

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

REPORT NUMBER 128 OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD

June 3, 2004

To the Governing Council,
University of Toronto.

Your Board reports that it held a meeting on Thursday, June 3, 2004 at 4:30 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall. An attendance list is presented at the end of this report. In this report, items 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 14(f) are recommended to Governing Council and the remaining items are reported for information.

The Chair suggested that the *in camera* approval items be considered before those for information.

The President announced that Professor Vivek Goel had been appointed Vice-President and Provost effective June 1, 2004 to June 30, 2009. The committee advising the President on this appointment had been large and broadly based. The process had been very thorough and Professor Goel had been chosen from an extremely strong field, including a number of very impressive external candidates. The members of the Board congratulated Professor Goel on his appointment.

1. Report of the Previous Meeting

The Chair noted that he had been advised of one proposed correction to the report. A member has requested that on page 8, under item 7, the report by the Faculty of Medicine would be of a review of the implementation of the new constitution at the end of two years and not a progress report. Another member noted that in the same paragraph, the word “precedence” should be “precedent”.

The report of the previous meeting, as amended, dated April 8, 2004, was approved.

2. Report Number 113 of the Agenda Committee

The report was received for information.

3. Policy on Clinical Faculty

Professor Goel said that the issue of policies for clinical faculty was one of long standing but that over the past year the administration, following the recommendations of the Task Force on Clinical Faculty, had been engaged in discussions with the University of Toronto Faculty Association (UTFA) to resolve it. Alternative funding arrangements had been put in place which included various dispute resolution mechanisms which currently did not provide a role for the University in disputes involving academic freedom arising in the hospitals. Of particular importance to the University was the role it would have in resolving such issues. He recalled that the outbreak of SARS had interrupted the work on the policies but that the participants had resumed their discussions in fall. He said that the clinical faculty had recently voted and given overwhelming support to the proposed policies.

3. Policy on Clinical Faculty (cont'd)

The key issue in discussions with UTFA had arisen concerning the dispute resolution mechanism in cases involving academic freedom. The task force report and the proposed policies included three tracks for the resolution of disputes. In the first case, when the grievance concerned a University decision-maker, such as a chair of a department, the clinical faculty member would follow the provisions similar to those outlined in the Memorandum of Agreement and the grievance would be heard by a Grievance Review Panel of clinicians. The Panel's decision would be a binding finding of fact and a remedy. If the matter at dispute occurred in a hospital setting involving a hospital or a clinical practice plan, the matter would be dealt with entirely under the hospital's or the practice plan's dispute resolution mechanisms which both provided for binding resolution. In the case of a matter concerning academic freedom, the hospital, the practice plans and the University all have overlapping responsibilities. At present, the University's role in these matters involving clinicians was ambiguous. The proposed policies clearly delineated a role for the University in these particular grievances. The University and the hospital would establish a tribunal to determine if a breach of academic freedom had occurred. Such a finding of fact would be binding on all parties. The grievor would then take the finding of fact to the dispute resolution mechanism in the hospital or practice plan for a remedy.

Professor Goel gave an example of how the latter type of grievance would proceed. A surgeon published a study critical of colleagues. She then found her operating time was reduced. The hospital cited resource problems but the surgeon said it was a reaction to the published study. The first step would be mediation, led by the departmental chair. If that failed, the Dean would investigate and as necessary, the tribunal would be established. Following a hearing, a binding finding of fact would be issued. If the finding of fact favoured the surgeon, the hospital would determine the remedy. Professor Goel said that the tribunal could recommend a remedy but the final decision was the hospital's. There were provisions in the policies to ensure that the hospital respected the decision of the tribunal. If the hospital failed to act in an appropriate manner, the policies required the University to intervene.

Professor Goel said that the recommendation for consideration was one of approval in principle. This would allow further work to develop a detailed manual of policies and procedures and the final form of the policies. The policies would return to the Board in the fall for final approval.

It was duly moved and seconded,

THAT the draft Policy on Clinical Faculty dated May 27, 2004, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "A", be approved in principle as the basis for the formation of a Clinical Relations Committee which will develop a detailed Manual of Policies and Procedures for Clinical Faculty on the understanding that the final policy will be brought forward for approval by Academic Board and Governing Council.

Professor Naylor, Dean of the Faculty of Medicine, and a member of the task force, commented on the proposal. Professor Naylor introduced the colleagues that were present, indicating in numerous instances when the individuals held dual University and senior hospital positions. (A list of those in attendance is found at the end of the report.) In the past, the jurisdiction regarding the clinical faculty had been ambiguous; the proposed policies would rectify that problem. He made three points. First, there would be a Grievance Review Panel with clinical faculty members. It would have binding powers to decide grievances. Secondly, the co-existence of two panels would make jurisdictional ambiguity less likely. Thirdly, having an agreed finding of facts

3. Policy on Clinical Faculty (cont'd)

in academic freedom cases was essential, otherwise resources would be wasted and good will would be destroyed. He noted that this motion was for approval in principle; the details were yet to be settled. One issue outstanding was who would perform the role UTFA currently did in helping colleagues through the grievance process. He said that the Ontario Medical Association and Hospital Medical Staff Associations were seized of the issues to be resolved. The clinical faculty saw the proposal as a step forward. The survey showed wide-ranging and deep support for the policies.

