

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL
REPORT NUMBER 115 OF
THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD

June 3, 2003

To the Governing Council,
University of Toronto.

Your Board reports that it met on Tuesday, June 3, 2003 at 5:00 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, with the following members present:

Dr. John P. Nestor (In the Chair)
Ms Durré Hanif, Vice-Chair
Professor David Farrar, Vice Provost,
Students
Ms. Catherine Riggall, Assistant Vice-
President, Facilities and Services
Mr. John Badowski
Dr. Robert M. Bennett
Ms. Margaret Hancock
Mr. Jason Hunter
Professor Bruce Kidd
Ms. Karen Lewis
Mr. Sean Mullin
Mr. Colm Murphy
Ms. Cheryl Shook
Ms. Maggy Stepanian
Dr. John Wedge

Non-voting Members:

Ms. Susan Addario, Director of Student Affairs
Mr. John Bisanti, Chief Capital Projects Officer
Mr. Louis R. Charpentier, Secretary of the
Governing Council
Mr. Felix Chee, Vice-President, Business
Affairs and Chief Financial Officer
Professor Vivek Goel, Vice-Provost, Faculty
Ms. Marilyn Van Norman, Director, Student
Services
Professor Ian Orchard, Vice-President and
Principal, University of Toronto at
Mississauga (UTM)
Professor Ron Venter, Vice-Provost, Space and
Facilities Planning

Office of the Governing Council:

Mr. Neil Dobbs
Mrs. Beverley Stefureak, Secretary

Regrets:

Dr. Shari Graham Fell
Ms. Françoise Ko
Professor Michael Marrus

Ms. Parissa Safai
Mr. Janakan Satkunasingham
Ms. Geeta Yadav

In Attendance:

Mr. Chris Ramsaroop, Member, The Governing Council
Mr. Mike Foderick, Member-Elect, The Governing Council
Dr. Jon Dellandrea, Vice-President and Chief Advancement Officer
Ms. Alexandra Artful-Dodger, Vice-President, Operations, Students' Administrative
Council
Mr. Dan Bandurka, President, Scarborough Campus Students' Union (SCSU)
Mr. Jim Delaney, Assistant Director, Student Affairs
Mr. Paul Donoghue, Chief Administrative Officer, UTM
Mr. Ken Duncliff, Director, Centre for Physical Education, Athletics and Recreation, UTM
Mr. Ashley Morton, President, SAC
Mr. Mark Overton, Dean of Students and Assistant Vice-Principal, UTM
Mr. Kyle Winters, Associate Director, Marketing and Licensing, Division of University
Advancement

ITEMS 3, 4, 5 AND 7 ARE RECOMMENDED TO THE GOVERNING COUNCIL FOR APPROVAL.

ALL OTHER ITEMS ARE REPORTED TO THE GOVERNING COUNCIL FOR INFORMATION.

At the request of the Chair and with the permission of the Board, the order of the Agenda was varied to consider item 8 following item 2.

1. Report of the Previous Meeting

Report Number 114 of April 29, 2003 was approved.

2. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting

There was no business arising from the report of the previous meeting.

8. Code of Conduct for Trademark Licensees: Annual Report

Dr. Dellandrea said that this was the third annual report following the implementation of the *Code of Conduct for Trademark Licensees* which emerged out of the initiative of students. The Office for Trademark Licensing was housed in the Division of University Advancement and was responsible for all non-philanthropic revenue earned by that department. Dr. Dellandrea spoke briefly about the pro-active role the University of Toronto has taken in this area and gave examples of what the office has accomplished in its few years of operation. He introduced Mr. Winters and commended him on an excellent conference, "Brand Day", hosted by the University of Toronto last October.

A member asked what progress had been made on establishing a Canadian equivalent for the two commercial agencies in the United States who did the research into approved manufacturers. Mr. Winters replied that he was working with several other Canadian universities to establish a system for monitoring and he hoped there would be a resolution within the next six months.

