, with subsequent additions to the document, had become somewhat unwieldy in its scope. As Professor Mock had stated, the MOA served multiple roles. In addition to being an affiliation agreement with the Federated Universities, it outlined the role of the seven St. George Colleges, including the four constituent colleges. The existing MOA also specified the mechanics for the budget relationship in its appendix. With the revision of the Agreement, the University had taken the opportunity to update the funding framework along the lines of the new budget model.

Professor Goel acknowledged all of the partners who had worked on the proposed Agreement over the past few years. He explained that members of the Board were being asked to approve a template; customized federation and funding agreements would then be drawn up for each of the Federated Universities as well as a separate statement on the roles of the constituent and federated colleges. Professor Goel added that the introduction of a new approach to budgeting would allow greater stability and predictability in the future. Although an increased investment of base funding for the Federated Universities would be implemented, there would be greater transparency and accountability going forward.

5. Federation Framework Agreement with the Federated Universities (cont'd)

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

Be It Recommended to Governing Council

1. THAT the template for the Federation Framework Agreement between the University of Toronto and the Federated Universities, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "A", be approved, effective July 1, 2008; and
2. THAT the agreements signed under the provisions of this resolution be filed with the Secretary of the Governing Council.

6. Toronto School of Theology: Master of Sacred Music (M.S.M.) Conjoint Degree

The Chair stated that the proposal for a Master of Sacred Music (M.S.M.) conjoint degree had been considered by the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs (AP&P) on May 13, 2008 and by P&B on May 14, 2008. If approved by the Board, the proposal would be considered for approval by the Governing Council on June 23, 2008.

Professor Sass-Kortsak said that the proposed degree program would be a second-entry undergraduate program which would require for admission both a previous undergraduate degree and music experience. The program would be open to students of any religious denomination or of none. The name of the degree, Master of Sacred Music, was a standard one in North America. Completion of the degree would require twenty half courses taken over two years of full-time study or up to five years of part-time study. The courses were currently offered by Emmanuel College in liturgy and sacred music and by the Faculty of Music in organ, choral conducting and music education. Students would receive a degree conferred conjointly by Emmanuel College of Victoria University, the Toronto School of Theology (T.S.T.), and the University.

Professor Mock informed members of the Board that P&B had considered the resource implications of the proposed M.S.M. program. At the Committee meeting, Professor Zaky had stated that since all of the courses had already been approved and were offered by regular faculty members in Emmanuel College, T.S.T., and the Faculty of Music, resource requirements were minimal and were the sole responsibility of Victoria University. P&B had fully supported the proposal.

The Chair welcomed Reverend S. Peter Wyatt, Principal of Emmanuel College, and Professor Fred Graham, of Church Music at Emmanuel College. Reverend Wyatt said that Emmanuel College was celebrating its eightieth anniversary; a MOA had been originally struck with the University of Toronto on October 25, 1928. Reverend Wyatt expressed his deep appreciation to members of the Faculty of Music for their willingness to collaborate with Emmanuel College on the proposed program.

During the discussion of the Board, a member asked for a definition of the music experience that would be required for admission. Professor Graham explained that a holistic approach would be taken in assessing applications. While some applicants might have completed a degree in music, others with extensive experience in the field might be interested in upgrading their skills. A member commented that, in her view, twenty half courses seemed to be a heavy program requirement. Professors Graham and Goel assured her that the course load of 10.0 full credits was manageable and was in fact typical of many two-year professional programs.

6. Toronto School of Theology: Master of Sacred Music (M.S.M.) Conjoint Degree (cont'd)

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the Master of Sacred Music (M.S.M.) degree offered by Victoria University, as described in Appendix "B" hereto, have conjoint status with the University of Toronto, as of September 1, 2008.

7. Standards of Professional Practice Behaviour for All Health Profession Students

The Chair stated that the proposed *Standards of Professional Practice Behaviour for All Health Profession Students* had been considered by AP&P on May 13, 2008. If approved by the Board, the proposed *Standards* would require confirmation by the Executive Committee on June 16, 2008.

Professor Sass-Kortsak reported that the Council of Health Science Deans had proposed a single set of standards of professional practice behaviour for virtually all students working in clinical settings. The *Standards* would replace those currently in place in the Faculties of Medicine, Pharmacy, and Social Work. It was anticipated that the *Standards* would also be referred to by the affiliated teaching hospitals. The proposal followed a broad process of consultation, and if approved, the *Standards* would be made effective in September, 2008.