The Chair said that he had granted speaking privileges to Professor Luste, President of UTFA, and to Dr. Dorian, President of the Medical Staff Association of St. Michael's Hospital

Professor Luste noted that the issue of clinical faculty policies had been one during his tenure as President for the past two years and for 25 years before that. He too wished to see closure on this matter but there was an issue at stake. Mostly UTFA dealt with matters such as pension plans and other benefits. He hoped it also represented the preservation of values and important principles such as academic freedom. He believed that, if faculty members had appointments, taught classes and supervised students, they should all have the same rights. If any aspect of academic freedom was removed from a group of faculty, the repercussions would come back to haunt the University. He said that the current proposal which removed the right to specify remedy from the University in cases where academic freedom was deemed to have been infringed had that potential. He referred to a handout he had prepared and urged the members to consider it. In it, UTFA's position was clearly stated: "Clinical faculty must have the same or equivalent protection of academic freedom as non-clinical faculty. [The University] must not introduce a two-tier or bifurcated system for academic freedom." In closing, he asked the President to re-open the issue and said that a public forum was essential. He also noted that he took issue with some of the statements in the administration's documentation.

Dr. Dorian said that he had consulted with the Medical Staff Associations of the nine affiliated teaching hospitals. The focus had been on the ends rather than the means. There was full agreement on the former, though perhaps not on the latter. The problem of which group represented the clinical faculty was ambiguous and was a distinct problem only at this University in Ontario. The survey, supported by 80 – 90 percent of those voting, showed an overwhelming desire for the clinical faculty to be represented by the clinical faculty. It was crucial to the hospitals that the excellent track record of working with University colleagues continued. The task force report was the important first step in drafting a reasonable and formal relationship.

In response to the speakers' comments Professor Goel said that the University joined Professor Luste and was in full support of the protection of academic freedom as shown in the Statement of Institutional Purpose, several policies and re-affirmed in the new academic planning document, *Stepping UP*. All faculty and students had that protection but it was not always provided in identical ways. He noted that the federated universities made their appointments and had their own dispute resolution mechanisms. The University had gained a window of opportunity with the hospitals in the resolution of academic freedom grievances that did not exist elsewhere. Rather than creating two tiers of academic freedom, the proposals resolved the current ambiguity. The University had made an advancement in this issue, not given up a previously held position.

A member said that he was, in general, delighted with the proposal. He did not agree that UTFA should represent a group that did not want to be represented by it. He did, however, agree with Professor Luste on the question of academic freedom. It was an issue of principle for the future. He agreed that there was a difference in the academic freedom for faculty and

3. Policy on Clinical Faculty (cont'd)

students but that there should be equal protection for all faculty. The grievance procedure in the Memorandum of Agreement provided an independent mechanism for resolution of problems and led to a binding decision and remedy. This procedure was not at present open to clinical faculty. To have two different bodies involved in academic freedom decisions weakened the process.

He proposed the following motion:

THAT the administration ensures that all University of Toronto professorial appointments satisfy minimal standards for resolving all grievances concerning alleged violations of academic freedom, whether they arise in the university or in the affiliated medical hospital. These standards must include the provision of a final, independent arbitration board or committee with the authority that its decision (regarding academic freedom) be final and binding on the griever and the institution or institutions.

Although there was a seconder for this motion, the Chair ruled the motion out of order as there was already a motion on the floor, and because, in the Chair's opinion, the motion was the same in content as the proposal of the administration..

A member expressed her support for the proposal. She felt uncomfortable in considering the matter as focused on academic freedom. She noted that the clinical faculty had voted overwhelmingly to support the proposed policies. She suggested that the idea of protecting them whether they wished to be protected or not bordered on imperialism. The University would protect the academic freedom of the clinical faculty. The University should not, however, dictate to a hospital how its resources should be spent.

Professor Goel referred members to point 6 in the proposed Policy for Clinical Faculty. It clearly stated the University's commitment to academic freedom and laid out the procedures that would be followed if remedial action was not taken by a hospital or a practice plan in response to a finding of a breach of academic freedom. The ultimate authority to ensure remedial action rested with the President and this had been drafted into the policy.

A member spoke in support of the motion. He believed the proposed policy was sound and represented a significant step forward to resolve the current ambiguity.

A member asked the President about UTFA's request for a public forum. The President responded that he had been waiting to reply to UTFA until the appointment of a Vice-President and Provost had been made. He also did not want to delay the approval in principle of the policy until a public forum could be held in the fall as suggested by UTFA.

A member noted that there were faculty in situations analogous to clinical faculty in other divisions and he noted that perhaps these colleagues should also be considered.

It was duly moved and seconded,

THAT the motion be referred back to the administration for more discussion and to allow for a public forum on the matter.

3. Policy on Clinical Faculty (cont'd)

A member urged that the matter not be referred back. Discussions about this issue had been proceeding for a long time. There was major support for the policy directions. The proposal gave protection for academic freedom that was supported by the clinical faculty. He believed it would be disastrous to delay approval.

Professor Goel said that there was no reason to refer the proposal back. The motion provided for approval in principle. The Policy would return in the fall following more discussion and a forum could be held prior to that.

