

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO  
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL  
**REPORT NUMBER 402 OF**  
**THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

**Thursday, January 18, 2007**

To the Governing Council,  
University of Toronto.

Your Committee reports that it held a meeting on Thursday, January 18, 2007 at 5:00 p.m. in the Boardroom, Simcoe Hall, with the following members present:

Ms Rose M. Patten (In the Chair)  
Mr. John F. (Jack) Petch, Vice-Chair  
Professor David Naylor, President  
Ms Susan Eng  
Dr. Shari Graham Fell  
Professor Ellen Hodnett  
Mr. Timothy Reid  
Professor Arthur S. Ripstein  
Professor Barbara Sherwood Lollar  
Ms Estefania Toledo

**Non-Voting Member:**

Mr. Louis R. Charpentier

**Secretariat:**

Mr. Henry Mulhall, Secretary

**Regrets:**

Mr. P.C. Choo  
The Honourable William G. Davis  
Miss Coralie D'Souza  
Mr. Robert S. Weiss

**In Attendance:**

Dr. Claude Davis, Chair, University Affairs Board and Member of the Governing Council  
Professor Michael R. Marrus, Chair, Academic Board and Member of the Governing Council  
Professor Vivek Goel, Vice-President and Provost and Member of the Governing Council

On motion duly moved and seconded,

IT WAS RESOLVED

THAT, pursuant to sections 28 (e) and 33 of *By-Law Number 2*, consideration of item 1 take place *in camera*, with the Board Chairs, and Vice-President and Provost admitted to facilitate the work of the Committee.

**1. Senior Appointments**

(a) On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED

to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation for a senior appointment contained in the memorandum from the President dated January 15, 2007.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

THAT, pursuant to Section 38 of *By-Law Number 2*, the recommendation for the senior appointment be considered by the Governing Council *in camera*.

(b) On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED

to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation for a senior appointment contained in the memorandum from the President dated January 15, 2007.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

THAT, pursuant to Section 38 of *By-Law Number 2*, the recommendation for the senior appointment be considered by the Governing Council *in camera*.

The Committee was briefed by the President, and Vice-President and Provost on a personnel matter.

The Committee returned to closed session.

**2. Reports of the Previous Meetings**

Report Number 400 of the Executive Committee meeting held on November 23, 2006, and Report Number 401 of the Executive Committee meeting held on December 14, 2006 were approved.

**3. Business Arising from the Reports of the Previous Meetings**

There was no business arising from the reports of the previous meetings.

**4. Minutes of the Governing Council Meetings of November 2, 2006 and December 14, 2006**

Members received for information the minutes of the Governing Council meetings held on November 2, 2006 and December 14, 2006.

**5. Business Arising from the Minutes of the Governing Council Meetings**

There were no items of business arising from the previous meetings.

## 6. Report of the President

### (a) Gold Medal for *The Bulletin*

The President reported that *The Bulletin* had been awarded a gold medal in the annual regional competition for college and university publications sponsored by the Council for Advancement and Support of Education, including major institutions in Canada and eastern United States. This award was a positive recognition of the ongoing efforts to redesign and enhance the publication, and reflected the strength of the editorial team.

### (b) Vision 2030

The President reported that a second President, Vice-Presidents and Vice-Provosts (PVP) retreat had been held to continue outlining the key issues to be considered in the University's long term planning exercise, Vision 2030. The goal was to produce a preliminary document by early spring intended to frame these topics in preparation for a broad consultative process. Among the issues under discussion were the following:

- **Enrolment:** Should enrolment continue to grow as it had in the past, on average doubling in size every 20 years over the course of the University's history? If so, would a fourth campus be necessary? Should partnerships be established with colleges? Or conversely, should the University's enrolment shrink over time, and if so, by how much, and in which programs and divisions?
- **Structure and Roles:** The administrative structure of the University was a complex matrix of divisions, units and colleges. The University was a federation of divisions, some of which varied greatly in size. Accountability and mandates were not always clear, in particular between the central administration and the divisions.
- **Governance:** Would the governance structure need to be modified to take into account the tri-campus structure of the University? Should some of the governance activity currently carried out centrally be devolved to the growing east and west campuses, with a parallel campus-specific body for St. George?
- **Internationalization:** What was the University's long-term international strategy? Should it include the establishment of satellite operations, similar to those of many peer institutions, and if so where?
- **Student Mix:** Should the University conduct student recruitment differently, seeking to admit more students from outside the Greater Toronto Area (GTA), and augmenting the residential component of the student population?
- **Financial Model:** Should the University's financial model be modified to reflect an environment where tuition levels were regulated, government grants lagged inflation levels, and the endowment was expected to provide a return of 4%? Or should the University seek new financial arrangements?

Consultation on these and other issues would likely continue through much of 2007 and involve online fora, focus groups, existing administrative and governance bodies, and working groups. Once feedback had been distilled and a broad consensus achieved, a vision document would be produced and forwarded for appropriate governance approval sometime in early 2008. The intent was not to produce a detailed prescriptive blueprint for the next 25 years, but rather to outline clear strategic directions in which to take the University over that period.

**6. Report of the President (cont'd)****(b) Vision 2030 (cont'd)**

A member asked whether a survey of organizational models at other institutions, including large multi-campus state universities in the U.S., would be a part of the University's planning exercise. The President responded that this would occur, and that the President of the Association of American Universities (AAU), who had served as an administrator in four different U.S. systems, had agreed to be of assistance and had identified other potential consultants from different AAU systems.

A member asked whether the University's existing internationalization strategy included a list of targeted countries or regions. The President responded that the strategy was not currently that refined, but that the development of such a list would be a priority task for the new Assistant Vice-President, International Relations once he or she was appointed.

A member commented that much of what would be included in the University's vision document would necessarily be dependent on future government policy. However, by developing a long-term strategy, the University would be taking the initiative rather than simply reacting to successive government platforms. The President noted that the University's financial model, in particular, was contingent upon government behaviour.

**(c) Capital Plan, Real Estate, and Debt Strategy**

The President noted that the Business Board, at its meeting of January 15, 2007, had received an integrated presentation by the University's senior administration on the Capital Plan, the Real Estate Strategy, and the Debt Strategy. This high-level strategic plan had been well received, and its details would be recorded in the Board's Report to the Governing Council. The President wished to signal to the Executive Committee that the University was facing a substantial cumulative deficit as had been planned in the multi-year budget framework. The planned measures, including 'one time only' (OTO) and base budget reductions, would be required in coming years to reduce the deficit to an acceptable level.

**7. Items for Confirmation by the Executive Committee****(a) Constitution: Faculty of Information Studies**

*(Arising from Report Number 147 of the Academic Board [January 11, 2007]- Item 14)*

Professor Marrus reported that a number of divisional constitutions, including that of the Faculty of Information Studies, were being revised in order to accommodate new responsibilities and authority for divisional councils resulting from the reorganization of the School of Graduate Studies, and to adopt a range of best practices for governance.

A member of the Committee noted that requirements for quorum varied among the divisional councils, and asked whether there should be a minimum limit. The Secretary of the Governing Council responded that the minimum required for quorum, generally speaking, would not be less than one-third of members.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE CONFIRMED THE DECISION OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD

THAT the revised Constitution of the Faculty of Information Studies, approved on November 21, 2006, be approved.

**7. Items for Confirmation by the Executive Committee (cont'd)**

**(a) Constitution: Faculty of Information Studies (cont'd)**

Documentation is attached to Report Number 147 of the Academic Board as Appendix “J”.

**(b) Constitution: Faculty of Social Work**

*(Arising from Report Number 147 of the Academic Board [January 11, 2007]- Item 15)*

Professor Marrus reported that the Constitution of the Faculty of Social Work had been revised for similar reasons, and that no questions had been raised by members of the Academic Board.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE CONFIRMED THE DECISION OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD

THAT the revised Constitution of the Faculty of Social Work, approved on December 5, 2006, be approved.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 147 of the Academic Board as Appendix “K”.