Professor Mock, the Chair of the Council of Health Science Deans, stated that the *Standards* had been initiated by the Council and had been strongly supported by the health science divisions. Consultation with affiliated institutions had already begun, and over time individual guidelines within the faculties and institutions would be established to support the *Standards*.

A member pointed to the importance of raising students' awareness of the existence of such policies that governed their behaviour. Professor Mock agreed, noting that the matter had been considered by the Council. The *Standards* would be posted on the websites of the relevant faculties and would be distributed to all affected students. Opportunities for explanation and discussion of the *Standards* with students would be provided, and a number of divisions already had ethics modules in place that could be used to reinforce the concepts of the *Standards*. Professor Goel concurred with the member's views, stressing the importance of taking proactive measures to inform students of ethics standards. In his opinion, most students were exposed to the relevant policies and procedures at the appropriate stages of their University experiences.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE CONFIRM

THAT the *Standards of Professional Practice Behaviour for All Health Professional Students*, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "C", be approved, effective September 2008; and

THAT the *Standards of Professional Behaviour for Medical Undergraduate and Postgraduate Students of the Faculty of Medicine* (approved June 28, 1995) and the *Social Work Code of Ethics* (approved August 31, 1995) and the *Standards of Professional Behaviour for Pharmacy Undergraduate and Postgraduate Students of the Faculty of Pharmacy* (approved August 26, 1996) be rescinded.

8. Policy on Access to Student Academic Records

The Chair stated that the *Policy on Access to Student Academic Records* had also been considered by AP&P on May 13, 2008. If approved by the Board, rescission of the *Policy* would require confirmation by the Executive Committee on June 16, 2008.

Professor Sass-Kortsak explained that the *Policy on Access to Student Academic Records* had served as the University's privacy regulation on student records since the 1980s. In June of 2006, universities had been made subject to the Province of Ontario's *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*. The University had now rescinded its general *Policy on Access to Information and Protection of Privacy*, and the purpose of the current proposal was to propose rescinding the *Policy on Access to Student Academic Records*.

The *Policy* was no longer required. In fact, it would be risky to continue to have such a policy outside of the Province's legislation. Because many faculty and staff made use of student academic records, the University would have guidelines on the interpretation of the Province's legislation in the context of the University. Those guidelines had been included with the proposal for members' information.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE CONFIRM

THAT the *Policy on Access to Student Academic Records*, approved by the Governing Council on April 21, 1998, be rescinded.

Documentation is attached hereto as Appendix "D".

9. Faculty of Information Studies: Name Change to Faculty of Information

The Chair reminded members that the Board was responsible for approving name changes of academic units. If the proposed name change of the Faculty of Information Studies was approved by the Board, it would require confirmation by the Executive Committee on June 16, 2008.

Professor Goel stated that the Faculty of Information Studies had proposed to change its name to the Faculty of Information. There had been a world-wide trend as schools which had originally focused on libraries had become engaged in information sciences. With developments in the field, technological developments, and a shift in thinking from a focus on information science to the study of information, there had been an emergence of the Information Schools ("i-schools"). The University of Toronto's Faculty of Information Studies was currently the only Canadian member of the "i-schools" movement. The proposed name change had been well supported by faculty and stakeholders and by the incoming dean, Professor Seamus Ross, who would begin his term on January 1, 2009.

The Chair welcomed Professor Brian Cantwell Smith, Dean, Faculty of Information Studies (FIS) and Professor Jens-Erik Mai, Vice-Dean and incoming Interim Dean, FIS, to the meeting. Professor Smith informed the Board that the Faculty had joined the "i-schools" movement three years earlier and currently served a leadership role. Members within the group, such as the University of California Berkeley, the University of Michigan, the University of Texas, and the University of Washington, had now adopted names such as *The School of Information*, *The Information School*, etc. A successful Town Hall meeting had been held in Spring, 2008, and all three of the Faculty's student societies had endorsed the proposal which had been in development for some time.

