

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

REPORT NUMBER 114 OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD

October 7, 2002

To the Governing Council,
University of Toronto.

Your Board reports that it held a meeting on Monday, October 7, 2002 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 5 and 6 are recommended to Governing Council for approval, items 7 and 8 are presented for Executive Committee confirmation and the remaining items are reported for information.

Introductory Remarks

The Chair welcomed the members to the first meeting of the Academic Board for 2002-2003. He introduced Professor Brian Corman, the Vice-Chair of the Board, Professor Shirley Neuman, Vice-President and Provost and the Board's senior administrative assessor, Dr. Tom Simpson, Chair of the Governing Council and the President, Dr. Robert Birgeneau. Professor Neuman introduced the Associate Provost, Professor Carolyn Tuohy, Vice-Provosts who were present, Professors Derek McCammond and Ron Venter and the interim Vice-Provost, Students, Dr. Sheldon Levy, who was also Vice-President, Government and Institutional Relations.

The Chair said that notes about the Board's structure, its rules and procedures had been distributed to members in their agenda packages. He invited members to contact him, the Provost or the Secretariat at any time throughout the year if they had questions about the Board. He asked that members stand and identify themselves when addressing the Board.

A motion to adjourn at 6:30 p.m. was duly moved and seconded. The motion was carried. A member indicated that he had voted against it because, in his opinion, it was not appropriate to limit the length of the meeting.

1. Report of the Previous Meeting

The report of the previous meeting, dated June 6, 2002, was approved.

2. Business Arising

A member asked for an update on a report on accessibility and career choice in the Faculty of Law and another member proposed to raise an issue with respect to the terms of reference of the Board and its committees. The Chair indicated that Professor Neuman could address the first matter in her report and the second matter could be raised under other business. The second member expressed his disagreement with the Chair's ruling.

The Chair noted that at the orientation for Governing Council members in September, a suggestion of what constituted business arising was distributed. This definition stated that only matters requiring action from the previous meeting should be considered business arising. These could include undertakings to take particular steps in a specific matter or to provide additional information on a particular topic, or the disposition of a notice of motion. The Chair proposed to apply this definition. All other matters could be raised under other business.

3. Report Number 100 of the Agenda Committee

The report was received for information.

4. "The Year Ahead": The Vice-President and Provost's Address

The Chair invited Professor Neuman to speak about the year ahead.

Before she began her report on the year ahead, Professor Neuman responded to the question on the accessibility and career choice review concerning students in the Faculty of Law. Her office was amassing accessibility data on who was admitted this year and their financial status. She had spoken to the Law Society of Upper Canada about data on career choice. The Law Society required registered lawyers to report their employment annually. It has been collecting such data for a number of years and believed it could supply data on those positions and also on articling positions. Progress was slow because of staffing shortages at the Law Society but the proposed methodology for the review would come to governance in the next months.

Professor Neuman said that there were four items that would be engaging her attention this year: academic planning, enrolment planning, the implementation of the tri-campus academic administrative structure and the budget process.

Academic Planning

Professor Neuman stated that the University was coming to the end of the current planning process and that a new plan was needed. The process for creating the new plan had begun this summer with discussions within the Provost's office and in various retreats with senior administrators. She hoped to publish a green paper – a policy discussion paper – in late November. There would be three-campus consultation and she hoped to engage faculty, staff and students in the discussion of the green paper. A web site would also be provided. In late February a draft white paper would be distributed widely for feedback and a final plan would be submitted to Governing Council in the spring. Next fall, departments would be asked to engage in a planning exercise that required them to think forward about their discipline. If they were to be one of the top departments in the world, what would they look like in terms of faculty and curriculum? There would be a 40-45% turnover in faculty in the next five years and this provided an extraordinary opportunity to shape the future. At the end of the planning period with the positions filled, the departments would have less flexibility to change.