Several members spoke against referral back, citing clinical faculty support, loss of morale and the need to make a decision and move on.

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

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

The member who moved the second motion wished the reason for ruling the motion out of order be recorded. The Chair responded that there was another motion on the floor and the new motion was similar to it.

4. Toronto School of Theology: Memorandum of Agreement - Amendments

(arising from Report Number 108 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs)

The Chair welcomed Dr. Lind to the meeting.

Professor Smith said that the memorandum of agreement between the University of Toronto and the Toronto School of Theology had been approved in 1978 and had been renewed three times since then. The current agreement required renewal by June 30, 2004.

The discussion at the Committee had focused on the changes to the agreement. The principal changes involved the creation of a joint committee to deal with routine changes in the agreement. The creation of the joint committee would mean that most changes would not need to pass through governance approval of all parties to the memorandum, which was a time-consuming and difficult process. He emphasized that the fundamental arrangement of the agreement, especially regarding the funding model of the TST, would be placed in a new schedule that would require the higher level of approval for amendment.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDED

THAT the Memorandum of Agreement between the University of Toronto and the Toronto School of Theology, dated May 4, 2004, as amended, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "B", be approved for implementation July 1, 2004.

5. Property: Declaration as Surplus to University Requirements

(arising from Report Number 97 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

The Chair noted that he had maps of the property at both UTM and UTSC, showing the location of the lots in question. These had been requested by a member of the Committee.

Professor Mock said that the Committee had a number of questions about the property which it was proposed to declare surplus. With respect to the parking lot on Simcoe Street, members asked whether the sale of the parking lot was the most prudent option to pursue, or should the University consider using the lot as a for-profit operation? The response was that the best-case scenario for the parking lot was to operate it on a break-even basis. The lot was well away from the main St. George campus, and that University parking already existed nearby at the 89 Chestnut Residence. Only a few staff members currently used the lot. The administration had concluded that the benefit of selling the property far outweighed the benefit of retaining it. The lot had originally come into University hands only as a result of the purchase of the 500 University Avenue property, and was not central to that purchase.

In response to another concern, the Committee had learned that the cost of cleanup of contaminated lands at Scarborough had been factored into the estimated cost of the land.

With respect to the sale of land at UTM and UTSC, members were concerned about any affect on long-term site planning for those campuses. Given the location of the two lots (separated from the main campus), the administration could see no potential for future development. The greater benefit could accrue from the sale of the properties, which, in one case, had already been zoned for residential development.

The final query from the Committee concerned any potential for academic use of the rural lands. The administration, which had consulted with all divisions with any possible research tie to the lands, and the Dean of Arts and Science had both reported that they could see no potential use for the rural lands as research properties.

A member asked what the proceeds of the sale of the land would be used for. Professor Goel said that the funds would be added to the capital fund and would be used to fund capital projects.

A member noted that in the documentation there was a reference to mineral exploration at the Iroquois Falls site but there was no mention of an estimated value. Professor Venter said that the cost of doing a site survey to evaluate this was greater than that of the land and that there was no value to be derived from further investigation.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDED

THAT the following property be declared surplus to University requirements:

the 210 Simcoe Street parking garage presently operated by the university as a parking lot;
the 210 Lane at Duncan and Pearl Streets;
the 11 acre parcel of land on Conlin Road located on the Scarborough Lands;
the 8 acre parcel of land north of the UTM campus on Mississauga Road;
property within the town of Iroquois Falls, PCL 1074SEC;
property within the town of the Township of Woford, C4 W PT Lot 2.

5. Property: Declaration as Surplus to University Requirements (cont'd)

Documentation for this item is attached hereto as Appendix “C”.

6. Capital Project: 155 College Street – Project Planning Report
(arising from Report Number 97 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Mock reported that the Committee had considered a planning report for 155 College Street. The site was the former Board of Education Building on College Street, and would house Nursing; Public Health Sciences; and Health Policy, Management and Evaluation. The Committee recommended approval of the proposal, which included the initial expenditure of \$1.3 million to perform design work up to the pre-tender stage of the facility’s redevelopment.

A member noted that funding was to be spent on design work, although funding for the full cost of the project was yet to be identified. He asked if the project was delayed, would the design work have to be redone? Professor Venter recalled that the building had been acquired 18 months ago to fill a known need for space. It was not good for the building to be unoccupied; the design work would be done and details of the cost of the project would be brought back for approval in October. Professor Goel added that the more detail that was available, the easier it would be to interest donors and government agencies in supporting the project.

A member noted that there was a reference in the documentation to space allocated to the Provost’s Office. Professor Venter responded that the space was primarily to house computers within the Faculties of Nursing and Medicine. This space would be controlled by the Office of Space Management and would be available to accommodate larger computer mainframes within the health sciences and the St. George campus.

