

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO  
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL  
**REPORT NUMBER 110 OF**  
**THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD**

**November 5, 2002**

To the Governing Council,  
University of Toronto.

Your Board reports that it met on Tuesday, November 5, 2002 at 3:00 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, with the following members present:

Dr. John P. Nestor (In the Chair)  
Ms Durrè Hanif, Vice-Chair  
Professor Robert Birgeneau, President  
Dr. Sheldon Levy, Interim Vice-Provost,  
Students and Vice-President,  
Government and Institutional Relations  
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 Françoise Ko  
Ms. Karen Lewis  
Mr. Sean Mullin  
Mr. Colm Murphy  
Ms. Parissa Safai  
Ms Cheryl Shook  
Ms Maggy Stepanian

Dr. John Wedge  
Ms. Geeta Yadav

**Non-voting Members:**

Ms. Susan Addario, Director of Student Affairs  
Mr. John Bisanti, Chief Capital Projects  
Officer  
Professor Vivek Goel, Vice-Provost, Faculty  
Ms. Marilyn Van Norman, Director of  
Student Services  
Professor Ron Venter, Vice-Provost,  
Space and Facilities Planning

**Office of the Governing Council:**

Ms. Cristina Oke  
Mrs. Beverley Stefureak, Secretary

**Regrets:**

Dr. Shari Graham Fell  
Professor Michael Marrus  
Mr. Janakan Satkunasingham

**In Attendance:**

Professor Shirley Neuman, Vice-President and Provost, member of Governing Council  
Professor Angela Hildyard, Vice-President, Human Resources  
Mr. Kelvin Andrews, Race Relations and Anti-Racism Initiatives Officer  
Mr. Jim Delaney, Assistant Director, Student Affairs  
Ms. Tina Doyle, AccessAbility Services Coordinator, University of Toronto at Scarborough  
Dr. Beata Fitzpatrick, Director of the President's Office and Assistant Vice-President  
Ms. Kaye Francis, Family Care Coordinator  
Ms. Connie Guberman, Status of Women Officer  
Ms. Myra Lefkowitz, Community Safety Coordinator  
Ms. Janice Martin, Accessibility Services Coordinator  
Ms. Elisabeth Martin, AccessAbility Resource Centre Coordinator, University of Toronto at  
Mississauga  
Mr. Pardeep Nagra, Diversity Relations Officer, University of Toronto at Mississauga

**In Attendance** (cont'd)

Ms. Jan Nolan, Director, Faculty Renewal

Ms. Rosie Parnass, Quality of Work Life Advisor and Special Assistant to the Vice-President, Office of the Vice-President - Human Resources

Ms. José Sigouin, Research Information Analyst

Ms. Paddy Stamp, Sexual Harassment Officer

Ms. Jude Tate, Coordinator of LGBTQ Resources and Programs

ALL ITEMS ARE REPORTED FOR INFORMATION.

**1. Reports of the Equity Issues Advisory Group**

The Chair welcomed members of the Equity Issues Advisory Group, Professor Birgeneau and Professor Neuman to this meeting at which the annual reports of the Group were received by the Board. He invited Professor Birgeneau to make introductory remarks.

Professor Birgeneau thanked the Chair for organizing the meeting. He recalled that, during the six months between his appointment and arriving in the position, he had met with a number of individuals and groups on campus, including the Equity Issues Advisory Group. He had been very impressed with the talented and committed individuals in the Group. The University of Toronto was a richly diverse community in which the wide spectrum of opinion naturally led to some tensions. He saw this group as playing a critical role as advocates of the under-represented. Continuing, he said that the concordance of equity and excellence was the under-lying philosophy of the University's leadership. The Provost and the Vice-President, Human Resources had been specially charged with moving the University forward in its equity objectives and the EIAG played an essential role in this initiative.

The Chair thanked the President. He noted that members had had ample time to read the equity reports prior to the meeting. Each office had been requested to make a short presentation that would compliment their written report, focusing on a key issue or two, or a case study. Each presentation would be followed by a brief question period.

The Chair invited Ms. Myra Lefkowitz, **Community Safety Coordinator**, to address the Board. She said a key issue in her portfolio was the balancing of objectives, given the increase in the requests for direct assistance. Sometimes public education and policy development initiatives were sidelined by situations requiring immediate intervention. A second key concern in discourse about community safety was to identify the threats to and maintain the focus on personal safety issues related to the physical environment during this time of rapid capital expansion. Responses to safety issues varied depending on the individuals involved and their location. Her service extended to all three campuses, though at UTM and UTSC her role was one of consultant. She was called for advice on issues but was not a part of the "fabric" of the campuses. An important goal for the upcoming year would be to work with members of all three campuses to expand the services that would ensure personal safety for staff, students and faculty.

A member indicated that the consensus among students was that equity initiatives were progressing well at the University of Toronto and he congratulated members of the Group for their commitment. His question related to what kind of educational campaign would be undertaken to address online stalking. Ms. Lefkowitz replied that some initial activities had been initiated to educate the community with respect to criminal stalking and discussions were now underway about serious concerns with e-mail harassment. It appeared obvious that this would be a difficult and lasting problem.