**(c) Faculty of Arts and Science: Departmental Name Change**

*(Arising from Report Number 147 of the Academic Board [January 11, 2007]- Item 16)*

Professor Marrus reported that the change in name of the Department of Fine Art to the Department of Art, and the Graduate Department of the History of Art to the Graduate Department of Art had been intended to more accurately convey the range of research and instruction undertaken by the Unit. Such changes to the names of units generally reflected broader changes within academic disciplines.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE CONFIRMED THE DECISION OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD

THAT the name of the Faculty of Arts and Science Department of Fine Art and Graduate Department of the History of Art become the “Department of Art” and “Graduate Department of Art” respectively, effective immediately.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 147 of the Academic Board as Appendix “L”.

**8. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council**

**(a) Statement on Research Partnerships**

*(Arising from Report Number 147 of the Academic Board [January 11, 2007]- Item 5)*

Professor Marrus reported that this revised policy was the first of several that would come forward for approval from a review that had been carried out of all the University’s research policies. The proposed *Statement on Research Partnerships* placed no political tests upon such partnerships, was a clear affirmation of the University’s commitment to academic freedom, and had been positively received by the Academic Board.

**8. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council (cont'd)****(a) *Statement on Research Partnerships* (cont'd)**

A member of the Committee asked whether it was always appropriate that no University policy or practice should limit research partnerships conducted within legal limits, if, for instance, a researcher published results that were critical of a corporate partner. The President responded that if one political test for partnerships were applied, many others would be possible, and it was best to avoid such tests altogether.

Referring to section 6 of the *Statement*, a member asked for clarification regarding partnerships that might not be made public for proprietary reasons. Professor Goel responded that such would only be the case for a restricted period of time for clear proprietary reasons, and that no research partnerships would exist at the University that provided for permanent secrecy of academic results. The President noted that such an approach might be necessary, for instance, to avoid compromising patent applications.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation

THAT the proposed *Statement on Research Partnerships* be approved.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 147 of the Academic Board as Appendix “A”.

**(b) *Statement on Conflict of Interest and Conflict of Commitment***

*(Arising from Report Number 147 of the Academic Board [January 11, 2007]- Item 6)*

Professor Marrus reported that, while this was a statement of commitment to the principle of academic freedom, it acknowledged that freedom needed to be exercised with appropriate regard for the avoidance of conflicts of interest.

Referring to section 5 of the *Statement*, a member of the Committee asked for clarification regarding the granting of approval to a faculty member not to disclose the source of research funding when publishing the findings of research. Such approval would be at the discretion of a faculty member's dean, would be granted only rarely, and would be time limited.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation

THAT the proposed *Statement on Conflict of Interest and Conflict of Commitment* be approved.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 147 of the Academic Board as Appendix “B”.

**8. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council (cont'd)**

**(c) Policy on Information Technology**

*(Arising from Report Number 147 of the Academic Board [January 11, 2007]- Item 7)*

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation

THAT the proposed *Policy on Information Technology* be approved, replacing the *Policy on the Use and Development of Computing Facilities* (April 16, 1984) and the *Computing Services Financial Policy and Accounting Practice in Respect of Major Computer Mainframe Acquisitions* (December 21, 1978).

Documentation is attached to Report Number 147 of the Academic Board as Appendix “C”.

**(d) Policy on Interdisciplinary Education and Research Planning**

*(Arising from Report Number 147 of the Academic Board [January 11, 2007]- Item 8)*

Professor Marrus noted the importance of excellent interdisciplinary teaching, learning and research at the University, and explained that this *Policy* was intended to support interdisciplinarity through the creation of appropriate institutional structures.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation

THAT the *Policy on Interdisciplinary Education and Research Planning* be approved, replacing the *Report of the Provostial Committee on Centres and Institutes*, approved by Governing Council in 1984.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 147 of the Academic Board as Appendix “D”.

