

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL
REPORT NUMBER 118 OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD

April 10, 2003

To the Governing Council,
University of Toronto.

Your Board reports that it held a meeting on Thursday, April 10, 2003 at 4:15 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall. An attendance list is presented at the end of this report. In this report, items 4, 5, 6 and 7 are recommended to Governing Council for approval and the remaining items are reported for information.

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

1. Report of the Previous Meeting

A member recalled that he had asked about English as a Second Language (ESL) programs for post-doctoral fellows. This was not recorded in the Report nor was there a response. The Chair undertook to review the Report.

The report of the previous meeting, dated March 20, 2003, was approved.

2. Business Arising

The Chair noted that there were no matters of business arising.

3. Report Number 104 of the Agenda Committee

The report was received for information.

4. School of Graduate Studies: Proposed New Master of International Trade in Forest Products Program

(arising from Report Number 101 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs and Report Number 87 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Smith explained that this program would complete the set of three “professionally-focused” programs approved in the Faculty of Forestry’s strategic plans and it addressed the demand for well-trained specialists in the forest industry with expertise in international trade and economics. The program targeted individuals with strong professional experience in high level positions in government or industry and, as such, the program was offered in a modular format over a 16-month period. The focus of the program was international and, though initially most students would be from Canada, international recruitment was expected in the future. The faculty would be drawn from Forestry, the Rotman School of Management, the Institute of Policy Analysis, the Faculty of Law and a member from UBC. This core group would be supported by an international expert advisory panel.

4. School of Graduate Studies: Proposed New Master of International Trade in Forest Products Program (cont'd)

Professor Smith drew to members' attention the letter from Dean Marrus included in the agenda package indicating that SGS and the Faculty of Forestry had agreed to change the initials of the degree designation to M.I.T.F.P. This change was proposed during the discussion at the Committee meeting.

Professor Horton, reporting from the Planning and Budget Committee, noted that this was a self-funded program and the revenue generated from tuition fees would provide the necessary resources to deliver the program.

A member asked what the tuition fee would be. Dean Bryan said that the fee for the program would be \$25,000.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDED

THAT the new Master of International Trade in Forest Products (M.I.T.F.P.) program, as described in the submission from the School of Graduate Studies, dated February 10, 2003, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "A", be approved, effective January 2004.

5. University of Toronto at Scarborough: Discontinuation of 15-credit BA/BSc Program (arising from Report Number 101 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs and Report Number 86 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Horton reported that this proposal was a request from the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC) to discontinue a program for which demand continued to decline dramatically. There were no resource implications to this proposal.

Professor Smith drew members' attention to the discussion at the Committee on Academic Policy and Program meeting that was presented in Report Number 101. The Committee reviewed this proposal in detail and saw the opportunity for a 20-credit degree program to offer greater breadth of study. It would also serve to meet the demand from students seeking a liberal arts education. The Committee focused on the academic reasons supporting the proposal and recognized that standards to achieve academic excellence in the undergraduate curriculum should be the same on all three campuses. With the discontinuation of the 15-credit program in the Faculty of Arts and Science and at the University of Toronto at Mississauga, UTSC should be offered the same vehicle to achieve those standards.

It was duly moved and seconded

THAT the proposal for the discontinuation of the 15-credit B.A. and B.Sc. degrees, as described in the University of Toronto at Scarborough submission, dated February 26, 2003, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "B", be approved, effective for students registering at the University of Toronto at Scarborough in the Summer of 2004.

A member asked what kind of student enrolled in the three-year degree program. Professor Thompson said the profile of these students, based on convocation statistics, was similar to students taking the four-year degrees in terms of such characteristics as full or part-time status and maturity. He suggested that the discontinuation would not have an impact on the students.

5. University of Toronto at Scarborough: Discontinuation of 15-credit BA/BSc Program (cont'd)

A member asked whether the University was considering offering an associate's degree and if other options were available. Professor Neuman noted that the University had procedures in place that gave transfer credit from the Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology. The issue of transfer credits was under review. Professor Horton noted that there were seven programs at UTSC offered in conjunction with Centennial College. UTSC also offered a wide range of co-op programs that combined work placement with academic study. These programs offered another option to students which many found attractive. The member asked whether it might not be better to look at other options before discontinuing the three-year degree. Professor Neuman said that interest in the three-year degree program was waning and enrolment was decreasing. The degree had been eliminated in most other universities. She believed the three campuses should offer the same quality degree.