## 1. Reports of the Equity Issues Advisory Group (cont'd)

A member asked how statistics on sexual harassment in this report compared with those in the report of the Sexual Harassment Officer. Ms. Lefkowitz responded that there were a number of different points at which sexual assaults might be reported. Because of issues of confidentiality, there was no reliable way to determine what overlap there might be in the statistics. She knew of at least two cases recorded in both reports. Though a single reporting point would give a more accurate reflection of the number of incidents, Ms. Lefkowitz said it was important that victims felt comfortable about reporting incidents. The more options they had to do so, the greater the likelihood that an incident would be reported.

Dr. Levy added that the Critical Incident Response Team had done an excellent job over the past year in responding quickly to threats to personal safety. By and large, the group worked behind the scenes and the community was not aware of the tremendous support they offered. He thanked Ms. Lefkowitz who in turn recognized the critical role played by the many volunteers, primarily from the staff, who agreed to be on call 24-hours a day for critical response in addition to their full-time staff responsibilities. She saw the model as a very good one and acknowledged Mr. Brian Marshall, Manager, Human Resources and the campus unions for the part they played in its success.

Mr. Pardeep Nagra, **Diversity Relations Officer, UTM**, began his report by noting that this was the fourth year of operation for the office. A number of good recommendations had emerged out of a program review that had been done at the end of the initial three years of operation. One of the recommendations identified the importance of good data. This would be a challenge because diversity statistics could be gathered only where individuals self-identified. A survey had been completed, with more than 1,000 responses, that, once analyzed, would inform what policies and programs were needed. Another recommendation addressed the need for greater relations with student organizations. Student leadership had been most cooperative and he was using opportunities to work with student groups to have students deliver programs and act as ambassadors for the program.

A member noted that UTM's childcare services had been replaced, for financial reasons, with daycare bursaries. Had this been a positive change? Mr. Nagra indicated that the transition had been carried out carefully in consultation with potential users. Though he was not sure of the details since the bursary program was administered through registration, it was his impression that overall this was a more effective way of assisting students with childcare needs. There were some drawbacks, notably that the facilities were off-campus, but overall feedback had been positive.

Ms. Kaye Francis, Coordinator of the **Family Care Office and Faculty Relocation Service**, spoke briefly about the re-organization in that department. One of the key issues facing the Office was affordable childcare and the limitation on toddler spaces. As well, there was an urgent need for after hours and part-time childcare. The Office assisted parents with workshops on parenting, identifying sources of financial assistance, budgeting and organization of family events. Workshops had doubled since last year and a program of student focus groups had identified what could improve the service. She concluded by indicating that a key objective for this year was finalizing an additional staff position and expanding the potential for using outside expertise.

A member commended the Office for what, in her view, had been phenomenal workshops. In response to a question from the Chair, Ms. Francis thought the increased use of the office was due to greater awareness of the services it offered.

Ms. Jude Tate, Coordinator of **LGBTQ Resources and Programs**, began by expressing her appreciation to all those in the University community that had assisted in meeting the objectives of

### 1. Reports of the Equity Issues Advisory Group (cont'd)

the office. The highlight of the year was a Thanksgiving dinner hosted by the office to welcome those who might not have had a family environment in which to celebrate the holiday. A key accomplishment had been the establishment of a reporting page on the website whereon anyone could notify the office of any kind of harassment, with assurance of anonymity except in situations where safety was an issue. The UTSC, in a great demonstration of leadership, had reinitiated positive space with all administrative staff involved in a two-hour seminar. Ms. Tate reiterated key issues that had been outlined in her annual report and highlighted objectives and concerns related to the capability of the office to respond to increased enrolment.

A member asked if there were plans to collaborate with the students in identifying social space to replace The Hangar. Ms. Tate indicated that the office had been working with the administration to generally identify social spaces for students. This had proven difficult. Most was currently now associated with a particular College. However, she was working with those responsible for the tremendous capital expansion underway and was hopeful that when the new buildings were complete the situation relative to lack of student social space would be resolved. In the long-term, the greater challenges were limitations related to minors and liquor licensing.

Mr. Kelvin Andrews, **Race Relations and Anti-Racism Initiatives Officer**, was heartened by the continuing progress in race relations on campus. Some had been impressive, most notably curriculum changes in New College, the Faculty of Law and the Faculty of Medicine. A key objective for him was to strengthen the summer mentorship program. While it had been successful, it had had some difficulties throughout which the University had maintained its commitment with moral support from his office and financial support from the Office of the Vice-Provost, Students. He hoped in the coming year to resolve the anomalous situation wherein students in Medicine were given a stipend and other students in the program were not. Stipends were not usually a significant issue but in this case many of the participants were in socio-economic positions that demanded they find employment in the summer. Since they could not participate in the mentoring program and be employed elsewhere, it was important that this issue be addressed and Mr. Andrews intended to bring together the major stakeholders to determine how.

In response to a question, Mr. Andrews indicated that progress has fluctuated but in a fairly consistent upward trend. There was now a greater awareness of diversity within the community. Overall, he had a positive impression of progress.