3. Capital Project: University of Toronto at Mississauga, Wellness Centre – Project Planning Report

Professor Venter reviewed his memorandum of May 20, 2003, giving the background to and highlights of the proposal for a Wellness Centre at the University of Toronto at Mississauga. This was a facility that was much needed as that campus evolved toward its projected enrolment of 11,500 by 2007. Students at UTM were strongly supportive of the project and of a capital levy to help finance the project and the University had agreed to a capped contribution of \$7,000,000 for a 50-cent match on each dollar raised through the student levy for the initially planned \$14 million.

The Chair noted that some clarifying comments were necessary. Clearly there was support for the Wellness Centre from the student leaders at the UTM campus. One of the elements of the financing for this project was the matter of an increase in the levy. While the University Affairs Board had considered the levy in April 2002 and the initial amount of \$25 had been approved, under the *Protocol* the Board was not permitted to approve the increase in levy to \$150 at that time. However, the Board favourably anticipated considering the proposed increase when it came forward some time in the future, after appropriate approval by the students at UTM. He reminded members that the focus of discussions today should be the merits of the proposal with respect to the mandate of this Board, in particular, the level and type of services provided to students.

3. Capital Project: University of Toronto at Mississauga, Wellness Centre – Project Planning Report (cont'd)

The Chair invited Mr. Morton to speak. Mr. Morton expressed concern with the funding model, in particular that the University's 50-cent match on the dollar was capped at an amount that fell short of a 50% match to the student funding for the project. He was disappointed that the University had been unsuccessful in securing appropriate other funding for this project that would allow the students to avoid paying the larger share of the cost. He had spoken to students at UTM who shared his concerns. They would not, however, vote against the proposal because they realized that the Centre would not become a reality without the students' financial support.

A member asked for clarification on the funding model which capped the University's matching funds at less than 50% of the student contribution. Professor Venter responded. When the proposal had first been considered, the estimated planned cost had been \$21 million, \$14 of which would be provided through the student levy with matching funds of \$7 million from the University. Since then, the project had undergone changes which had increased its estimated cost considerably, followed by a rationalization which had brought the students' cost back down to the \$15 million to \$16 million that was currently recommended for approval. There had been discussions with the students in an attempt to further reduce the project cost so their portion would remain at the original \$14 million. However, the students had chosen not to trim back to the original cost, opting instead to increase their contribution to the \$15 million to \$16 million.

Professor Orchard was invited to speak. He noted that this was an important project for UTM and acknowledged the students and administrative team, Mr. Duncliffe, Mr. Overton, and Mr. Donoghue, who together had provided the leadership to make this happen. Speaking to the funding model, he noted that UTM was contributing \$1 million and was committed to further fund-raising of \$500,000, which meant that the student portion of the funding would be slightly less than twice what the University would contribute. Addressing the guest speaker's concern about external funding, Professor Orchard reported that UTM had undertaken extensive negotiations with the City of Mississauga and a Mississauga hospital, hoping to create a partnership to build a facility that would be beneficial to all three. Unfortunately, after several months of talks it became clear that a match was not possible, but efforts to find other sources of funding would continue.

In response to a question, Professor Orchard indicated that incremental, annual operating costs of the Centre were built into the \$150 levy.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD CONCURS WITH THE RECOMMENDATION OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD

1. THAT the Project Planning Report to establish the Wellness Centre at the University of Toronto at Mississauga be approved in principle.
2. THAT the project scope for the Wellness Centre at UTM comprising a total of 4,810 nasm, of which 490 nasm are renovations to existing space, for a net increase of 6,700 gsm be approved.

3. Capital Project: University of Toronto at Mississauga, Wellness Centre – Project Planning Report (cont'd)

3. THAT the funding arrangements for the Wellness Centre at UTM be approved at an estimated total project cost of \$23,500,000 to \$24,500,000 with funding as follows:
 - (i) A capped contribution of \$7,000,000 from the University of Toronto for the 50 cent match on each dollar raised through the student levy support,
 - (ii) A one-time-only contribution of \$1,000,000 from the University of Toronto at Mississauga,
 - (iii) A \$500,000 contribution to be secured from fund raising at the University of Toronto at Mississauga [UTM], and
 - (iv) A mortgage to be amortized over a period of approximately 25 years in the range of \$15,000,000 to \$16,000,000, with payments forthcoming from the planned student levy income. Student levy income would continue until such time as the mortgage is fully paid.