In response to a member’s question, Professor Venter agreed that the percentage of the cost spent on design and development of the detailed drawings was marginally high at 10 percent as compared to the more usual 8 percent. He said that the administration had preferred not to take the chance that it would need to come back for a further allocation under summer executive authority. What was unspent would revert back to the funding set aside for the project. A member said that it was expected to be a “bare bones” renovation.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDED

Subject to the approval by Business Board of a sufficient increase in the borrowing limits available to the University,

1. THAT the Project Planning Report for the Center for Health Improvement and System Performance [CHISP] at 155 College Street, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix “D”, be approved in principle;
2. THAT the project scope identified in the Project Planning Report, to establish 8,594 of net assignable square metres (nasm) of space to accommodate the teaching and research needs of the Faculty of Nursing [3804 nasm] and the Departments of Public Health Sciences [3124 nasm] and Health Policy, Management and Evaluation [1666] respectively be approved in principle;

6. Capital Project: 155 College Street – Project Planning Report (cont'd)

3. THAT funding in the amount of \$1,300,000 be made available to undertake the design [July to November, 2004] through to the pre-tender stage of development.
4. THAT these funds, in the amount of \$1,300,000 to be acquired from a mortgage, amortized over twenty years, to be repaid from the University of Toronto operating budget.

7. Sunnybrook and Women's College Health Science Centre: Master Plan, April 2003
(arising from Report Number 97 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Mock reported that the Committee had considered a new Master Plan for Sunnybrook and Women's College Health Science Centre. The land upon which the Centre was situated was owned by the University under a legal covenant; if the land was not used for health and education purposes, it would revert to parkland. He noted that the current 21-year lease period was coming to an end, which gave the University an opportunity to examine a longer-term arrangement that would clarify the land use at the site while simultaneously ensuring a U of T 'footprint' there for future development. The University was considering a 49-year lease, and designating some of the site for the hospital development and some for University and partner development. This designation was summarized in the map that was distributed to members of the Board. This arrangement would continue to be operated under a single lease agreement in separate parts.

The principal point of discussion revolved around the University's accountability for the arrangement. Members were informed that for Sunnybrook, unlike the other fully affiliated hospitals, the Governing Council had authority on the appointment of the members of the Board of the hospital and thus the ultimate accountability flowed through the University's governing body.

In response to a question, Professor Venter indicated that Sunnybrook paid a nominal rent in the order of \$1 per year.

A member asked about the arrangements for funding any new capital projects. Professor Venter explained that in 1994, the current master plan had been approved. The proposed amendments were necessary if Sunnybrook wished to continue to develop. The new plan called for the identification of two zones. Considerable space had been set aside for University use while the hospital had the flexibility to develop the hospital zone under the constraints set out in the lease. Should the University wish to build on these sites in the future, it would have designated land and would pay for its own capital projects or develop them in partnership with the hospital.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDED

THAT the Sunnybrook and Women's College Health Science Centre Master Plan, dated April 4th, 2003 be approved, and

THAT the revisions to the Sunnybrook and Women's College Health Science Centre Master Plan, dated April 4th, 2003, identified within Long Range Planning Framework – Sunnybrook Campus Site Plan, Chapter 1 and coded as Dwg.SKA-10-3a, dated March 31st, 2004, plus the companion text, be approved.

7. Sunnybrook and Women’s College Health Science Centre: Master Plan, April 2003 (cont’d)

Documentation for this item is attached hereto as Appendix “E”.

8. Capital Project: University of Toronto at Mississauga – Phase 8 Residence – Sources of Funding
(arising from Report Number 97 of the Planning and Budget Committee)

Professor Mock recalled that at its March meeting, the Governing Council had approved a recommendation to expend \$300,000 to perform some preliminary design work on the Phase 8 residence at UTM. At the time, it was understood that further approvals would come through governance when additional monies were necessary. He noted that UTM viewed this project as a top priority; residence spots were scarce, housing only 11% of the student population (compared to 18% at the St. George campus), and about three-quarters of those were in first year. Members of the Board might recall that the proposal called not only for the 418-bed residence, but also for a dining hall, which would significantly enhance student residence life at UTM. The occupancy date was August, 2006. The Committee had one main concern: that the Business Board increase the overall borrowing capacity for the University before the expenditure was made.

A member asked what proportion of UTM students would be able to live in residence once this project was complete and would the percentage of first-year students in residence change. Professor Venter said that, given the expected growth in enrolment at UTM, the percentage change would be negligible. It was hoped that the percentage of first-year students in residence could be reduced from 76 percent to between 60 and 70 percent. Established policy cited 25 percent as the goal for accommodating students in residence but the current numbers were 17 percent on St. George, 11 percent at UTM and 10 percent at UTSC.

A member noted that there would be 8 barrier-free rooms and she asked how this number was determined. Professor Venter noted that in the Innis residence, 50 percent of the rooms were barrier free and they were not all used for disabled students. The administration had found that about 3 percent was adequate; this would continue to be monitored and adjusted in new buildings.

A member said that he supported the motion but, with the borrowing cap in place, it would be useful to see a capital project priority list to see what the opportunity cost of proceeding with this project was. Professor Goel said that an update on the capital program was given regularly to both the Planning and Budget Committee and the Business Board. The criteria for ranking the projects were known. If the borrowing capacity was increased, this would be one of the top projects to be implemented.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDED

Subject to the approval by Business Board of a sufficient increase in the borrowing limits available to the University,

THAT the source of funding for the Phase 8 residence (approved by Governing Council March 29, 2004: 418-bed student residence totaling approximately 11,000 gross square meters at an estimated cost of \$26.215 million) at the University of Toronto at Mississauga be a mortgage in the

8. Capital Project: University of Toronto at Mississauga – Phase 8 Residence – Sources of Funding (cont'd)

amount of \$26,215,000, to be amortized over a period of 20 years and to be repaid from the UTM Residence Ancillary.