A member asked about the certificate of attestation for which students could apply. Professor Tuohy explained that Woodsworth College would issue a certificate of attestation to any part-time student who completed 10 courses and applied for it. She noted that the College did not keep records on this matter but relatively few had applied for the certificate. The certificate was offered in response to those who wanted a milestone in their studies recognized.

It was duly moved and seconded,

THAT Ms Alex Artful-Dodger, External Commissioner from the Students' Administrative Council, be invited to address the Board.

The motion was carried.

Ms Artful-Dodger said that SAC was aware of issues regarding the discontinuation of the three-year degree arising on the St. George campus. The loss of this option had had a disproportionate effect on certain groups of students. Students were now forced to find an extra \$5000 to complete a fourth year. This was particularly hard on women, people of colour and mature students who would be less likely to be able to afford the increased cost. She was not convinced that the three-year degree was not valuable and noted that a number of students applying to Law and Medicine, for example, had three-year degrees.

A member noted that admission to second-entry programs did not require a degree but rather a number of years of university education. He was in favour of having uniform standards across the three campuses.

Professor Neuman responded that accessibility was supported by the student financial aid policy. Accessibility was monitored carefully and a report was presented annually to governance. There was no evidence that accessibility had decreased since the three-year degree was discontinued on the St. George campus. Professor Thompson noted that, as student interest in the three-year degree decreased at UTSC, there had been a strong increase in interest in the co-op program which included work placements and a chance to help finance their education. In response to a question, Professor Thompson said that by 2007, he expected 60% of enrolment at UTSC to be in the co-op programs.

A member commented that everyone wanted a well-rounded education. Beneficiaries of the three-year degree appreciated its unique character. The fact that other universities did not offer the degree was not a good argument. A four-year degree required more money and more time to complete. When mature people wanted to take a degree, particularly on a part-time basis, a fourth year could dramatically extend the time. He urged members to vote against the motion and he urged the Board to preserve the degree for certain cases.

5. University of Toronto at Scarborough: Discontinuation of 15-credit BA/BSc Program (cont'd)

A member asked about the costs to offer the degree if a decreasing number of students were enrolled in it. Professor Tuohy explained that the academic reasons for discontinuing the degree were paramount. To offer the kind of excellent programs the University wished, a 20-credit degree was necessary to provide academic integrity.

A member referred to the cost of having two different bachelor of arts and bachelor of science degrees. The University should have one degree that was instantly recognizable. When there were two degrees, there was confusion. The driving force behind the proposal to discontinue the three-year degree was curricular and it made sense for all three campuses to offer the same degree. There was a continuing cost to providing documentation to attest to which degree a graduate had earned. He re-iterated the point that second-entry programs did not require a degree. He saw value in the fact that the bachelor's degree would mean one and only one thing.

A member asked what would be said to those who hold three-year degrees. Professor Neuman said that the discontinuation would not affect them.

It was duly moved and seconded

THAT the motion be referred back to the committees for further study.

A member spoke against the motion saying he was convinced by previous speaker's points. Another member said that the matter had been adequately discussed at the committee level.

A member said that he supported the motion and wished to increase the options for students, not decrease them. He suggested that other ways to offer the three-year degree in special circumstances be considered.

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

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

6. Budget Report, 2003-04
(arising from Report Number 87 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Horton said that members of the Planning and Budget Committee had been exceptionally well briefed on this year's Budget Report. Prior to its presentation at the March 26 meeting, Professor Neuman had invited Committee members and members of the Governing Council to an off-line information session on the Report on March 21. Professor Neuman's presentation to the Committee on March 26 had been well received and the debate following, while acknowledging that this was not a good news budget, had been positive and supportive. The Committee strongly endorsed the Budget Report and the responsible approach taken in it.

It was duly moved and seconded

THAT the Budget Report, 2003-04, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "D", be approved.