9. Faculty of Information Studies: Name Change to Faculty of Information (cont'd)

Professor Mai noted that there had been movements over the decades to change the names of institutions in the field to more appropriately reflect the subject matter. The Faculty's name had changed to the *Faculty of Library Science* in 1972 and again in 1982 to the *Faculty of Library and Information Science*. Currently there was a greater focus on information problems in society; ways in which to organize and define information; and ethical, policy and management issues in information. The name change would signal the expansion of the field and the type of student and faculty member that would be attracted. Professor Mai added that the Faculty planned to submit a proposal to governance in the fall for a revision of the current Master of Information Studies program to a Master of Information.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE CONFIRM

THAT the name of the Faculty of Information Studies be changed to the Faculty of Information, effective June 30, 2008.

Documentation is attached hereto as Appendix "E".

10. Capital Project: Project Planning Report – Interdisciplinary Design Studios within the Department of Civil Engineering and the Lassonde Institute

The Chair said that the Project Planning Report for the Interdisciplinary Design Studios had been considered by P&B on May 14, 2008. If approved by the Board, the proposal would be considered for approval by the Governing Council on June 23, 2008.

Professor Mock stated that the Mining Building, which was over 100 years old, housed several units including the Lassonde Institute. The attic of the building, which was currently unusable, had been identified as a potential location for the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering's Interdisciplinary Design Studios and the Lassonde Institute. The proposal would address the pressing need for additional facilities in support of undergraduate and graduate expansion, and enhancement of research and the student experience. The project would also complete some high-priority maintenance of the Mining Building and increase its accessibility by creating an interior elevator shaft. The total estimated project cost was \$12.150 million. A commitment of \$4 million in external funding had been secured, and additional private funding was being sought.

At the P&B meeting, a member had noted that although the project cost was high, it was justified, given the heritage status of the Building, the resulting difficulty in completing renovations, and the extensive private funding of the project. A Board member made a similar comment and asked whether other options had been considered. Professor Goel replied that although the cost per square foot appeared high, it was actually comparable with the cost of other projects on campus, if the restoration, maintenance, and related costs were taken into consideration. This option was reasonable, given costly alternatives such as the purchase of additional land for development.

10. Capital Project: Project Planning Report – Interdisciplinary Design Studios within the Department of Civil Engineering and the Lassonde Institute (cont'd)

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

1. THAT the Project Planning Report for the Civil Engineering Interdisciplinary Design Studios, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix “F”, be approved in principle; and
2. THAT the project scope, comprising renovations to approximately 632 net assignable square metres and 1,129 gross square metres with a project cost of \$10,065,000, and high priority repairs to the exterior of the Mining Building, estimated to cost approximately \$2,085,000, for a total project cost of up to \$12,150,000, be approved.

11. Capital Project: Project Planning Report – Northeast Sector of the St. George Campus

The Chair stated that the Project Planning Report for the Northeast Sector of the St. George Campus had been considered by P&B on May 14, 2008. If approved by the Board, the proposal would be considered for approval by the Governing Council on June 23, 2008.

Professor Mock reported that the remaining development sites in the northeast sector of the St. George campus were Sites 11, 12, and 24. Sites 11 and 12 were already in the early stages of expansion, and Site 24 belonged to Trinity University. There was a need for the establishment of appropriate guidelines for balanced development of the area, including increased density where appropriate. The current recommendations took into account the findings of the Bloor Corridor study; it had suggested that Site 12 be built to a height of 80 metres in order to accommodate planned development. Comprehensive development of the area would incorporate enhanced pedestrian routes, consideration of heritage preservation, and universal design principles to maximize accessibility.

There were no questions.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the Project Planning Report for the Northeast Sector of the St. George Campus, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix “G”, be approved in principle.

12. Capital Project: Project Planning Report – Southeast Campus Electrical Plan

The Chair said that the Project Planning Report for the Southeast Campus Electrical Plan had also been considered by P&B on May 14, 2008, and would be considered for approval by the Governing Council on June 23, 2008, if recommended by the Board.

Professor Mock explained that future growth in research initiatives required modifications to the electrical infrastructure in the southeast sector of the campus to avoid the need to schedule, curtail, or relocate research activities. The first priority in the area was the Wallberg Building, which was fed from Loop #1. Loads on the Loop had grown to the point that the ability to feed buildings in either direction had been compromised. The Project Planning Committee recommended obtaining a total of 2,500 kVA to provide room for future growth in research

12. Capital Project: Project Planning Report – Southeast Campus Electrical Plan (cont'd)

activity. The total project cost estimate, including necessary infrastructure upgrades and site restoration, was \$3 million, which would be funded under the Capital Renewal Program.