Documentation for this item is attached hereto as Appendix “F”.

9. Summer Executive Authority

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT between the last meeting of the Academic Board in this academic session and the first meeting in the next academic session, proposals from the Provost for academic administrative appointments be approved on behalf of the Academic Board by a subgroup consisting of the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Board, the Vice-President and Provost, and the student member of the Agenda Committee.

10. Items for Information

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

Professor Goel said that he wished to give the Board an idea of the impact and the scope of the proposal currently under consideration. A great deal of work and consultation would take place over the summer and the administration hoped to bring a proposal to governance for approval in the fall.

Ms Riggall gave a presentation, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix “G”.

Following the presentation, Professor Goel clarified the three points of principle that any proposal would have to meet:

- It must meet the needs of the students and the academic programs.
- It cannot adversely impact the University’s operating budget.
- It cannot impact the borrowing capacity for academic programs.

He noted that an alternative to this proposal was for the University to develop the site. The University would then have to pay the debt service on any borrowed amount. The irony was that the University could not afford to finance a 5,000-seat stadium but it could afford to participate in a proposal for a 25,000-seat stadium. The proposed stadium would increase the time available for students to use the facilities. It would not impact on the ability of the University to undertake other projects. The \$15 million available in donations were for this project only and would unlikely be available for another project.

A member asked about the probability of fans’ taking the TTC. Professor Goel said that the issue of parking and traffic would be one of a number of issues to be analyzed over the summer. He invited members to contact Ms Riggall about any concerns they might have so that the final proposal could address these matters and the Board would be able to make an informed decision.

10. Items for Information (cont'd)

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

(ii) School of Graduate Studies: Review and Decanal Search

Professor Goel said that the report of the review of the School of Graduate Studies was now available on the Provost's Office web site. The search for a new dean was now underway and he hoped to be able to recommend an appointment by the end of June. He noted that a search for a dean at UTSC was also underway and the recommendation was expected by the end of the month also.

(iii) Budget Update

Professor Goel said the proposed OSAP reform was good news but there was also distressing news. The replacement funding for the tuition fee freeze was the same amount as that taken out of the Quality Assurance Fund. The announcement of a post-secondary education commission chaired by the Honourable Robert Rae was encouraging for the University. The administration would be preparing a submission over the summer and the commission was expected to report in January.

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

Professor Goel drew attention to the list of appointments and status changes, including the appointment of professors emeriti.

(b) Employment Equity Annual Report 2003

Professor Hildyard referred to her covering memorandum for the Report which noted that the University was making slow but steady progress in the number of women and visible minority faculty but that the numbers of aboriginal faculty and faculty with a disability were not growing as much as planned.

A member commented that the Report was not as easy to read and understand as it could be. He pointed to page 6, Graph 3, which referred to groups 1 through 5. The groups were not identified in the graph. It made the Report unnecessarily ambiguous to read. Professor Goel noted that the groups were identified in the table which provided the data for the graph.

A member noted that there were no data on the intersection between the four categories such as between race and gender. It would be useful to have the data compiled over time. He was also concerned about the lack of progress in hiring aboriginal faculty and those with disabilities. Finally, he said that this was an important item. It should not appear as the last item on the last meeting of the Board. He suggested that next time it be first on the agenda and appear earlier in the year.

Professor Goel responded that he too would like to examine the intersection between the four categories but the cell sizes would be small and would not provided useful analysis. He said that the University was examining trends over time and noted that several such graphs were included. With respect to aboriginal faculty and faculty with a disability, he noted that the University might not be at the level it wished to be but the data helped to focus the issues.

10. Items for Information (cont'd)**(b) Employment Equity Annual Report 2003 (cont'd)**

A member expressed some concern about the issue of self identification of disabilities. A disability had been defined as one that affected how individuals did their work. She believed that self identification presented a problem as people might not want to identify a disability. She suggested that to determine whether the University was meeting its objectives in this area, it needed to do a better survey. Professor Hildyard commented that in its Plan submitted in accordance with the Ontarians with Disabilities Act, the University had committed to undertake a survey using the ODA definition.

A member referred to the Federal Contractor's Program and asked whether its guidelines related to hiring or composition of staff. Professor Hildyard noted that the guidelines related to both composition and hiring and that the University was currently being audited for its compliance with the Program. In response to a second question, she noted that the ODA definition of a disability was different from that used by the Federal Contractor's Program.

In response to the timing of the Board's review of the report, the Chair noted that the report had been ready for the May meeting but that that meeting had been cancelled due to lack of business.

(c) Items for Information in Report Number 97 of the Planning and Budget Committee

Members had no questions on this report.

(d) Items for Information in Report Number 108 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs

Members had no questions on this report.

(e) Report of Donations over \$250,000, February – April, 2004

A member noted that this report was marked confidential. Professor Goel said that this was the first time for this designation. In the past, these reports had been posted to the web as part of a regular practice in the Office of Governing Council of posting all agenda material, except confidential items. Donors had been concerned that their business was being made public and the confidential designation ensured the report would not be posted.