Professor Neuman introduced the budget with the aid of a powerpoint presentation, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "C". The highlights were:

6. Budget Report, 2003-04 (cont'd)

- the budget, at the end of a 6-year planning period must be balanced and the accumulative deficit could be no more than 1.5% of the operating budget or \$14.7 million
- the projected accumulated deficit for the year end 2002-03 as reported in the 2002-03 budget, adjusted by the actual year end result for 2001-02, would be \$22.4 million
- the current deficit projected for 2002-03 was \$34.1 million
- unrealized revenue for 2002-03 included the inflation adjustment on the operating grant, reduced investment return on the Expendable Fund Investment Pool, and Research Performance Fund and ORDCF overhead
- increased expenses included utility costs and asbestos removal
- revised revenue and expense assumptions for 2003-04 included increased amortization of investment losses, resumed contributions to the pension fund and the consequent loss of the ability to redirect pension contribution savings, the elimination of the inflation adjustment on the operating grant and the elimination of the increase from 20% to 30% on the indirect costs of federal research
- the major revenue assumptions for 2003-04 were a zero inflation increase in grants, tuition fee revenue capped at 2% for the majority of students, reduced investment revenue and part of the losses amortized over 5 years, full average funding for enrolment growth in undergraduate programs, and an MTCU imposed cap on graduate enrolment growth
- there would be an additional \$17.1 million in grant/fee revenue over the amount previously budgeted, indirect cost recovery of federally funded research was projected at \$15.8 million, the endowment pay-out would be reduced from \$9.10 to \$6.60 per unit (4.2%) and there would be a \$2.5 million provision to assist in transition to that lower pay-out rate
- the total income projected for the 2003-04 budget would be \$977 million, a \$90.3 million increase over 2002-03; provincial operating grants would increase from \$391.2 million to \$412.9 million in 2003-04; the biggest increase in revenue over last year would be in tuition fees
- the basic operating grant per basic income unit (BIU) was \$3699 in 2002-03, lower than the \$4419 value in 1991-92; if the 1991-92 had been adjusted annually by CPI, it would have been \$5311 this year
- in comparison across the country, Ontario universities were funded at the lowest amount per student; the University's funding was considerably lower than its peers in the Association of American Universities
- major cost drivers of the budget included the protection of the library acquisition budget, compensation increase assumptions, resumption of current service payments to the pension plan, debt services charges to the operating budget on capital borrowing, and guaranteed funding packages for doctoral-stream students
- a capital budget had evolved from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund, encompassing all academic, non-academic and endowed capital infrastructure
- expenses for 2003-04 were expected to total \$977.6 million, an increase of \$73.3 million over 2002-03
- revenue and expenses after budget reductions of 4.45% (or \$22.2 million) for 2003-04 would be balanced at \$977 million, the budget projection for the year was a \$19.4 million surplus on April 30, 2004, reducing the accumulated deficit to \$14.6 million, within the limit of 1.5% of the operating budget set by the Governing Council policy

Professor Neuman noted that the recently announced provincial budget contained good news for the University. The government would provide Quality Assurance Funds of \$75 million province-wide in 2003-04 with \$200 million being disbursed by 2006-07. Phase 2 of the Ontario Student Opportunities Trust Fund would be implemented with \$400 million being provided over

6. Budget Report, 2003-04 (cont'd)

the next decade and \$14 million targeted to help student with learning disabilities. The University's pro-rata share of the Quality Assurance Funds would probably mean the elimination of the OTO budget cut of 1.46%.

Professor Neuman said that there had been suggestions that this budget was too hard to implement and that the Governing Council should be asked to change its policy. She reported that the out year picture was still difficult. The pension plan needed to realize a 7% return in order to meet its liabilities; in the next years the pension plan was not projected to meet this rate of return. The University would have to resume its contributions to the plan and fund any shortfall between assets and liabilities. There was also a large deferred maintenance problem. The capital plan was being revisited to determine what the University could realistically achieve. Putting the difficult decisions off for a year or increasing the allowed deficit would not, in her opinion, be a wise way to proceed.

A member congratulated the Provost on her clear presentation. Concerning the library acquisition budget, he asked whether there was any benefit to be gained from the increasing value of the Canadian dollar. Professor Neuman said that results for this year would need to be known before a prediction for next year might be made.