The Chair expressed his thanks to a member for having submitted a question about the project prior to the meeting. The member acknowledged the importance of supporting research on campus but voiced his concerns about the associated increase in power usage. According to his calculations, the University would generate approximately an additional 3,500 tons of greenhouse gases with the proposed project. While the *University Environmental Protection Policy* contained an objective of minimizing energy use, specific targets were not defined. In his opinion, the University's sustainability plan should be carefully discussed, with a view to exploring the capping of energy use.

Professor Goel agreed that long-term sustainability was an important objective. However, he also emphasized the pressing need for increased electricity capacity of past growth – the present proposal was dealing with what had already happened. Over the past few years, there had been considerable growth on all three campuses and increased requirements for electrical power in all areas of institutional activity. Some researchers in the precinct were being subject to brownouts due to the electrical load on the system. In response to a suggestion for the development of a plan for the University to achieve carbon neutrality, Professor Goel noted that the Sustainability Office was working on developing such a plan to help to reduce the environmental impact of operations on all three campuses.

A member indicated his support for the provision of adequate power that would enable researchers to further their work. He suggested that by supporting the University's research mission now, future methods for energy efficiencies could be developed.

Ms Riggall drew attention to the numerous energy reduction initiatives that had been implemented by the University over the past few years. For example, a project to convert chiller plants had recently been completed and efficient lighting retrofits had been conducted throughout the University. She noted that students were especially engaged in contributing towards a sustainable campus, and she welcomed similar input from members of the Board. At the present time, the University was collecting baseline information with respect to its consumption of energy, so it would be premature to set a specific reduction target.

A member asked whether it was possible to generate the necessary power without producing emissions. A member suggested that by shifting some of the heavy research activities from peak periods to evening hours, the amount of energy drawn by the University on the Toronto electrical grid could be reduced. Production means were not controlled by the University.

Invited to comment, Mr. Bruce Dodds, Director of Utilities and Buildings Operations, stated that the University had thoroughly examined renewable energy options, including increased generation on campus. It currently generated six megawatts of energy on campus at the central power plant. Opportunities offered by incentive programs to increase generation had been explored, but they were not yet financially viable. Mr. Dodds reiterated that growth on the campuses over the past decades had had a significant impact on the University's energy consumption and its limited distribution systems needed to be addressed immediately.

12. Capital Project: Project Planning Report – Southeast Campus Electrical Plan (cont'd)

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

1. THAT the Project Planning Report for the Southeast Campus Electrical Plan, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix “H”, be approved in principle; and
2. THAT the project scope as described, with a capital cost of \$3 million, be approved, with funding to be provided from the Capital Renewal Program 2007/08.

13. Capital Project: Interim Project Planning Report – Institute of Child Study Expansion

The Chair stated that the Interim Project Planning Report for the Institute of Child Study Expansion had been considered by P&B on May 14, 2008, and would be considered for approval by the Governing Council on June 23, 2008, if approved by the Board.

Professor Mock said that the Institute of Child Study (ICS) had been established in 1925 and had moved to its current location on Walmer Road in 1953. Adjoining properties on Spadina Road had been purchased in 2000 and 2008 to facilitate the planned expansion. The expansion of the ICS facilities, both for teaching, research, and the operation of the Laboratory School, was needed in order to meet guidelines and provide an exemplary student experience. An interim space program of 3,177 nasms was proposed, but further site review would be necessary to determine the ability of the site to accommodate additional expansion.

It was estimated that the total project cost would be approximately \$21-24 million, assuming a current tender; all funds for new construction and renovation would be raised from external sources. Further refinement to the project cost would be completed prior to distribution of the final report. At the P&B meeting in response to a member's question about the availability of government funding for the project, Professor Goel had advised that although the University would not seek government funding on behalf of the ICS, additional external sources of funds could be pursued.

The Chair welcomed Mr. Joe Weinberg, Chief Administrative Officer, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE). Mr. Weinberg informed members that the current report was an update to the one submitted to governance in 2002. The Interim Project Planning Committee had taken into account the availability of additional space with the purchase of 58 Spadina Road, as well as the need for a suitable auditorium, gymnasium, and expansion of classrooms. If the Board granted approval for the release of funds as outlined in the motion, further planning of the site including architectural consultation and examination of possible development opportunities on the site could occur.