The member asked if he were to copy and distribute the report to those who were not members of the Board, would he be in violation of his responsibilities as a member. The Chair indicated he would.

(f) Summary of Degrees, Diplomas and Certificates Awarded, 2003

Members had no questions on this report.

(g) University Tribunal: Individual Cases

A member noted that one of the decisions contained, what he termed, an inappropriate remark about the defendant. Professor Goel said that such remarks were not unusual in law reports but that he would draw the matter to the attention of the Judicial Affairs Officer.

11. Other Business

The Chair took the opportunity to thank the Provost, the other assessors, the Vice-Chair and the members of the Board for their counsel and support throughout the year. He noted that membership on the Board was a volunteer job, done over and above members' normal commitments. He was particularly grateful for members' attention to and careful execution of their duty. He also thanked the chairs and vice-chairs of the committees:

Professors Berry Smith and Cheryl Regehr from the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs
Professors Avrum Gotlieb and Edith Hillan from the Planning and Budget Committee
Professors Ralph Scane and Edward Morgan and Assistant Deans Bonnie Goldberg and Jane Kidner from Academic Appeals Committee.

He also thanked, in particular, the members who would not be returning next year. Professor Goel, on behalf of the Board, thanked the Chair for his service.

The Board moved *in camera*

12. Academic Administrative Appointments

The following academic administrative appointments were approved:

FACULTY OF ARTS AND SCIENCE

Professor David Cameron	Acting Vice-Dean, Undergraduate Education, from July 1, 2004 to December 31, 2004 (extension)
-------------------------	---

Professor Jonathan Freedman	Acting Vice-Dean, Graduate Education and Research, from July 1, 2004 to December 31, 2004
-----------------------------	---

Department of Botany

Professor Rowan Sage	Chair from July 1, 2004 to June 30, 2009
----------------------	--

Department of Classics

Professor John Magee	Acting Chair from July 1, 2004 to June 30, 2005
----------------------	---

Department of French

Professor Parth Bhatt	Interim Chair from July 1, 2004 to June 30, 2005
-----------------------	--

Department of Mathematics

Professor Jeremy Quastel	Acting Chair from July 1, 2004 to June 30, 2005
--------------------------	---

Centre for Comparative Literature

Professor Ricardo Sternberg	Acting Director from July 1, 2004 to June 30, 2005
-----------------------------	--

12. Academic Administrative Appointments (cont'd)

SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

Professor Umberto De Boni Acting Associate Dean, Division I, from
July 1, 2004 to September 30, 2004

FACULTY OF MEDICINE

Banting and Best Department of Medical Research

Professor Brenda Andrews Chair from July 1, 2004 to June 30, 2009

Department of Medical Genetics and Microbiology

Professor Rick Collins Acting Chair from July 1, 2004 to June 30,
2005

Department of Nutritional Sciences

Professor Michael Archer Chair from July 1, 2004 to December 31,
2008

ONTARIO INSTITUTE FOR STUDIES IN EDUCATION/UT

Professor Glen Jones Associate Dean, Academic, from July 1,
2004 to June 30, 2008

Professor Normand Labrie Associate Dean, Research and Graduate
Studies, from July 1, 2004 to June 30,
2008

FACULTY OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND HEALTH

Professor Gretchen Kerr Associate Dean, Undergraduate
Education, from July 1, 2004 to June 30,
2009 (re-appointment)

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE

Professor Sylvia Bashevkin Vice-Principal from July 1, 2004 to
December 31, 2006

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO AT MISSISSAUGA

Department of French, German and Italian

Professor Michael Lord Acting Chair from July 1, 2004 to June 30,
2005

Department of History and Classics

Professor Mohamad Tavakoli-Targhi Chair from July 1, 2004 to June 30, 2007

12. Academic Administrative Appointments (cont'd)

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO AT SCARBOROUGH

Department of Computer and Mathematical Sciences

Professor John Scherk

Chair from July 1, 2004 to June 30, 2007

13. University Professors: Appointment

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the following be appointed University Professors as of July 1, 2004: Professor Edward J. Chamberlin, Department of English, Faculty of Arts and Science; Professor Tirone David, Department of Surgery, Faculty of Medicine; Professor Jack Greenblatt, Banting and Best Department of Medical Research, Faculty of Medicine; Professor Donna Stewart, Departments of Psychiatry and Obstetrics and Gynecology, Faculty of Medicine; and Professor Donald Stuss, Departments of Medicine (Neurology, Rehabilitation Science) and Psychology, Faculty of Medicine and Faculty of Arts and Science.