There would be four thrusts to the planning exercise. The first would be to describe the characteristics of the best public research universities in the world; these would become touchstones for the University's own planning. The second would address faculty renewal. Not only would it focus on such matters as retention, mentoring, and the rigorous application of the University's tenure standards, but it would require departments to assess the most promising directions in their disciplines and to hire in light of that assessment and in light of the goal to become one of the world's leading departments. The student experience, the third thrust, would address not only academic dimensions such as curriculum and programs, including new innovations, but also non-academic matters from recruitment through graduation, that make the student experience as good a learning experience as it could be. The final thrust would focus on resources, including how to increase revenue and how to use the resources – money, space, time and people – in the best way.

Enrolment Planning

Professor Neuman reported that the University was now very close to the phase 3 target enrolment for next year as a consequence of a higher level of enrolment across the province than the government had projected. Over the summer, the provincial government had asked the University to sign an enrolment target document. She reported that the University was on target which was necessary because the enrolment target assumed a narrow corridor and penalties for deviation. The

4. "The Year Ahead": The Vice-President and Provost's Address (cont'd)

University again added a proviso that it required SuperBuild funding to provide space for the new students. It expected that the parameters for the next SuperBuild competition would be released shortly. Professor Neuman said that the government had underestimated the number of students who would be entering universities in 2003 and might come back to the universities for new agreements. The University's position would be carefully planned by the senior leadership and presented to the government by the President and Dr. Levy.

Tri-campus Academic Administrative Structure

Implementation of the Framework for a New Structure of Academic Administration for the Three Campuses would be led by Professor Tuohy.

Budget Process

Professor Neuman indicated that overseeing the budget process would require a great deal of her attention this year. The task was made a great deal more difficult because a number of revenue assumptions had not been realized. First, the budget assumed that the provincial government would provide for inflation in student funding and this had not happened. In the research area, the level of funding from the federal government to cover the indirect costs of research has not increased as much as was anticipated. Finally, projected levels of investment income from the endowment funds have not been realized; instead losses have been sustained. A number of difficult choices would have to be made. Academic planning would become very important in times of restricted resources.

The President supplemented the comments made by Professor Neuman. Academic planning has been historically important and would, in future, enable the University to determine what needed to be accomplished in order to move into the top echelons of universities world wide. The University must search broadly for the best faculty and thereby increase diversity. With respect to innovation, the University must be in a position to take advantage of new programs. This year, there would be a focus on three-campus planning and SuperBuild funding would be an essential part of implementing the plans. He reported that he had had a positive session with the director of the SuperBuild program. Finally, the Ontario Student Aid Program (OSAP) issue was being reviewed with the assistance of the student leaders.

In response to questions about a proposed new Ontario Student Opportunity Trust Fund (OSOTF) program and a review of the OSAP funding, Dr. Levy recalled that a new OSOTF program had been announced in the budget but so far, no guidelines had been made public. The University was actively urging the government to release details so that planning to take full advantage of this opportunity could begin. With respect to OSAP, a working group jointly chaired by Professor Rona Abramovitch and a student, Ms Geeta Yadav, with input from a number of students, had been reviewing this matter. It was hoped that it would come to a speedy conclusion.

A member asked if the racial and ethnic backgrounds of students in the Faculty of Law were being reviewed as one of the factors related to measuring accessibility. Professor Neuman replied in the affirmative.

The Chair asked Professor Neuman whether the Academic Board would have an opportunity to comment on the green paper. Professor Neuman said that it would be broadly distributed throughout the University community and comments from members would be welcome.

5. Capital Project: University College Residence Expansion - Project Planning Report - Revised
University Infrastructure Investment Fund: Allocation
(arising from Report Number 82 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Gotlieb noted that the Planning and Budget Committee had considered the first Project Planning Report on the proposed expansion of the University College Residence in April 2002. Shortly thereafter the administration became aware that the proposed site would not be approved by the City as a building site. Consultative and site exploration work had continued throughout the spring and summer, and the revised Project Planning Report now proposed construction of the residence expansion on site 22, adjacent and to the north of Sir Daniel Wilson Residence, with an 11-storey configuration. He said that the Planning and Budget Committee was supportive of this proposal.