A member thanked the Provost for a thoughtful budget in distressing times. He had seen numerous budget cuts visited on the divisions for a number of years. They were difficult to make. He wished to re-inforce the decision to review the spending on capital projects, including new buildings.

A member asked a number of questions about the investment policies and practices. Professor Neuman suggested that the member receive the recent report from University of Toronto Asset Management Board (UTAM).

A member asked if there were any qualifications attached to the Quality Assurance Funds. Professor Neuman said that there were no details given in the announcement but she thought they would be used for teaching, classrooms and faculty.

The Chair referred to the 4.45% budget reduction imposed on divisions and asked Professor Neuman to give some idea of the impact this would have. Professor Neuman said that she and Professor McCammond had been meeting with the various deans and principals. Various approaches to the problem were being considered. Unfilled faculty positions had been retrenched, some programs might be discontinued and some budget reductions were being taken in serial OTO reductions as a transitional measure. For a couple of Faculties, it was clearly impossible for them to meet the budget reductions and a transitional fund had been established to help them.

The President put the current problems at the University in context. He said that if the stock market rallied, the budget situation would improve. The interaction with the government and the successes there had been masked by the poor performance of the stock market. Public and private institutions across North America were facing the same difficult situation. For example, the University of California system was imposing a faculty salary freeze and salaries might be reduced in future. The Massachusetts Institute of Technology had imposed budget reductions of 7%.

A member noted that, in her presentation, Professor Neuman had indicated a tendency to overspend in the early years of a 6-year budget planning cycle. She asked whether there were plans to prevent this in future. Professor Neuman corrected any misapprehension on this matter and noted that the overspending was slight. The unpredictability of the stock market was always a factor. She also

6. Budget Report, 2003-04 (cont'd)

noted that, for example, in the first round of Academic Priority Fund (APF) allocations, the spending had been distributed more evenly while in the second round, the spending had occurred early in the cycle. She believed that the current situation was salutary and both the Provost's Office and the divisions would be more watchful in future.

A member noted that in the past, when inflation was rising, salaries had not kept pace. Budget reductions were in fact made under the cover of inflation. Now without inflation, the budget reductions were more obvious. Professor Neuman said that the burden of bearing the reallocation of resources had shifted from the individual to the institution. This was appropriate, given increasing workloads.

A member asked whether the University could consider selling any assets. Professor Neuman said that she had discussed this point with Mr. Chee, Vice-President, Business Affairs. He was reviewing the University's real estate. However, many properties that might be potentially sold had mortgages, reducing the gain that could be realized from a sale.

The Chair requested further elaboration of the proposed capital review. Professor Neuman said that the capital budget contained a listing of all capital project and the funds available to support them. It was a big list and it needed some refinement. Some projects were funded by SuperBuild or donors and there would need to be negotiations if the University wished to withdraw a project from the list. It was a big task and it would be undertaken with the help of the divisions.

A member asked if the budget was based on a computer model and, if so, was it able to handle sensitivity analysis? Could it deal with changes as they happened? Professor Neuman said that it was computerized and she did receive frequent updates. Professor McCammond confirmed that it could do "what if" analyses.

A member commented that students were concerned about issues such as debt loads, high tuition, and Scotia loan debt levels. In addition, there would now be reductions to departments and academic programs. He agreed strongly that there was a problem with the level of provincial government funding. He agreed that the University should maintain its programs, financial aid and accessibility. His difficulty was that the assumptions in the budget planning process let the government evade its responsibility. The budget was formed in a this-is-the-way-it-has-to-be mode. In the past, investment income had filled in for the lack of government support; now it was tuition revenue. He quoted from a recent COU report in which a large percentage of the public thought that University education was too expensive. He noted that, if the provincial government increased the funding per student to the national average, the University would be able to eliminate the tuition fees for one quarter of the students. He suggested the need for legislation to be enacted that would guarantee access to post-secondary education and protect public funding of post-secondary education. He proposed that the budget report be referred back.