14. Report of the Striking Committee

* 2003-04 member of the Board or Committee

a) Co-opted Membership of the Academic Board

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the following be appointed as co-opted members of the Academic Board for 2004-05:

Administrative and Professional Staff

Ms L. Boyes, DUA

*Ms B. Goldberg, Law (3 years)

Alumni

*+Dr. I. Elliston, OISE/UT

+current member of Governing Council

14. Report of the Striking Committee (cont'd)**a) Co-opted Membership of the Academic Board (cont'd)***Students**Full-time Undergraduate*

Ms J. Bayani, Law

+Mr. B. Cameron, Engineering

Mr. B. Chapman, UC

Ms M. Chong, UTSC

*Ms L. Honeywell, Innis

Mr. S. Iman, UC

Mr. K. Patil, UC

Ms S. Rawof, UTSC

Ms A. Thaskaran, UTSC

Mr. L. Trottier, UC

Graduate

Mr. W. Lumsden, JD/MBA

Mr. R. Mirza, Pharmacy

+current member of Governing Council

b) Membership of Committees of the Board

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the following be appointed to committees of the Board for 2004-05:

i) Agenda Committee*Student*

Mr. B. Cameron, f/t, Engineering

Teaching Staff

Professor D. Massam, Faculty of Arts and Science (Linguistics)

*Professor P. Perron, Faculty of Arts and Science (French)

ii) Academic Appeals Committee

4 Chairs:

*Ms B. Goldberg

*Ms J. Kidner

*Professor E. Morgan

*Professor Emeritus R. Scane, Senior Chair

*Professor C. Beghtol, Faculty of Information Studies

*Professor J. Furedy, Faculty of Arts and Science (Psychology)

*Professor Y. Johnson, Faculty of Arts and Science (East Asian Studies)

14. Report of the Striking Committee (cont'd)**b) Membership of Committees of the Board (cont'd)****iii) Committee on Academic Policy and Programs***Administrative and Professional Staff*

*Ms V. Melnyk, Faculty of Arts and Science

Alumni

Dr. I. Elliston, OISE/UT

Students

Ms J. Bayani, f/t, Law

Ms M. Chong, f/t, UTSC

Ms L. Honeywell, f/t, Innis

Mr. S. Iman, f/t, UC

Mr. R. Mirza, grad, Pharmacy

Teaching Staff

*Professor R. Abramovitch, Transitional Year Program

Professor S. Aitchison, Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering
(Electrical and Computer Engineering)

*Professor D. Allen, Faculty of Arts and Science (Philosophy)

Professor M. Chipman, Faculty of Medicine (Public Health Sciences)

Professor S. Choudhry, Faculty of Law

Professor D. Clandfield, New College (French)

Professor L. De Nil, Faculty of Medicine (Speech Language Pathology)

*Professor W. Hindmarsh, Leslie Dan Faculty of Pharmacy

*Professor J. Jenkins, OISE/UT (HDAP)

Professor R. Kluger, Faculty of Arts and Science (Chemistry)

*Professor C. Regehr, Faculty of Social Work **Vice-Chair**

*Professor R. Reisz, UTM (Biology)

Professor J. Scherk, UTSC (Mathematics)

*Professor J. J. B. Smith, Faculty of Arts and Science (Zoology) **Chair**

iv) Planning and Budget Committee*Students*

Mr. B. Cameron, f/t, Engineering

Mr. W. Lumsden, grad, JD/MBA

Teaching Staff

Professor D. Brean, Rotman School of Management

Professor D. Dewees, Faculty of Arts and Science (Economics)

Dean J. Gaskell, OISE/UT

*Professor A. Gotlieb, Faculty of Medicine (Lab. Med. & Pathobio) **Chair**

*Professor E. Hillan, Faculty of Nursing **Vice-Chair**

Dean C. Misak, UTM (Philosophy)

*Dean D. Mock, Faculty of Dentistry

Professor S. Pfeiffer, Faculty of Arts and Science (Anthropology)

*Dean P. Sinervo, Faculty of Arts and Science (Physics)

Professor L. Steele, Faculty of Arts and Science (Fine Art)

14. Report of the Striking Committee (cont'd)**b) Membership of Committees of the Board (cont'd)****iv) Planning and Budget Committee (cont'd)**

Additional members of the Agenda Planning Group

*Dean D. Mock, Faculty of Dentistry

*Professor S. Pfeiffer, Faculty of Arts and Science

c) Provost's Advisory Committee on the University of Toronto Library

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the following be appointed as the Board's representatives on the Provost's Advisory Committee on the University of Toronto Library for 2004-05:

Professor J. Lepock, Faculty of Medicine (Medical Biophysics)

*Professor M. O'Neill-Karch, Faculty of Arts and Science (French)

d) Discipline Appeals Board

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the following be appointed to the Discipline Appeals Board for 2004-05:

Students

*Ms L. Honeywell, f/t, Innis

*Ms M. Jackman, p/t, Woodsworth

*Mr. J. Sousa, grad, OISE/UT

Teaching Staff

*Professor J. Barber, Faculty of Social Work

*Professor J. Browne, Faculty of Medicine

*Professor L. Weinrib, Faculty of Law

e) Council of Ontario Universities - Academic Colleagues

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the President's Academic Colleagues on COU for 2004-2005 be:

Professor P. Thompson, IHPST (Philosophy)

Professor I. Orchard, UTM (Zoology) (alternate)

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

f) Committee for Honorary Degrees

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the membership of the Committee for Honorary Degrees for 2004-2005, presented in the memorandum dated June 3, 2004, be approved.