As an addendum, because of the unique history to this project, both the approval in principle and the execution were going forward within the same governance cycle. Intense work has been done on estimates, business plans and the like in the past couple of weeks and, in fact, the cost approved by the Business Board was more firm and slightly higher than what appeared in this motion. The Executive Committee would consider the matter before the recommendations went forward to the Governing Council.

The motion was duly moved and seconded.

The Chair asked the administration to comment on the change in the cost of the project. Professor Venter reviewed the process with respect to the approval and execution of residence capital projects. These proposed projects were considered by the Academic Board which had principal carriage of the project and by both the University Affairs Board and the Business Board; the former looked at student life issues and the fees and the latter, at the viability of the business plan. The estimated cost of the project was the best estimate of the project at the time it was brought forward for approval in principle. In the normal course of events, once it had received Governing Council approval, architects would be hired and a firmer cost would be presented to the Business Board when it was asked to execute the project. In this case, the project cost presented to the Planning and Budget Committee was \$21.5 million. The University Affairs Board also considered the same cost but both bodies were informed that a slightly higher cost was being considered. The Business Board, meeting at the end of September, had before it a motion to concur with the Academic Board about the project in principle, but also, at the same time, approved a motion to execute the project at a higher cost. Professor Venter explained that the higher cost included an increased number of beds. He suggested that in the future, cost of projects presented for approval in principle would indicate a range of cost; for example, in this case, the range might have been \$21.5 million to \$22.5 million.

With the agreement of the mover and seconder, the motion was amended to include the higher cost of \$22 million and the amount to be financed was increased to \$17,145,000.

A member asked if the students in the new residence, through their residence fees, would be solely responsible for carrying the financing of the building. Professor Neuman indicated that the level of fees at the residences under the control of University College were lower than the University-wide level and would be increased. Professor Perron reported that the fees for UC residences has been raised 8% this year and a further 8% next year. The cost of the financing would be borne by all students in UC residences.

Several members wished to pursue issues concerning fees but the Chair said that that issue was the responsibility of the University Affairs Board.

5. Capital Project: University College Residence Expansion - Project Planning Report - Revised (cont'd)
University Infrastructure Investment Fund: Allocation (cont'd)

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT, subject to the understanding that the rates of the University College residence ancillary operation are increased sufficiently to ensure that the operation continues to recover its costs

1. The Revised Project Planning Report for the University College Residence Expansion, a copy of the executive summary is attached hereto as Appendix "A", be approved in principle;
2. The project scope totaling approximately 7,400 gross square metres, allowing for the construction of the University College Residence Expansion on site 22, an approved building site, be approved;
3. The project cost of \$22,000,000 be approved, with the funding sources as follows:
 - i) Donation from University College of \$2,500,000
 - ii) University College Residence Ancillary allocation of \$1,485,000
 - iii) University College Food Service allocation of \$800,000
 - iv) University Infrastructure Investment Fund allocation of \$70,000, and
 - v) Financing in the amount of \$17,145,000 to be repaid from residence fee revenues over a 25-year amortization period at 8 % per annum.

6. University Infrastructure Investment Fund: Allocation - Faculty of Information Studies
(arising from Report Number 82 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Gotlieb noted that the Planning and Budget Committee received an updated summary of the status of the University Infrastructure Investment Fund (UIIF) and supported this allocation.

A member commended the University for creating more student study space. In his view, this was a pressing need and the current amount of such space was inadequate.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT an allocation of \$35,000 be made from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund to address the partial cost of the dividing wall and related access doors to allow for the creation of student study space within the Faculty of Information Studies.

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

7. Leslie Dan Faculty of Pharmacy: Constitution - Amendments

The Chair indicated that the next two items had been presented on the agenda, at the direction of the Agenda Committee, as consent agenda items. The Chair of the Governing Council had suggested that the Boards and Committees of the Governing Council try instituting this method of dealing with issues that might normally not engender debate. The recommendations

7. Leslie Dan Faculty of Pharmacy: Constitution - Amendments (cont'd)

concerning the two items so designated would be moved, seconded and voted on without introduction or debate. It was hoped that this would be an efficient way of dealing with the items and free time for other more contentious items. Members were asked to contact the Secretary if they wished to remove the items from the consent agenda and discuss them in the normal manner. No such requests were received and the relevant divisional representatives had not been invited to be present for these items.