**(e) Cinema Studies Institute: Establishment**

*(Arising from Report Number 147 of the Academic Board [January 11, 2007]- Item 9)*

Professor Marrus reported that the proposed establishment of the Cinema Studies Institute as an extra-departmental unit within Innis College had arisen from the Faculty of Arts and Science’s *Stepping Up* planning exercise. The Cinema Studies program was very popular with students, and established important links to the arts communities of the City of Toronto. No questions had been raised by members of the Academic Board.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation

THAT the Cinema Studies Institute be established within the Faculty of Arts and Science, and,

THAT the Cinema Studies Institute be established as an EDU:B unit, subject to the approval of the *Policy on Interdisciplinary Education and Research Planning*.

**8. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council (cont'd)****(e) Cinema Studies Institute: Establishment (cont'd)**

Documentation is attached to Report Number 147 of the Academic Board as Appendix “E”.

**(f) Restructuring of Life Sciences at the University of Toronto at Scarborough**  
*(Arising from Report Number 147 of the Academic Board [January 11, 2007]- Item 10)*

Professor Marrus reported that this was a proposal from the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC) to disestablish the Department of Life Sciences and to create two departments, the Department of Psychology and the Department of Biological Sciences. The proposal had been unanimously supported by faculty members of the Department of Life Sciences, and had been approved by the UTSC Council.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation

THAT the Department of Life Sciences at the University of Toronto at Scarborough be disestablished coincident with the establishment of the new Department of Biological Sciences and the new Department of Psychology, effective July 1, 2007.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 147 of the Academic Board as Appendix “F”.

**(g) Template for Full Affiliation Agreements between the University of Toronto and the Member Hospitals of the Toronto Academic Health Science Network**  
*(Arising from Report Number 147 of the Academic Board [January 11, 2007]- Item 11)*

Professor Marrus reported that this very important item had resulted from years of detailed negotiations between the University and its teaching hospital partners. A number of excellent questions had been asked by members of the Academic Board, and the Dean of the Faculty of Medicine had provided thorough answers.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation

1. THAT the template for full affiliation agreements between the University of Toronto and the current full member hospitals of the Toronto Academic Health Science Network be approved, effective immediately;
2. THAT the President, or designate, be authorized to sign such agreements on behalf of the Governing Council, provided that the agreements conform to the approved template; and
3. THAT the agreements signed under the provisions of this resolution be filed with the Secretary of Governing Council.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 147 of the Academic Board as Appendix “G”.

**8. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council (cont'd)****(h) Faculty of Music: Graduate Program Restructuring**

*(Arising from Report Number 147 of the Academic Board [January 11, 2007]- Item 12)*

Professor Marrus reported that the Faculty of Music was proposing to restructure its graduate programs in order to bring them in line with those at other leading university music faculties in North America. Once again, good questions had been asked by members of the Academic Board, and the Dean of the Faculty of Music had provided thorough responses.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation

1. THAT the proposal from the Faculty of Music for restructuring of graduate programs be approved, effective September 2007; and
2. THAT the proposal for a Master of Music (Mus.M.) degree and a Doctor of Musical Arts (D.M.A.) degree in the Music Performance Program be approved, effective September 2007.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 147 of the Academic Board as Appendix “H”.

**(i) Capital Project: Project Planning Report: Expansion of the Rotman School of Management Facilities**

*(Arising from Report Number 147 of the Academic Board [January 11, 2007]- Item 13)*

The Chair stated that there was a need to make a minor change to the motion as it appeared on the agenda and that of the Governing Council, and asked the Secretary of the Governing Council to explain briefly the reason for the change. The Secretary noted that, following the introduction of this item at the Planning and Budget Committee, a minor technical revision had been made to the ‘subject to’ clause of the motion, by the Office of the Governing Council. The intent had been to provide greater clarity with respect to the resolution and the expected process. Although the change made by the Secretariat had been technically correct, concerns had been expressed about this revision prior to the Academic Board meeting, and it had been decided to revert to the original wording of the motion. The Board had therefore been asked to approve the original motion. In the meantime, the Executive Committee agenda had already been prepared, using the revised motion. There was thus the need to amend the ‘subject to’ clause on the Executive Committee agenda to include the original wording which read: “Subject to approval by the Governing Council of a completed Project Planning Report,”.