4. Capital Project: University of Toronto at Scarborough Student Centre, Change of Scope

Professor Venter reviewed his memorandum of May 20, 2003 and the Addendum to the Project Planning Report for the UTSC Student Centre of April 25, 2003. He expressed thanks to Mr. Bandurka and his predecessors at UTSC, without whose efforts this student facility would not have become a reality.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

**YOUR BOARD CONCURS WITH THE RECOMMENDATION
OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD**

1. THAT the addendum to Project Planning Report to establish the Student Centre at the University of Toronto at Scarborough be approved in principle.
2. THAT the project scope for the Student Centre at UTSC be approved at a total project cost of \$13,923,000 with funding as follows:
 - (i) A capped contribution of \$3,748,695 from the University of Toronto for the 50 cent match on each dollar raised through the student levy support,
 - (ii) A one-time-only contribution of \$975,000 from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund [UIIF],

4. Capital Project: University of Toronto at Scarborough Student Centre, Change of Scope (cont'd)

- (iii) A \$1,000,000 contribution to be secured from fund raising at the University of Toronto at Scarborough [UTSC],
- (iv) Cash contribution in the amount of \$1,250,000 from the Student Levy support already collected, and
- (v) A mortgage to be amortized over a period of approximately 25 years in the amount of \$6,950,000 with payments forthcoming from the planned student levy income. Student levy income will continue until such time as the mortgage is fully paid.

5. University of Toronto Alcohol Policy (Campus Alcohol Policy Revised)

Professor Farrar spoke briefly to the process by which the revised policy had come forward for approval and highlighted the proposed changes. There had not been a review of the *Campus Alcohol Policy* since 1990. The pending arrival of a much larger group of under-age students, changes in the interpretation of the duty of the host and the greater diversity of the student body were the primary reasons for the review and the proposed revisions. Student Affairs and Facilities and Services had worked together on the review and would continue to cooperate in the implementation of the changes. A major addition to the policy was the creation of a University Alcohol Advisory Committee, the terms of reference and membership of which were attached to the policy.

A member commended the review committee and expressed appreciation for the new policy, which would provide front-line staff with a good reference for concerned parents or for students organizing events.

A member asked if the University was in the position where it might take a zero-tolerance approach to alcohol in residences. Professor Farrar replied that the University saw its role as one of education rather than prohibition. Certainly, there would be the expectation in residences and elsewhere that individuals would abide by the law concerning possession and consumption of alcohol, but it was unlikely that a zero-tolerance approach would be enforceable. Legal advice had been that, in those circumstances, making any statement to that effect would increase rather than decrease liability. The *Policy* should be considered as a public statement, the objective of which was to educate members of the community.

A member strongly agreed with a policy with primarily an educational focus. Concern about events and about alcohol use in residence could be effectively addressed if the University were seen to be working with students. He saw the Students' Administrative Council as also bearing significant responsibility in this educational process.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

5. University of Toronto Alcohol Policy (Campus Alcohol Policy Revised)
(cont'd)

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the *University of Toronto Alcohol Policy*, dated May 16, 2003 under cover of Ms. Riggall's memorandum of April 9, 2003 (attached hereto as Appendix "A") be approved to replace the *Campus Alcohol Policy*.

6. Operating Plans 2003-04: 89 Chestnut Ancillary

The Chair reported that in February, 2003, the administration had brought forward a proposal to purchase the Colony Hotel with the plan that it would be converted into a student residence. Because of the need to truncate the timing for governance approval, the proposal had been taken to the Business Board and then directly to the Governing Council, with the understanding that the University Affairs Board would have the opportunity to review the operating plans and to comment on the conversion plans, as soon as those were available. He invited Ms. Riggall to introduce the item.

Ms. Riggall informed the Board that the University had officially taken possession of the Colony Hotel at 8:45 a.m. on June 2 and that it had, today, completed its first day of operation in the conference business. Two more conferences were booked for this week. The new residence plan had been worked out by a committee, coordinated by the residence administration at New College. Converting the building to residence use had not been a simple process. Students had different requirements than hotel guests, primary of which had been the need to upgrade the electrical system and install internet connections.