A motion to approve both recommendations was moved and seconded.

A member indicated that he wished to discuss both items, and the Chair asked for comments on the Constitution. The member asked about a matter in the by-laws. The Chair noted that the Board was only concerned with approving the Constitution as detailed on the cover memorandum and that the by-laws were presented for information. The divisions had approval powers for their by-laws. The Chair suggested that the member contact the Dean about the matter in the by-laws. There were no more questions.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

The amended constitution of the Leslie Dan Faculty of Pharmacy.

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

8. School of Graduate Studies: OISE/UT Department of Adult Education, Community Development and Counselling Psychology – Name Change

A member noted his understanding that part of the role of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education at the University of Toronto (OISE/UT) was connecting with the community and he wondered about the change in name.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the name of the Department of Adult Education, Community Development and Counselling Psychology be changed to the Department of Adult Education and Counselling Psychology, effective September 1, 2002.

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

9. Items for Information**(a) Report of the Vice-President and Provost**

Professor Neuman reported that at its meeting in September, the Governing Council had appointed Professor Ian Orchard and Professor Paul Thompson Vice-President of the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM) and of the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC) respectively.

(i) Performance Indicators for Governance, Annual Report, September 2002

Members had received in their agenda package a copy of the report and they were invited to comment or ask questions concerning the report.

9. Items for Information (cont'd)**(a) Report of the Vice-President and Provost (cont'd)****(i) Performance Indicators for Governance, Annual Report, September 2002**

A member referred to the data on student debt load presented on page 77. He said that it was concerned with OSAP debt levels but in the professional faculties, students were more likely to incur debt from other sources. Professor Tuohy noted the difficulty of obtaining reliable data. She had drawn on other reports, particularly the one prepared annually by the Vice-Provost, Students, on student financial support. She said that OSAP debt was the most reliable source of information for first-entry students. Professional faculty students might come to the University after completing their first degree at another institution. The University would not know the level of their previous indebtedness, if any. Professor Neuman said that the data were collected from surveys and the same students could give different answers in two different surveys depending on the way questions were asked. She noted that the charts showed the range of confidence in the data. A member said that page 78 showed that the number of students with debt at the high end of the scale had risen significantly in terms of percentage over the last five years and that this should be flagged as a serious concern, particularly when it referred only to OSAP debt and did not reflect other sources of debt.

Another member suggested that the analysis of debt load should include some consideration of the number of hours student work to support themselves and whether there was an optimal level from the University's point of view. Professor Tuohy agreed that there were a number of pieces of data she would like to collect, such as hours worked, but there was a tradeoff between the length of the survey and the response rate. All questions were reviewed to determine that they were, indeed, necessary and that the length of the survey was such that the students would take the time to respond.

A member referred to the entering grade averages and the variations across the public and private schools. Dr. Levy explained that the University was faced with about 50,000 applications that had to be processed and decisions made about applicants within matter of weeks. There was concern about the variations but the University had neither a proposed methodology or the resources to deal with this issue. The University was looking at the issue with respect to private academies.

A member questioned the presentation of the class size data. He said that people were aware of large classes for first-year students and it was important not to give a false impression. He suggested that the number of classes in a given range would be important information. Professor Tuohy indicated that class size was an important dimension of the student experience but that there were many ways to present the data. She would consult further on this issue. Another member stated the implication that smaller was better in terms of class size. This was not necessarily so and that if the large classes were well taught they could be very good experiences. The President recounted an experience where a class of 400 was split into a number of smaller sections to the detriment of the course. It was found that the students learned better in the large class format and the lecturer was brilliant. Professor Neuman agreed that this was an important point and that strategies for successful large classes were being reviewed by the Office of Teaching Advancement. Professor Tuohy commented that students needed a range of class size experience over the course of their programs. She would like to craft an indicator that took into account the points raised.

A member noted that evening courses were defined as 4 p.m. onward whereas the Faculty of Arts and Science used 5 p.m. as the beginning of the evening. Professor Tuohy responded that this was one of the original performance indicators developed by the Council of Ontario Universities and it allowed all universities to be compared on the same basis.