A member asked how involved the office was in achieving the President's goal of hiring with equity in mind. Mr. Andrews replied that the office seized on every opportunity to make views known and had found willing listeners in the senior administration. He believed he had had significant input and he expected this to continue.

Ms. Paddy Stamp, **Sexual Harassment Officer**, identified her biggest challenge as maintaining an appropriate balance between addressing complaints and delivering education. Both were equally important as education had to reflect current case issues. The key issue she wished to address was the growing concern that many of the complaints now had an electronic component. Electronic communication provided an opportunity to anonymously harass in a variety of ways and from destinations outside the control of current University policies. She hoped in the coming year to work with information technology specialists on campus to address this issue that was developing into a problem that went far beyond the portfolio of this office.

## 1. Reports of the Equity Issues Advisory Group (cont'd)

A member asked if other universities and institutions had developed guidelines. Ms. Stamp said they had. Dr. Levy asked if a workshop could be designed for administrators to help them better understand the issue of electronic harassment. Ms. Stamp agreed.

A member asked if the *Code of Student Conduct* was an adequate instrument under which to address misbehaviour in this area. In response, Ms. Stamp noted that the *Code* required someone to make a complaint and this presupposed faith that something could be done. Also, the *Code* governed only students at the University of Toronto. There was a need for some way of addressing conduct originating elsewhere.

A member asked what could be done to encourage individuals to report incidents of harassment. Ms. Stamp thought increasing people's awareness of avenues of remedy would be useful. However, generally speaking, a complaint-based strategy was not, in her view, sufficient to address this issue.

Ms. José Sigouin, presenting on behalf of the **Status of Women Office**, noted that, as a result of the interest and lobbying efforts of a member of the Board last year, the office complement had been essentially restored. As a result, there had been a significant difference in the office's ability to expand a mentorship program for women who felt disenfranchised and to assume additional responsibility for collaborative workshops. She expressed appreciation to colleagues in the office, without whose competence, depth of knowledge and efficiency the office would not have had a successful year.

A member asked if there was any plan to expand the "take our children to work" plan. Ms. Sigouin hoped the program could be expanded, noting that it achieved several goals including awareness on the part of young people of the importance of post-secondary education.

Ms. Elizabeth Martin, **AccessAbility Resource Centre Coordinator** at the UTM, as the first speaker of the three accessibility services, noted that, though each campus had its own office and varying procedures, the coordinators endeavoured to work together. Their goal was to ensure consistency in certain areas so students who were registered at one campus were able to take courses and use accessibility services at another. Ms. Martin reviewed the highlights of the program at UTM over the past year and indicated that she would continue to focus on key issues for the next year as well as addressing physical architectural, informational, communicational, attitudinal, technological and policy barriers on campus. She spoke briefly about the Principal's Advisory Committee on Access Issues Disabilities. She closed by saying that the Office would continue to promote inclusive practices at UTM in whatever avenue available to do so.

Ms. Tina Doyle, **AccessAbility Services Coordinator** at UTSC, said that service over the past year had been primarily related to the provision of academic accommodation. In collaboration with other offices, she had been able to achieve a couple of projects including cognitive behaviour therapy for students with difficulties and outreach to the University community in support of teaching and learning for diversity, including a tremendously successful national conference for faculty and service providers. The ongoing challenge for the office was adequate levels of funding. An important seminar scheduled for the past year could not be implemented and she hoped this could be managed in the upcoming year. As well, the guidelines for accommodating persons with disabilities needed to be updated to be more inclusive.

Ms. Janice Martin, **Accessibility Services Coordinator**, showed a short video to demonstrate the range of services offered by the University to address a wide range of disabilities among the

**1. Reports of the Equity Issues Advisory Group (cont'd)**

students. She stressed the unique needs of each individual and the importance of recognizing that there was no overall answer to ensuring that students with disabilities had the same experience as other students. Barriers to accessibility continued to be a challenge. She noted that under the *Ontarians with Disabilities Act* the University would be required to file annual accessibility plans. With continued commitment on the part of students and administration, she saw this as an opportune time for the University to take the lead in working toward a fully accessible environment.

A member noted that things as simple as the doorknobs in Simcoe Hall were a tremendous challenge for persons with disabilities and, in his view, this barrier should be rectified soon.

A member enquired about the access planning group. Invited to respond, Professor Hildyard indicated that she was responsible for the University response and she would begin with the creation of an advisory group. She hoped to include individuals from the staff and student groups who had first-hand experience with accessibility. Her objective was to have the first meeting before the end of the calendar year.

Dr. Levy noted that all of the equity offices faced huge increases in demand, for example, for students with special needs in examinations. Efforts were underway to project what those would be but it appeared the need was growing faster than the services to fulfill that need.

The Chair thanked all members of the Equity Issues Advisory Group for excellent reports and presentations. He thought the format of the meeting was appropriate but any comments or feedback would be most welcome, either to him or to the Secretary.

**2. Next Meeting**

The Chair reminded members that the next regularly scheduled meeting would be at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, November 19, 2002 in the Council Chamber.

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

---

Secretary

---

Chair

November 15, 2002