13. Capital Project: Interim Project Planning Report – Institute of Child Study Expansion (cont'd)

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

1. THAT the Interim Project Planning Report for the Institute of Child Study Expansion, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix “I”, be approved in principle.
2. THAT the project scope, totaling 3,177 net assignable square metres (nasm), including 1,800 nasm of new construction, at 45 Walmer Road and on the combined sites of 56-58 Spadina Road, be approved.
3. THAT consultants be hired to prepare schematic design drawings, to investigate and make recommendations regarding development of the site, and to investigate maximum development potential on the combined 56-58 Spadina Road site.
4. THAT approval to proceed with schematic drawings and detailed site investigations, at a maximum cost of \$225,000, be funded from the Institute for Child Studies capital fund.

14. Items for Information**(a) Annual Report on Academic Discipline, 2006-07**

The Chair said that copies of the Annual Report on Academic Discipline had been available at the door. He drew members' attention to a minor error on page two of the report - 21 University Tribunal cases had been resolved, not 18 as indicated.

Invited to comment, Ms Nancy Smart, Judicial Affairs Officer, reported that a new database had been developed to aid in the collation and reporting of statistical data on cases of academic discipline. Information from the database would be accessible on the new website which would be launched shortly. The Judicial Affairs Office had made two important changes in the report being presented to the Board. First, it had decided to use the governance year (July 1st to June 30th) as the “Reporting Year” for clarity. That would eliminate divisional differences in the way that the Reporting Year had previously been defined. Second, it had been decided that the date of resolution of a case would be used for counting purposes, where resolution was defined as the event that concluded the proceedings under the *Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters* within the University. This would minimize differences regarding the appropriate time to count a case for the statistical summary.

(b) Annual Report on Degrees, Diplomas, and Certificates Awarded, 2007

The Chair informed members of an error on page 4 of the Report that had been brought to the attention of the Secretary. The Grand Total for the Spring and Fall degrees should be reversed; 11,501 degrees, diplomas and certificates had been awarded in Spring, 2007 and 4,050 had been awarded in Fall, 2007. There were no questions.

14. Items for Information (cont'd)**(c) Excerpt from Report Number 136 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs (May 13, 2008)**

The Chair stated that an excerpt from draft Report Number 131 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs had been provided to the Board for information.

Professor Sass-Kortsak drew members' attention to item 4 of the Report. She noted that AP&P had approved a substantial upgrading to the admission requirements and program for the Bachelor of Science in Pharmacy degree. The Committee had also approved in principle the proposal that the entry-to-practice degree in Pharmacy be changed from the upgraded Bachelor's degree to a doctorate in Pharmacy. If the proposal were approved by the Ministry of Training, Colleges, and Universities, the Board's approval would be sought for a change in the degree designation to appropriately reflect the upgraded curriculum.

(d) Report Number 125 of the Planning and Budget Committee (May 14, 2008)

The Chair noted that Report Number 125 of the Planning and Budget Committee was not yet available; it would be circulated prior to the Board's next meeting in the Fall.

(e) Appointments and Status Changes (May 14, 2008)

The Chair said that copies of the Report on Appointments and Status Changes had been included in the agenda package. There were no questions.

15. Date of Next Meeting

The Chair informed members that the date of the next meeting was not yet available, but it would be held in the Fall, 2008. The 2008-2009 meeting dates for the Academic Board and its Committees would be made available on the Office of the Governing Council website after July 1, 2008.

16. Other Business

The Chair expressed his appreciation to all those who had contributed to the work of the Board during the past year.

The Chair thanked the assessors who brought matters forward to the Boards and Committees, and acknowledged the contributions of Professor Goel whose term was ending on June 30th. Professor Goel had served as voting assessor to the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs and the Academic Board between 2001 and 2004. Since 2004, he had served as senior assessor to the Academic Board and the Planning and Budget Committee, and voting assessor to the Agenda Committee. The Chair wished Professor Goel well as he began his position as Founding President and CEO of the newly created Ontario Agency for Health Protection and Promotion, and he thanked him for his extraordinary service to the University.

The Chair thanked the members of the Agenda Committee who oversaw the flow of the business of the Board, and who were diligent in approving academic administrative appointments on behalf of the Board.