Ms. Riggall reviewed the operating plans, commenting on food services, capacity and design, administration of the residence, athletic facilities and other amenities within the residence, staffing, retail tenants, cost of rooms and meal plans, and plans for banquet and summer conference business from which the residence hoped to generate revenue. The five-year financial forecast in the operating plan included a significant accommodation for renovation and maintenance. In conclusion, she indicated that conversion was currently on schedule to be fully completed by September 5, 2003 with the intent that it would be ready for students to move in on September 1.

There was discussion about the possibility of revenue generation from banquet services. Ms. Riggall said that this was the only facility in that part of downtown Toronto which would take reservations for banquet rooms, without accompanying guest room reservations, for longer than three months ahead of the event. That, together with its ideal location, gave the ancillary a competitive edge that was not enjoyed by similar facilities on campus.

A member asked how accessibility within this residence could be improved. Ms. Riggall indicated that for the upcoming year there was no intent to place students with physical accessibility needs in that residence because of its distance from campus. There would, however, be attention given to this in the near future with the intent that, if the transportation difficulty could be resolved, 89 Chestnut could prove to be a good residence experience for all students.

6. Operating Plans 2003-04: 89 Chestnut Ancillary (cont'd)

In response to a question from the Chair, Professor Farrar indicated that the relationship to New College could be long-term depending on the experience over this first year. The advantages to the relationship were evident, but it would be assessed at the end of this year. Students in this residence would be affiliated with New College, the professional faculties, and Arts and Science, and some would be international students.

A member asked about policing and security and if the residence would be part of the Walk Safer program. Ms. Riggall responded that the policing and security would be similar to other off-campus residences, such as 30-35 Charles Street, with regular security patrols on the premises, backed up in case of emergencies by the University of Toronto police. While there was not yet a decision on Walk Safer, she expected that the program would go only as far as University Avenue which was considered a major public thoroughfare.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RESOLVED

THAT the 2003/04 operating plan for the 89 Chestnut Ancillary be approved.

7. Policy on Child Care Programs (replacing Policy on Day Care)

Professor Farrar explained that the initiative for proposing this new policy to replace the former came from the shift in the way the University viewed daycare. Services had been amalgamated, the University now preferred to manage its own services, and the service related to the family housing area needed to be more comprehensive. With the changes in the way the University wished to offer daycare services, it was time to examine the policy.

Professor Farrar reviewed the *University of Toronto Policy on Child Care Programs* and the attached terms of reference and membership of the University Child Care Advisory Committee, under cover of his memorandum of May 16, 2003.

In response to a question, Ms. Addario indicated that, while the *Policy* applied to all three campuses, it was broad and enabling so as to allow each campus to determine its own provisions for child care.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the *University of Toronto Policy on Child Care Programs*, attached to Professor Farrar's memorandum of May 16, 2003, (attached hereto as Appendix "B") be approved to replace the *Policy on Day Care*.

9. Canadian Federation of Students' (CFS) Referendum

Professor Farrar referred to his memorandum of May 27, 2003, which formalized the administrative position that a recommendation could not be brought forward under the current circumstances. He recalled that a copy of the attached letter from Mr. Delaney to student leaders had been circulated to members for information in late February. There was no more he could say about this matter that had not been reported at previous meetings of the Board. He appreciated the difficult situation in which this left the Students' Administrative Council (SAC), the Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students (APUS) and the Scarborough Campus Students' Union (SCSU) but he hoped that each of those organizations would take up Mr. Delaney's suggestion to run their separate referenda in compliance with their own by-laws and policies. Hopefully, then, the administration would be in a position to bring a recommendation to the Board.

Mr. Foderick was invited to speak. He began by saying that it must be difficult for the administration to be in this position but he urged the Board to support the decision of the Vice-Provost, Students to not bring forward a recommendation. He recalled that, at the last meeting of the Board, a proposed increased fee for CINSSU could not be brought forward because of by-law violations in the conduct of the referendum. He believed that the rules must be applied consistently and fairly and that the administration had done so in the matter of the CFS referendum. He cited an example at York University wherein an increase proposed by CFS could not come forward for approval because the process had not met their policy, and a new referendum had been needed. He urged SAC, APUS and SCSU to conduct another referendum to provide the students with the opportunity to speak again.