It was duly moved and seconded

THAT the Budget Report, 2003-04 be referred back to the Planning and Budget Committee to strike a committee with membership from APUS, GSU, SAC, Governing Council, Faculty, Staff, Alumni and Community Representatives with the mandate to prepare a joint document detailing concerns and a call for the re-establishment of previously cut provincial government base funding.

A member spoke in support of referring the matter back. He said the University was moving from a public to a private university with increasing tuition. He asked that when the budget was referred back the issue of equity in hiring practices and a general increase in equity be considered.

6. Budget Report, 2003-04 (cont'd)

A member asked when the budget needed to be approved. Professor Neuman said that the budget year ended on April 30. Governing Council would consider the budget, if recommended by the Board, on May 1. The Business Board had recently authorized interim spending for two months. The kind of study proposed in the recommendation to refer back would take a great deal of time.

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

The Board returned to debate on the main motion. A member expressed his concern that the Ontario university system was declining while enrolment was increasing. Planning was inadequate and there was a real problem with the education system. When inadequate funding was given to the health care sector, it asked where the rest of the funding was. When inadequate funding was given to the universities, they said thank you. He understood the need for growth but he was disturbed that some capital costs came from the operating budget. There was a problem explaining deteriorating facilities to students while their fees increased. The operating fund appeared to be supporting capital costs because the provincial government was not providing the necessary financial support. Professor Neuman said that expanding enrolment required increased facilities. The funding came from three sources – the provincial government through the SuperBuild programs, donors, and the federal government through the Canada Foundation for Innovation. Both government funding programs required the University to provide matching funds. The University must pay the carrying costs on mortgages. The Bahen Centre, for example, was funded by SuperBuild, donors and allocations from two Faculties, Arts and Science and Applied Science and Engineering.

A member referred to the earlier remarks about slight overspending in the first years of a six-year planning period. He said that the only currency a Faculty had was faculty positions. In the 1996-2000 academic plan, his Faculty had had 100 faculty positions to fill, 25 per year. In a competitive market, it took as long as two years to fill a position. These positions were important to the academic plan of the Faculty. In the 2000-2004 plan, he had received authorization to fill the positions faster, sometimes being able to fill two positions from one search. In the end, he was only able to fill a portion of the positions because of cutbacks. He had about 30 faculty positions bridged to future retirements. The student:faculty ratio had increased, there were classroom space problems and concerns about the adequacy of the teaching assistants' budget. He did not view this as overspending but rather attempts by desperate divisions to try to maintain excellent academic programs.

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

7. Capital Project: Project Planning Report – Faculty of Arts and Science, Economics
(arising from Report Number 87 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Horton noted that this project had come forward in response to an urgent need for space for faculty and graduate students in the Department of Economics and for additional classroom space. The project had been divided into two phases, with funding identified for Phase 1 and fund-raising underway for Phase 2. Design of both phases would proceed but, if funding for both were not in place by the time the design stage was concluded, only Phase 1 would proceed to construction.

She noted that debate at the Committee revealed concern on the part of some members that this project was proceeding given the current budget situation. Dean Amrhein and Professor Dewees, representing the Department of Economics, had strongly supported the proposal, reiterating the grave

7. Capital Project: Project Planning Report – Faculty of Arts and Science, Economics (cont'd)

problems with limitations on and quality of faculty and graduate student space and the negative impact this had on the ability of the Department to successfully recruit and retain faculty and students. The Committee was assured that the need for space was critical, that there was virtually no financial risk to Phase 1, and that Phase 2 would not proceed until fund-raising had secured the necessary funds.

The Chair asked whether phase 2 would return to the committee level before proceeding when funding was found. Professor Venter explained that the intent was to hire a consultant to begin the process. The decision to proceed would be made in December 2004. It was hoped to have the funding for phase 2 then and, if that was the case, phase 2 would proceed without further referral to the Planning and Budget Committee.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDED

1. THAT the project planning report for the Department of Economics, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix “E”, be approved in principle. The project has two phases and the initial design will incorporate both phases in the design stage. The two phases will only be constructed concurrently if all funding is secured; presently only the funding for phase 1 has been defined.
2. THAT the project scope of 1880 nasm of new space and 450 nasm renovated space be approved at an estimated total project cost of \$14,300,000 (May 2004), with funding as follows:
 - (i) Financing of a mortgage in the amount of \$6,000,000 to be repaid over a 25 year amortization period at 8% per annum by the Faculty of Arts and Science to coincide with needs of the project. This contribution will address the first phase of the project.
 - (ii) \$8.3 million to be raised from external sources by the Faculty of Arts and Science for the second phase of the project. The second phase of the project will only proceed to construction once all funds are secured.