Professor Marrus reported that this item was an Interim Project Planning Committee Report for an expansion of the Joseph L. Rotman School of Management. The School’s academic plan had proposed a significant increase in the scale and scope of its activities, and was in line with the University’s objective of expanding graduate enrolments and research focus. The recommendation of the report was to approve in principle the assignment of the site to accommodate the activities and functions of the Rotman School, which would allow it to pursue fundraising opportunities to finance the expansion. Assignment of the site was provisional, and would only become final following approval of a final Project Planning Report. Should the final Project Planning Report not be approved, the site would revert to the general inventory of University development sites. Discussion at the Academic Board had focused on the degree to

**8. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council (cont'd)****(i) Capital Project: Project Planning Report: Expansion of the Rotman School of Management Facilities (cont'd)**

which environmental considerations had been considered by the Project Planning Committee, and the impact of the proposed expansion on the surrounding neighbourhood.

Professor Goel noted that the use of Interim Project Planning Reports was a recent innovation. Previously, all details regarding space requirements, project costs, and sources of funding had had to be finalized before the Academic Board would approve the assignment of a site. Fundraising for projects had been hampered by the absence of at least a provisional assignment of the site. Interim Project Planning Reports allowed greater transparency, in that plans were made public at an earlier stage in their development, allowing all stakeholders to provide input on issues of interest.

In response to a question, Professor Goel confirmed that fundraising initiatives would make clear that completion of the capital project in question was conditional upon Governing Council approval of a Final Project Planning Report, as well as municipal approvals of the project.

A member suggested that the motion might explicitly state that the project was subject to the necessary funding being secured. The Secretary of the Governing Council responded that it would be preferable to keep motions as simple as possible, rather than making greater use of 'subject to' clauses that had caused complications as projects proceeded. Qualifiers, understandings, or caveats should generally be recorded in meeting minutes rather than trying to capture them in motions. The Secretariat would work toward greater simplicity and consistency with respect to the use of 'in principle' motions that were meant to signal approval of the proposed directions, but also to allow appropriate flexibility in implementation. In the case of capital projects, if changes occurred as the project was being refined, further governance review and approval would be required.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation

Subject to approval by the Governing Council of a completed Project Planning Report,

THAT the Interim Project Planning Report for the Rotman School of Management be approved in principle to accommodate the activities and functions described for the expansion of the School's programs on 91-97 St. George Street (site 11).

Documentation is attached to Report Number 147 of the Academic Board as Appendix "I".

**9. Performance Indicators**

The Chair stated that the annual Performance Indicators Report was a major element of the University's accountability exercises, and consisted of a series of metrics of institutional achievement across a wide variety of indicators. A separate summary document, *Measuring UP: An Overview*, which had been suggested at the previous year's Executive Committee meeting, had also been placed on the table. The task of the Executive Committee was to agree on the focus of the presentation of the Report to be made at the Governing Council meeting, and to identify any issues that might need clarification.

## 9. Performance Indicators (cont'd)

Professor Goel stated that the overview document served at least three purposes: it presented the key elements of the full Performance Indicators Report; it served as a status report on the implementation of *Stepping UP*, the University's academic plan; and it provided context for the development of the University's long term planning exercise, Vision 2030.

The format of the 2006 Performance Indicators Report was similar to previous years, but enhancements had been introduced in the form of new metrics, better quality data, and, in particular, better quality comparative data with respect to peer institutions. It was important to note that the Report did not represent the sum total of the various means by which the University's performance was assessed. Rather it was a high level aggregation of some of the most significant performance indicators. The most important process for assessing quality was that of peer review, which individual faculty members, departments, and divisions underwent on a regular basis.