The Chair acknowledged the work of the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs, Professor Andrea Sass-Kortsak and Professor Doug McDougall, and of the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Planning and Budget Committee – Professor Avrum Gotlieb and Professor Miriam Diamond.

16. Other Business (cont'd)

The Chair thanked all members of the Board for their contribution to the governance of the University. He acknowledged the service of those members whose terms ended on June 30, and informed those whose terms were continuing that they would receive information about the 2008-09 Board over the summer.

In conclusion, the Chair thanked members of the Governing Council Secretariat for their support.

On behalf of the assessors and members of the Board, Professor Goel thanked Professors Corman and Marrus for their service as Chair and Vice-Chair of the Academic Board in 2007-08. He also thanked them for their additional contributions on the *Towards 2030* Task Forces.

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

17. Quarterly Report on Donations - February 1, 2008 – April 30, 2008

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

18. Appointment of University Professors

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

The appointments of Professor Spencer Barrett, Professor John Challis, and Professor Keren Rice as University Professors, effective July 1, 2008.

19. Report of the Tribunal Selection Committee

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT Ms Patricia Jackson be re-appointed Senior Chair of the University Tribunal for the period July 1, 2008 to June 30, 2011.

THAT Mr. Kirby Chown be re-appointed Associate Chair of the University Tribunal for the period July 1, 2008 to June 30, 2011.

THAT Mr. Bernard Fishbein, Mr. Michael Hines, Ms Jane Pepino, and Mr. Ronald Slaght be re-appointed as Co-Chairs of the University Tribunal for the period July 1, 2008 to June 30, 2011.

20. Report of the Striking Committee

(a) Co-opted Membership of the Academic Board ¹

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the following be appointed as co-opted members of the Academic Board for 2008-09:

Administrative and Professional Staff

- * Mr. Paul Ruppert, Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering (to June 30, 2009)
- Ms Lynn Snowden, University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM) (to June 30, 2011)

Alumni

- * Dr. Christena Chruszez, Faculty of Dentistry
- * Mr. Roger Parkinson, School of Graduate Studies (SGS)
- Ms Maureen Simpson, Faculty of Arts and Science/Faculty of Law
- Mr. Daniel Taranovsky, Joseph L. Rotman School of Management/SGS

Students

Full-time Undergraduate

- Ms Anne Guo, Faculty of Arts and Science, Victoria College
- Miss Jenna Hossack, University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC)
- Dr. Young Kim, Faculty of Medicine
- Mr. Andrew Mintz, Faculty of Arts and Science, Trinity College
- Mr. Andrew Ngo, Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering (FASE)
- Ms Charlene Saldanha, UTM
- * Miss Pamela Santora, Faculty of Arts and Science, Woodsworth College

Part-time Undergraduate

- Mr. Shane Smith, Faculty of Arts and Science, Woodsworth College

Graduate

- Ms Jacqueline Greenblatt, School of Public Policy and Governance
- * Ms Emily Gregor, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE)
- Ms Tharsni Kankesan, UTSC
- Ms Sheron Perera, Faculty of Medicine

¹ * Indicates a member of the Board or Committee in 2007-08.
40819

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

(b) Membership of the Agenda Committee

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the following be appointed to the Agenda Committee for 2008-09:

Student

Miss Pamela Santora, Faculty of Arts and Science, Woodsworth College

Teaching Staff

Professor Ragnar Buchweitz, UTSC

* Professor Rick Halpern, Faculty of Arts and Science, New College

(c) Membership of the Academic Appeals Committee

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the following be appointed to the Academic Appeals Committee for 2008-09:

Chairs:

* Professor Emeritus Ralph Scane, Senior Chair

* Mr. Tad Brown

* Ms Bonnie Goldberg

* Ms Kate Hilton

Ms Renu Mandhane

* Professor Edward Morgan

* Professor Lorne Sossin

Members:

Students

Ms Jacqueline Greenblatt, graduate, School of Public Policy and Governance

Ms Anne Guo, full-time undergraduate, Faculty of Arts and Science, Victoria College

Ms Tharsni Kankesan, graduate, UTSC

Mr. Andrew Ngo, full-time undergraduate, Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering (FASE)

Mr. Andrew Mintz, full-time undergraduate, Faculty of Arts and Science, Trinity College