9. Items for Information (cont'd)

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

(i) Performance Indicators for Governance, Annual Report, September 2002

A member suggested that it would be important to develop an indicator that presented information about educational support such as the teaching assistant support, on-line support, etc. Professor Tuohy agreed that this was a good point and suggested that it would be examined in the forthcoming planning process.

(ii) Calendar of Business 2002-03

The Chair noted that the calendar of business was very important for members to consider and was presented so that members would be able to keep track of items that were of interest to them. The Calendar was posted on the Governing Council website and would be updated periodically. There were no questions.

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

(iv) Post-65 Appointments

The above two items were presented for information. There were no questions.

(b) Items for Information in Report Number 82 of the Planning and Budget Committee

There were no questions or comments.

(c) Report Number 268 of the Academic Appeals Committee

The Chair noted that the Secretary had not been informed of any questions.

A member expressed his concern that the student involved had financial support issues which, in his opinion, were not adequately addressed. Another member invited members to read the minority report in which solutions to the problems were presented.

(d) Report on Approvals under Summer Executive Authority

I. Academic Administrative Appointments

At the June meeting, the Board approved a delegation of authority to the Provost, the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Board and the student member of the Agenda Committee, to approve on behalf of the Board academic administrative appointments until the first meeting of the next academic year.

The following academic administrative appointments were approved under the Academic Board's summer executive authority:

Faculty of Arts and Science

Department of Anthropology

Professor Susan Pfeiffer

Acting Chair from July 1, 2002 to June 30,
2003

9. Items for Information (cont'd)

(d) Report on Approvals under Summer Executive Authority (cont'd)

Department of English

Professor Alan Bewell	Acting Chair from July 1, 2002 to June 30, 2003
-----------------------	---

Department of Fine Art

Professor Margaret Miller	Acting Chair from August 1, 2002 to December 31, 2002
---------------------------	---

Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures

Professor Christina Kramer	Chair from January 1, 2003 to June 30, 2007
----------------------------	---

Department of Statistics

Professor Keith Knight	Chair from July 1, 2002 to June 30, 2007
------------------------	--

Faculty of Dentistry

Centre for the Study of Pain

Professor Michael Salter	Director from July 1, 2002 to December 31, 2002 (extension)
--------------------------	---

School of Graduate Studies

Professor Bernard Katz	Associate Dean, Division I, from July 1, 2002 to June 30, 2004 (reappointment)
------------------------	--

Professor Joan Cherry	Associate Dean, Division II, from July 1, 2002 to June 30, 2005
-----------------------	---

Centre for South Asian Studies

Professor Chelva Kanaganayakam	Director from July 1, 2002 to June 30, 2007
--------------------------------	---

Faculty of Information Studies

Professor Clare Beghtol	Associate Dean from July 1, 2002 to June 30, 2005
-------------------------	---

Faculty of Law

Professor Anthony Duggan	Associate Dean from July 1, 2002 to June 30, 2004
--------------------------	---

Professor David Dyzenhaus	Associate Dean, Graduate Studies, from July 1, 2002 to June 30, 2005
---------------------------	--

9. Items for Information (cont'd)

(d) Report on Approvals under Summer Executive Authority (cont'd)

Faculty of Medicine

Department of Laboratory Medicine and Pathobiology

Professor Avrum Gotlieb	Chair from September 1, 2002 to December 31, 2007 (re-appointment - amendment)
-------------------------	--

Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology

Professor J. W. Knox Ritchie	Chair from July 1, 2002 to June 30, 2003 or until the position is filled (extension)
------------------------------	--

Department of Surgery

Professor John Wedge	Chair from July 1, 2002 to December 31, 2002 or until the position is filled (extension)
----------------------	--

Professor Richard K. Reznick	Chair from October 1, 2002 to December 31, 2007
------------------------------	---

Faculty of Music

Professor Russell Hartenberger	Acting Associate Dean from July 1, 2002 to June 30, 2003
--------------------------------	--