Mr. Bandurka was invited to speak. He questioned some of the conclusions reached by the administration with respect to the management of the referendum and its fairness. In his view, it was inappropriate to have used the International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (IDEA) code of conduct in assessing this referendum. There were other ways of looking at democracy. The IDEA code was not a University of Toronto policy and he believed it might be useful in the future to develop policy for referenda. He noted that SCSU had by-laws and he believed that the CFS referendum was not in conflict with those by-laws. In his view, the conclusions reached with respect to oversight and management of the process were not valid. Finally, he did not agree that there had been an "unbalanced playing field". In his view, there were no related policies nor guidelines beyond those that the student societies had in place and, he thought, they had been followed.

In conclusion, Mr. Bandurka believed that some people saw CFS as a threat. However, 80% of the student body at UTSC had indicated that CFS would be of great benefit to them, assisting with the quality of education, etc. He hoped the Board would entertain a motion to support the fee; certainly, students at UTSC would see this as appropriate.

A member spoke of his familiarity with CFS and the good job they had done in organizing a demonstration in which he partook. However, he had questions about how this referendum had been held. He believed it was debatable whether CFS had met the student organizations' policies. Certainly, it was simply not right that two members of CFS had been on the oversight body for the referendum.

9. Canadian Federation of Students' (CFS) Referendum (cont'd)

Ms. Artful-Dodger was invited to speak. It was her strong view that the decision of whether students could pay a fee for CFS memberships should not be made by a governing body of the University of Toronto. She perceived bias against CFS among the administration and the students and, early in the process, there had been rumours among students that Governing Council would do what it could to stop membership from going ahead. She believed the "NO" side had used this environment of rumour to focus voters on procedure. She thought the rules of the referendum had been agreed to by all three student organizations and there had been minimal by-law violations. She was concerned with what she perceived to be significant influence over the referenda by the administration and she had lots of problems with the reports of referendum violations. In any event, this should not be the concern of the University Affairs Board but rather a student matter.

Professor Farrar, speaking to the allegation of bias among students against CFS, recalled that the students at the University of Toronto were, in fact, among the founding members of CFS, through the Graduate Students' Union. In his view, it was unfair to say that students were against the Federation. With respect to the influence of administration, Professor Farrar had great confidence in the administrator concerned, as well as a sincere belief that he had worked very hard with students throughout this process to ensure that policies would be followed so as to allow for a positive recommendation to come forward.

A member spoke with sympathy to the view that this chamber was perhaps not the appropriate place for decisions about student fees to be made. Nevertheless, that was what current policy required. With respect to this referendum, he was also a member of the Board of Directors of SAC and he believed SAC had had ample opportunity to adequately address these concerns and to run a fair referendum. He believed they had not done so. In his view, the way it had been conducted was fundamentally unfair. He had become increasingly uneasy when attempts to eliminate some predictable problems were not accepted. Ultimately, he hoped that SAC, APUS and SCSU would reflect on why this referendum had not been appropriately run and proceed to hold another referendum, this time fairly.

For the record, a member clarified that this Board was not part of the process of whether or not student organizations should belong to CFS. The Board's responsibility simply was to consider requests for compulsory student fees, following a recommendation from the administration.

10. Accommodation and Facilities Directorate, Special Committee on Accessibility – Annual Report Update

Professor Venter spoke to his memorandum of May 20, 2003 and the attached report from Ms. Addario. The annual report would be available for the Board's first meeting in September.

A member commended the initiatives that had been taken by the Accommodation and Facilities Directorate during the past year. However, in her view the process and progress seemed to be slow, and she wondered if it could be sped up. Professor Venter replied that a lot of good ideas had come out of the discussions at Governing Council on May 29. He believed that everyone – students, administration, governing

10. Accommodation and Facilities Directorate, Special Committee on Accessibility – Annual Report Update (cont'd)

bodies – was committed to improving accessibility, but there were serious limitations on resources. He would be taking the comments from Governing Council members under advisement and hoped to report in a more substantial form in the fall.