The key finding of the Performance Indicators Report was that the University continued to perform very well in core areas, especially in its research activities. In terms of its academic programs, in particular its undergraduate teaching functions, the University scored well on some quantitative measures, but faced challenges with respect to student perceptions of the quality of the educational experience. A number of initiatives had been implemented in recent years to address this challenge, and it was intended that future Performance Indicators reports would include process measures to attempt to demonstrate the impact of these interventions.

A member expressed concern at Figure B 5b-i on page 60 of the Report that indicated a decline in 2005 in the proportions of students in undergraduate and first-entry and professional programs who came from households with income levels of less than \$50,000 per year. It was insufficient merely to state that the data appeared to be unreliable and that other measures of household income would be explored. The Vice-President and Provost responded that this was just one of a number of metrics that addressed this issue, and that other data did not indicate the same decline. The introduction of online data collection for that survey represented a significant change in methodology, and could have accounted for some of the decline. A much more comprehensive report on student financial aid would be made by the Vice-Provost, Students to the University Affairs Board. The President agreed that the reasons for this apparent decline needed to be elucidated, and that the impact of the methodological change should be clarified.

A member commented that he would have liked to have seen an explicit definition of co-curricular activities that included sports in section B.1 'Enhance the Student Experience' (p. 20). He also noted the importance of developing further metrics related to the University's performance in the humanities, so as to avoid giving the impression that the institution was predominantly science-focused.

It was agreed that Professor Goel would provide a presentation at the Governing Council meeting on February 1, 2007 of approximately 20-30 minutes duration on the Performance Indicators Report. An offline session would also be organized for members of the Governing Council as well as its boards and committees for a later date.

**9. Performance Indicators (cont'd)**

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

THAT the *Performance Indicators for Governance Annual Report for 2006* be placed on the agenda of the Governing Council meeting on February 1, 2007.

**10. Assistant Vice-President Positions**

**(a) Renaming**

The President referred to the supporting documentation that provided the rationale for the proposed renaming of the currently vacant position of Chief Capital Projects Officer to that of Assistant Vice-President, Real Estate and Construction. The new name would more accurately describe the two important functions of the position, namely managing real estate assets and managing capital projects. A search was currently underway to fill the vacant position.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation

THAT the renaming of the position of Chief Capital Projects Officer to Assistant Vice-President, Real Estate and Construction, be approved.

**(b) Establishment**

The President referred members to the memorandum from the Vice-President and Provost that provided a detailed rationale for the creation of the position of Assistant Vice-President, Student Life. The enhancement of the student experience was the University's top institutional priority, and this recommendation had arisen from an external review of the portfolio of the Vice-Provost, Students. The review had also recommended an administrative restructuring that was in the process of being implemented. The AVP, Student Life would function as the senior student affairs officer on the St. George campus and would report directly to the Vice-Provost, Students. The AVP, Student Life would have operational responsibility for student services on the St. George campus, while the Office of the Vice-Provost, Students would have University-wide policy responsibilities. Given the scope of the new position, it was considered appropriate that it be established at the assistant vice-presidential level.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation

THAT the position of Assistant Vice-President, Student Life be established.

**11. Reports for Information**

Members received the following reports for information.

- (a) Report Number 146 of the Academic Board (November 15, 2006);
- (b) Report Number 153 of the Business Board (November 9, 2006);
- (c) Report Number 138 of the University Affairs Board (November 7, 2006);
- (d) Report Number 13 on Namings.

**12. Date of the Next Meeting**

Members were reminded that the next regular meeting of the Executive Committee was scheduled for Thursday, March 8, 2007 at 5:00 p.m.

**13. Other Business**

A member wished to note that a significant development related to the student experience had occurred at the University in recent weeks; the Department of Chemistry had decided to provide 8 weeks of paid maternity leave to its female graduate students.

There was no other business.

The meeting adjourned at 6:55 p.m.

---

Secretary

---

Chair

January 29, 2007