Professor Cameron Walter	Associate Dean from July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2008 (re-appointment)
--------------------------	--

OISE/UT

Department of Human Development and Applied Psychology

Professor Janet Astington	Chair from September 1, 2002 to June 30, 2007 (re-appointment)
---------------------------	--

Institute of Child Study

Professor Carl Corter	Director from September 1, 2002 to June 30, 2004
-----------------------	--

University of Toronto at Scarborough

Division of Physical Sciences

Professor Jim Thompson	Chair from July 1, 2002 to December 31, 2002 or until a new chair is appointed (extension)
------------------------	--

II. Other Matters

There were no matters of Academic Board business approved under the Governing Council's summer executive authority:

9. Items for Information (cont'd)

- (e) Quarterly Report on Donations May - July, 2002

This report was presented for information in accordance with the Provost's Guidelines on Donations.

- (f) Report on Degrees Awarded

There were no questions on this report.

- (g) Report of the Council of Ontario Universities (COU) Colleague

The Chair noted that Professor Perron was the academic colleague on COU and had presented his annual report to the Board.

A member referred to debate at COU concerning the double cohort and the two main issues that arose, mainly adequate space for the Ontario Secondary School (OSS) students and the Ontario Academic Course (OAC) students and the standard of evaluation and level of preparation for study at the university of both groups of students. He asked whether there would be a "dumbing down" of programs to deal with the double cohort. Dr. Levy said that performance was being studied by subject matter and that, for example, there was a slight difference of about 1% in Mathematics marks. There have been discussions with Arts and Science on the new curriculum.

A member asked about unified lobbying on the part of COU to increase the total amount of provincial funding for the universities. Professor Perron said that COU was actively lobbying the Minister directly and those who have influence in the government. The President said that he was working unrelentingly to convince the government of the value and importance to the province of education. He believed that it was more important to change the attitudes of those who elect the government. The Ontario public must be convinced that spending on education was important.

The Chair thanked Professor Perron, and his alternate from last year, Professor Vipond, for their service.

- (h) University Tribunal - Individual Case

The Chair noted that the Secretary had not been informed of any questions.

A member referred to a section of the report where the chair of the panel wrote that he was not prepared to say that the University had acted in an unreasonable manner in bringing forward the evidence that it did. The member asked what changes the University would make, if any, to its procedures. Professor Neuman took the matter under advisement and indicated that a response would be prepared for the next meeting.

10. Date of Next Meeting

The Chair noted that the next regular meeting of the Board would be held on November 14, 2002.

11. Other Business

- (a) Consent Agenda

The Chair asked members for their comments on the use of consent agenda.

11. Other Business (cont'd)**(a) Consent Agenda (cont'd)**

A member said that he was not convinced it was an efficient way to deal with some items. He did not think members could decide in advance what was an important matter, particularly in this volatile climate. He said that members had the right to free speech and he did not support stifling debate.

The Chair noted that the Agenda Committee had chosen the two items based on past experience where constitutional changes did not usually engender debate.

A member said that practice served a valuable purpose of allowing time to focus on debate of major issues. Members could do the preparatory reading and flexibility had been built in which allowed debate. She suggested it be given a fair trial.

Several members raised concerns with this process. It was proposed that the matters be presented as usual and that it be left to the members whether they wished to discuss the matters. Another member suggested that there might be no debate of certain items; on the other hand, details of a proposal might trigger debate.

A member suggested that it might not be the best use of time to ask guests to sit through a meeting on the off chance there might be a question. Another member thought it was an advantage to have guests present to answer questions in case they arose in discussion.

A member commented that the Board had used more time to discuss this issue than it had saved using the consent agenda. In his view, the appearance of limiting debate might not be worth the time it saved.

The Chair thanked the members for their comments.

(b) Terms of Reference of the Academic Board and its Committees

A member asked whether the revised terms of reference contained any substantive changes and whether the committees continued to operate the way they used to operate.