8. Items for Information

- (a) Report of the Vice-President and Provost
 - (i) Congratulations

Professor Neuman announced that Professor Carl Amrhein, Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Science, was leaving the University to take up the position of the Vice-President (Academic) and Provost of the University of Alberta. His term at this University would end on April 30, 2003. This would be a great loss to the University. He has been a very effective leader and was well respected by chairs and faculty members in his Faculty. Professor Neuman offered sincere congratulations and wished Professor Amrhein success in his new role. The Board showed their appreciation for Professor Amrhein's leadership.

8. Items for Information (cont'd)

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

Professor Neuman said that a second member of the Board would soon be leaving and that it would be appropriate to acknowledge the invaluable work done by Professor Derek McCammond, on this, his last budget day. He had been a source of strength to her when she began her term as Provost. She expressed her appreciation and was joined by the Board.

(ii) Clinical Faculty

Professor Neuman reported that negotiations with the University of Toronto Faculty Association were proceeding. The parties had agreed to engage the services of Dr. Hugh Scully, Professor of Surgery, as a mediator. The parties remained committed to an early resolution.

(iii) SuperBuild Funding

Professor Neuman noted that the announcement had not, as yet, been made.

(iv) Appointments and Status Changes / Appointment of Professors Emeriti

Professor Neuman presented a number of appointments and status changes for information.

(b) Items for Information in Report Number 101 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs

Members had no questions on the report.

(c) Items for Information in Reports Number 86 and 87 of the Planning and Budget Committee

Members had no questions on these reports.

(d) Reports Number 275, 276 and 277 of the Academic Appeals Committee

Members had no questions on these reports.

9. Date of Next Meeting

The Chair noted that the next regular meeting of the Board would be held on May 8, 2003.

10. Other Business

Dean Amrhein spoke at the request of Ms Ranjini Ghosh, President of the Arts and Science Students' Union (ASSU). Ms Ghosh, a member of the Board, had had to leave early. ASSU, an organization representing 18,000 Arts and Science Students, wished to publicly acknowledge and congratulate Professor McCammond for his work on behalf of the students. He had been working with ASSU on such issues as 24-hour study space, the tuition fee refund schedule and interest charges to students.

A member recalled that, at the previous meeting, the Board had received a report about cases that had been before the Ontario Human Rights Commission (OHRC) concerning the LSAT test and the barriers it was perceived to present to some groups of students. The member said

10. Other Business (cont'd)

that the student in question was denied admission to the Faculty of Law based on his LSAT scores. He asked that the Board be given the public documents the University had presented in this case. Professor Goel responded that the cases were now before the courts and the documents were in the public record. Such documents were not normally given to the Academic Board. The member asked that the documents be given to the Board. The Chair said that the Agenda Committee would discuss the request.

The Board moved *in camera*

11. Academic Administrative Appointments

The following academic administrative appointments were approved:

FACULTY OF ARTS AND SCIENCE

Professor Pekka Sinervo	Interim Dean from May 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004
-------------------------	--

FACULTY OF SOCIAL WORK

Professor Usha George	Associate Dean from July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2006 (re-appointment)
-----------------------	--

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO AT SCARBOROUGH

Department of Life Sciences

Professor John Kennedy	Chair from July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2006
------------------------	--

12. Report of the Striking Committee

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT Professor Pekka Sinervo, Interim Dean, Faculty of Arts and Science, be appointed to the Planning and Budget Committee, effective May 1, 2003, for the remainder of 2002-03.

The meeting adjourned at 6:35 p.m.