Commenting on accessibility in residences, Professor Farrar added that new residences were being completed with a high level of accessibility. The older a residence was the less it met the criteria for accessibility. The Task Force on Student Housing was looking into this overall issue as well. Governing Council members had pointed out the problems with the Admissions and Awards Office. He had looked into problems there and found that, in fact, the building was very inaccessible. However, it was a heritage building and installation of an elevator would cost between \$3 million to \$4 million. Installing a ramp would cost approximately \$1 million. Given that most students do not go to this building, opting to use ROSI instead, it was difficult to justify such an expensive renovation. When face-to-face meetings were necessary and accessibility was an issue, Ms. Swift met students at Woodsworth College. The administration recognized the lack of accessibility to this building and was attempting to resolve it.

Ms. Addario added that capital projects were now being planned with much improved design standards. The Advisory Committee on the Ontario Disabilities Act had a sub-committee looking at issues of building accessibility and expected to have a plan for moving forward by September 30. Every capital project now had some funding set aside for accessibility design. However, there continued to be a challenge with the retrofitting of existing old buildings. Accessibility had had to be considered concurrent to huge deferred maintenance issues and, as a result, there had not been a lot of funding available over the past year. Ms. Addario gave examples of where significant improvements had been made, including improvements to the Banting and Best Building, and the installation of the elevator at Hart House. Progress was being made. In particular, all new residences were completely accessible and the challenge in that regard now was to get information out to students early enough so that their college choice could match their residence needs. She cautioned, too, that students needed to work closely with Accessibility Services. Solutions were often complex and unique to an individual.

A member congratulated the administration on making the appointment of Professor Ron Venter as Vice-Provost, Space and Facilities Services under whose leadership the University had made great strides towards its accessibility goals. He believed consultation and problem solving had been effective and the only remaining constraint was in financing.

11. Recognized Campus Groups: Final Report

The Chair referred to Professor Farrar's memorandum of May 23, 2003, and its attachment. He invited questions. There were none.

12. Operating Plans: Ancillaries – 30-35 Charles Street, Revision to Capital Priorities

The Chair noted Professor Farrar's memorandum of May 23, 2003, outlining a change to a proposed expenditure in the annual operating plan for the ancillary at 30-35 Charles Street. There were no questions.

13. Report of the Assessors

Professor Farrar commented briefly on his Report #6. He mentioned in particular his regrets at the departure of Ms. Anita Benedict, Co-ordinator of First Nations House. He recognized her tremendous contribution to the University and knew she would be greatly missed.

Professor Venter had circulated a memorandum at the beginning of the meeting, informing the Board that the University College Residence Capital Project was proceeding through governance for approval of a change in scope. The change did not relate to matters that were the responsibility of the University Affairs Board, so it was brought for information. It would be considered at a special meeting of the Planning and Budget Committee on June 17 and at a special meeting of the Academic Board on June 23, to proceed to Governing Council on June 26.

14. Other Business

The Chair took the opportunity to express his thanks to Ms. Hanif for her assistance as Vice-Chair, to the members who were leaving the Board this year for their contributions, to the assessors for their advice and support, and to members of the Secretariat for their assistance through the year.

Professor Farrar, speaking on behalf of the Board, expressed sincere appreciation to the Chair for his strong leadership and to the unique support he brought to the administration in his deep understanding of governance and his knowledge of students' issues. He presented Dr. Nestor with a gift and the Board showed its appreciation for the Chair by applause.

ON MOTION DULY MOVED AND SECONDED, THE BOARD CONTINUED THE MEETING *IN CAMERA*.

15. Report of the Striking Committee:**(a) Appointment of Co-opted Members for 2003-04**

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the following be co-opted members of the Board for the year July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004:

Professional and Administrative

Mr. Jason Hunter

Ms. Rebecca Spagnolo

15. Report of the Striking Committee: (cont'd)

(a) Appointment of Co-opted Members for 2003-04 (cont'd)

Ms. Maggy Stepanian

Alumni

Mr. John Badowski

Students

Ms. Lisa Aldridge

Mr. Christopher Collins

Mr. Sean Mullin

Ms. Parissa Safai

(b) Discipline Appeals Board: Appointment of Members

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the following be appointed to the Discipline Appeals Board for the period July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004:

Professor Sherwin Desser

Ms. Françoise Ko

Mr. Sean Mullin

Mr. Colm Murphy

Ms. Parissa Safai

Ms. Cheryl Shook

The meeting adjourned at 7:10 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

June 10, 2003