Mr. Charpentier recalled that the individual committees reviewed their revised terms of reference in some detail and recommended approval to the Academic Board. Governing Council approved the revised terms of reference based on the Board's recommendation. Revisions included making the presentation of information consistent across the committees and the Board, adding changes which had arisen because of approved policies, codifying practice, updating language to reflect new administrative structures and responsibilities and reiterating relevant elements of the Balfour Report on Governance. Governing Council's approval of the revised terms of reference had not changed the substance of the Academic Board's and its committee's responsibilities and procedures.

The Board moved *in camera*.

12. Report of the Striking Committee

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT Professor Emeritus Ralph Scane be appointed the senior chair of the Academic Appeals Committee for 2002-03.

The meeting adjourned at 6:05 p.m.

Secretary
October 8, 2002

Chair

Present:

Professor W. R. Cummins, Chair
Professor Brian Corman, Vice-Chair
Dr. T. Simpson, Chair, Governing Council
Professor R. J. Birgeneau, President
Professor S. Neuman, Vice-President and
Provost
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
Professor D. Affonso
Professor D. Allen
Professor C. Amrhein
Professor M. Beattie
Professor C. Beghtol
Professor M. Berkowitz
Mr. M. Bonham
Ms H. Brabazon
Professor R. Bryan
Professor N. Camerman
Mr. G. Chan
Mr. A. Chapnick
Professor M. Chipman
Professor D. Clandfield
Dr. R. Deber
Professor S. Desser
Professor M. Diamond
Professor C. Dyer
Professor M. Eichler
Dr. I. Elliston
Dr. S. Graham Fell
Professor E. Fiume
Professor U. George
Ms R. Ghosh
Professor L. Girolametto
Ms. B. Goldberg
Professor A. Gotlieb
Professor H. Gunz
Professor A. Haasz
Dr. G. Halbert
Professor P. Halpern
Professor E. Hillan
Professor E. Hodnett
Professor S. Horton
Professor L. Howarth
Mr. J. Hunter
Professor M. Hutcheon
Mr. M. Hyrcza
Ms M. Jackman
Professor A. Johnston
Professor A. Jones
Professor B. Kidd

Professor R. Kluger
Professor L. Loeb
Ms S. McDonald
Ms V. Melnyk
Mr. D. Melville
Professor C. Misak
Professor D. Mock
Ms C. Moore
Professor M. O'Neill-Karch
Mr. E. Ohayon
Professor I. Orchard
Professor P. Pennefather
Professor P. Perron
Mr. C. Purchase
Mr. C. Ramsaroop
Professor C. Regehr
Professor R. Reisz
Professor K. Rice
Professor B. Sampson
Mr. R. Sanders
Mr. V. Sekhar
Mrs. C. Seymour
Professor J. J. B. Smith
Professor D. Thiessen
Mr. N. Turk-Browne
Professor T. Venetsanopoulos
Ms S. Walker
Professor L. Wilson-Pauwels

Non-voting Member:

Mr. L. R. Charpentier

Non-voting Assessors:

Dr. S. Levy
Professor R. Venter

Secretariat:

Ms S. Girard, Secretary
Ms C. Oke

Absent:

Mr. S. Ahmed
Professor G. Allen
Professor S. Aster
Professor B. Baigrie
Dr. M. Barrie
Professor N. Bascia
Professor D. Beach
Professor B. Benhabib
Professor S. Choudhry
Professor D. Cook

Professor F. Cunningham
Professor R. Daniels
Professor L. De Nil
Professor J. Donaldson
Professor D. Edwards
Mr. J. Fraser
Professor E. Freeman
Professor M. Fullan
Professor J. Furedy
Professor R. Geist
Professor V. Goel
Professor M. Gotlieb
Mr. B. Greenspan
Mr. A. Hamoui
Mr. D. Herbert

Professor W. Hindmarsh
Ms B. Horne
Professor G. Kerr
Dr. M. Letarte
Professor J. MacDonald
Professor M. Marrus
Professor R. Martin
Professor M. McGowan
Professor D. Naylor
Professor L. Richards
Professor B. Sherwood Lollar
Professor P. Sinervo
Professor P. Thompson
Professor V. Timmer

In Attendance:

Ms M. McGee, Assistant Provost
Mr. A. Morton, President, Engineering Society