Secretary
April 11, 2003

Chair

Present:

Professor W. R. Cummins, Chair
 Dr. T. Simpson, Chair, Governing Council
 Ms R. Patten, Vice-Chair, Governing Council
 Professor R. J. Birgeneau, President
 Professor S. Neuman, Vice-President and Provost
 Professor V. Goel, Vice-Provost, Faculty
 Professor D. McCammond, Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget
 Professor C. Tuohy, Vice-President, Policy Development and Associate Provost and Interim Vice-President, Research and International Relations
 Professor R. Abramovitch
 Mr. S. Ahmed
 Professor G. Allen
 Professor C. Amrhein
 Professor J. Barber
 Professor C. Beghtol
 Professor B. Benhabib
 Professor M. Berkowitz
 Ms H. Brabazon
 Professor R. Bryan
 Professor N. Camerman
 Mr. G. Chan
 Professor M. Chipman
 Professor S. Choudhry
 Professor D. Clandfield
 Professor D. Cook
 Professor R. Deber
 Professor S. Desser
 Professor M. Diamond
 Ms R. Fernandes
 Professor E. Freeman
 Ms R. Ghosh
 Professor L. Girolametto
 Professor M. Gotlieb
 Professor H. Gunz
 Professor A. Haasz
 Dr. G. Halbert
 Professor P. Halpern
 Professor E. Hodnett
 Ms B. Horne
 Professor S. Horton
 Professor L. Howarth
 Mr. M. Hyrcza
 Ms M. Jackman
 Professor A. Johnston
 Professor A. Jones
 Professor R. Kluger
 Professor J. Lepock
 Professor J. MacDonald
 Ms V. Melnyk
 Mr. D. Melville
 Professor D. Mock

Ms C. Moore
 Professor M. O'Neill-Karch
 Mr. E. Ohayon
 Mr. J. Paterson
 Professor P. Perron
 Mr. C. Purchase
 Mr. C. Ramsaroop
 Professor C. Regehr
 Professor B. Sampson
 Mr. R. Sanders
 Professor P. Sinervo
 Professor J. J. B. Smith
 Professor D. Thiessen
 Professor P. Thompson
 Professor V. Timmer
 Mr. N. Turk-Browne
 Professor L. Wilson-Pauwels

Non-voting Member:

Mr. L. Charpentier

Non-voting Assessors:

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

Secretariat:

Ms S. Girard, Secretary
 Ms C. Oke

Absent:

Professor D. Affonso
 Professor D. Allen
 Professor S. Aster
 Professor B. Baigrie
 Dr. M. Barrie
 Professor N. Bascia
 Professor D. Beach
 Professor M. Beattie
 Mr. M. Bonham
 Mr. A. Chapnick
 Professor B. Corman, Vice-Chair
 Professor F. Cunningham
 Professor R. Daniels
 Professor L. De Nil
 Professor J. Donaldson
 Professor C. Dyer
 Professor D. Edwards
 Professor M. Eichler
 Dr. I. Elliston
 Dr. S. G. Fell
 Professor E. Fiume
 Mr. J. Fraser

Professor M. Fullan
Professor J. Furedy
Professor R. Geist
Ms B. Goldberg
Professor A. Gotlieb
Mr. B. Greenspan
Mr. A. Hamoui
Mr. D. Herbert
Professor E. Hillan
Professor W. Hindmarsh
Professor L. Howarth
Mr. J. Hunter
Professor M. Hutcheon
Professor G. Kerr
Professor B. Kidd
Dr. M. Letarte
Professor L. Loeb

Professor M. Marrus
Professor R. Martin
Professor M. McGowan
Ms S. McDonald
Professor C. Misak
Professor D. Naylor
Professor I. Orchard
Professor P. Pennefather
Professor R. Reisz
Professor K. Rice
Professor L. Richards
Mr. V. Sekhar
Mrs. C. Seymour
Professor B. Sherwood Lollar
Professor T. Venetsanopoulos
Ms S. Walker

In Attendance:

Mr. M. England, Assistant Vice-Provost, Strategic Planning
Professor F. Fich, member-elect, Academic Board
Dr. B. FitzPatrick, Assistant Vice-President and Director, Office of the President
Ms L. Lewis, Assistant Provost and Special Assistant to the Vice-President and Provost
Ms A. Artful-Dodger, External Commissioner, Students' Administrative Council
Ms E. Sadowski, President, Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students