It was agreed that names for the unfilled positions on the Committee for Honorary Degrees would be recommended by the President prior to submission to the Executive Committee

The meeting adjourned at 6:50 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

June 4, 2004

Amended September 27, 2004

Present:

Professor W. R. Cummins, Chair
Professor B. Corman, Vice-Chair
Professor R. J. Birgeneau, President
Professor V. Goel, Vice-President and
Provost
Professor J. Challis, Vice-President
Research and Associate Provost
Professor R. Venter, Vice-Provost,
Space and Facilities
Professor S. Zaky, Vice-Provost,
Planning and Budget
Professor R. Abramovitch
Professor D. Allen
Professor G. Allen
Professor C. Beghtol
Professor T. Blake
Mr. M. Bonham
Professor R. Bryan
Professor P. Byer
Professor N. Camerman
Professor P. Catton
Professor S. Choudhry
Professor D. Clandfield
Mr. B. Davis
Mr. C. Davis
Ms M. De Jesus
Professor R. Deber
Professor R. Elliott
Dr. I. Elliston
Ms A. Emam
Dr. S. Graham Fell
Professor J. Furedy
Professor J. Gaskell
Dr. R. Geist
Ms R. Ghosh
Ms B. Goldberg
Professor D. Goring
Professor E. Hillan
Professor W. Hindmarsh
Ms B. Horne
Professor S. Horton
Mr. M. Hyreza
Ms M. Jackman
Professor J. Jenkins
Professor M.Y. Johnson
Professor A. Johnston
Professor B. Kidd
Professor B. Langille
Ms L.A. Lavack
Professor J. Lepock
Professor R. Lewis
Professor J. MacDonald
Professor M. Marrus
Professor D. Massam
Ms S. McDonald

Ms V. Melnyk
Professor C. Misak
Professor D. Mock
Ms C. Moore
Professor D. Naylor
Ms T. Pazonis
Professor P. Perron
Professor S. Pfeiffer
Mr. C. Ramsaroop
Professor C. Regehr
Professor R. Reisz
Professor J. Rosenfield
Ms C. Seymour
Professor B. Sherwood Lollar
Professor P. Sinervo
Professor J. J. B. Smith
Miss M. Somerville
Professor T. Venetsanopoulos
Professor M. Williams

Non-voting Assessors:

Professor D. Farrar, Vice-Provost,
Students
Professor A. Hildyard, Vice-President,
Human Resources and Equity
Professor C. Tuohy, Vice-President,
Government and Institutional
Relations

Secretariat:

Ms S. Girard, Secretary
Ms C. Oke

Absent:

Professor D. Affonso
Mr. S. Aggarwal
Mr. S. Ahmed
Professor S. Aster
Professor J. Barber
Dr. M. Barrie
Professor N. Bascia
Professor D. Beach
Professor M. Beattie
Mr. F. Bellaurdo
Professor M. Chipman
Mr. J. Cohen
Professor F. Cunningham
Professor L. De Nil
Professor M. Diamond
Professor J. Donaldson
Ms R. Fernandes
Professor F. Fich

Mr. S. Forbes
Mr. J. Fraser
Professor E. Freeman
Professor A. Gotlieb
Professor M. Gotlieb
Professor H. Gunz
Professor A. Haasz
Professor P. Halpern
Ms L. Honeywell
Professor M. Hutcheon
Professor G. Kerr (on leave)
Professor R. Kluger
Professor L. Loeb
Professor R. Martin
Professor M. McGowan

Mr. S. Morley
Professor M. O'Neill-Karch
Professor I. Orchard
Professor J. Reilly
Professor L. Richards
Professor B. Sampson
Professor J. Scherk
Professor K.-L. Shun
Professor A. Sinclair
Professor B. C. Smith
Mr. J. Sousa
Professor D. Thiessen
Ms F. Turgeon
Mr. N. Turk-Browne

In Attendance:

Professor J. Wedge, member, Governing Council; Department of Surgery; and Associate Vice-Provost, Relations with Health Care Institutions
Professor. P. Berger, Department of Family and Community Medicine; Chief of Family Medicine, St. Michael's Hospital; Chair, Medical Advisory Committee, St. Michael's Hospital; and member of the Task Force on Clinical Faculty
Professor A. Bocking, Chair, Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology; and Chief of Obstetrics and Gynaecology at Mount Sinai Hospital
Professor J. Bohnen, Department of Surgery
Professor V. Brill, representative from the UHN Alternative Funding Plan governing body
Professor D. Davis, Department of Family and Community Medicine; and Associate Dean, Continuing Education, Faculty of Medicine
Professor P. Dorian, Department of Medicine; President, Medical Staff Association of St. Michael's Hospital
Ms S. Drummond, Assistant Provost and Special Assistant to the Provost
Dr. B. FitzPatrick, Assistant Vice-President and Director, Office of the President
Professor B. Gallie, Departments of Ophthalmology, and Medical Genetics and Microbiology
Professor M. Gospodarowicz, Chair, Department of Radiation Oncology
Professor P. Gullane, Chair, Department of Otolaryngology; and Chief of Otolaryngology at UHN
Professor J. Hurowitz, Chair, Department of Ophthalmology; and Ophthalmologist-in-Chief at Mount Sinai Hospital
Dr. C. Lind, Toronto School of Theology
Professor G. Luste, President, University of Toronto Faculty Association
Professor N. Olivieri, Departments of Pediatrics and Medicine
Mr. M. Overton, Dean of Students Affairs, University of Toronto at Mississauga
Professor C. Whiteside, Department of Medicine; and Associate Dean, Graduate and Inter-faculty Affairs, Faculty of Medicine.