Ms Sheron Perera, graduate, Faculty of Medicine

20. Report of the Striking Committee (cont'd)**(c) Membership of the Academic Appeals Committee (cont'd)***Teaching Staff*

- * Professor Jan Angus, Faculty of Nursing
- * Professor Katherine Berg, Faculty of Medicine
- Professor Elizabeth Cowper, Faculty of Arts and Science
- Professor Gerald Cupchik, UTSC
- * Dr. Chris Koenig-Woodyard, UTM
- Professor Rhonda Love, Transitional Year Program
- * Dr. Cindy Woodland, Faculty of Medicine

(d) Membership of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the following be appointed to the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs for 2008-09:

Administrative and Professional Staff

Ms Lynn Snowden, UTM

Students

- Ms Jacqueline Greenblatt, graduate, School of Public Policy and Governance
- * Ms Emily Gregor, graduate, OISE
- Ms Anne Guo, full-time undergraduate, Faculty of Arts and Science, Victoria College
- Miss Jenna Hossack, full-time undergraduate, UTSC
- Ms Charlene Saldanha, full-time undergraduate, UTM

Teaching Staff

- * Professor Gage Averill, UTM
- * Professor Katherine Berg, Faculty of Medicine (Physical Therapy)
- * Professor Ragnar Buchweitz, UTSC
- * Professor Elizabeth Cowper, Faculty of Arts and Science (Linguistics)
- Professor Luc DeNil, Faculty of Medicine, (Speech Pathology)
- * Professor Robert Gibbs, Faculty of Arts and Science (Philosophy)
- Professor Lesley Lavack, Faculty of Pharmacy
- Professor Rhonda Love, Transitional Year Program
- Professor Hy Luong, Faculty of Arts and Science (Anthropology)
- * Professor Douglas McDougall, OISE/UT (Curriculum, Teaching and Learning), **Vice-Chair**
- Professor Ato Quayson, Faculty of Arts and Science (English)
- * Professor Cheryl Regehr, Faculty of Social Work
- * Professor Andrea Sass-Kortsak, Faculty of Medicine (Public Health Sciences), **Chair**
- * Professor Suzanne Stevenson, Faculty of Arts and Science (Computer Science)

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

(e) Membership of the Planning and Budget Committee

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the following be appointed to the Planning and Budget Committee for 2008-09:

Student

Dr. Young Kim, full-time undergraduate, Faculty of Medicine

Teaching Staff

Professor Denise Belsham, Faculty of Medicine (Physiology)

Professor Gabriele D'Eleuterio, FASE

Professor Joseph Desloges, Faculty of Arts and Science, Woodsworth College

* Professor Meric Gertler, Faculty of Arts and Science

* Professor Avrum Gotlieb, Faculty of Medicine (Laboratory Medicine & Pathobiology), **Chair**

* Professor Gregory Jump, Faculty of Arts and Science (Economics)

Dr. Chris Koenig-Woodyard, UTM

* Professor David Mock, Faculty of Dentistry

Professor Wendy Rotenberg, Rotman School of Management, **Vice-Chair**

Professor Romin Tafarodi, Faculty of Arts and Science (Psychology)

Additional members of the Agenda Planning Group:

Professor Joseph Desloges, Faculty of Arts and Science, Woodsworth College

* Professor David Mock, Faculty of Dentistry

(f) Discipline Appeals Board

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the following be appointed to the Discipline Appeals Board for 2008-09:

Students

Mr. Aaron Christoff

* Miss Milka Ignjatovic

* Miss Jemy Mary Joseph

Teaching Staff

Professor Wendy Duff, Faculty of Information Studies

Professor Guy Faulkner, Faculty of Physical Education and Health

Professor Gillian MacKay, Faculty of Music

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

(g) Advisory Committee on the University of Toronto Library System

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the following be appointed as the Board's representatives on the Advisory Committee on the University of Toronto Library System for 2008-09:

Professor Robert Gibbs, Faculty of Arts and Science (Philosophy)

* Professor Donna Orwin, Faculty of Arts and Science (Slavic Languages and Literature)

(h) Committee for Honorary Degrees

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the membership proposed for the Committee for Honorary Degrees for 2008-2009 in the Report of the Striking Committee dated June 3, 2008 be approved.

The meeting adjourned at 11:45 a.m.

Secretary

Chair

June 10, 2008