

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL
REPORT NUMBER 118 OF
THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD

November 26, 2003

To the Governing Council,
University of Toronto.

Your Board reports that it met on Wednesday, November 26, 2003 at 5:00 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall with the following members present:

Mr. Muhammad Basil Ahmad (in the Chair)
Dr. Robert M. Bennett, Vice-Chair
Professor Robert J. Birgeneau, President
Professor David Farrar, Vice Provost,
Students
Ms. Catherine Riggall, Assistant Vice-
President, Facilities and Services
Ms. Lisa Aldridge
Ms. Murphy Browne
Mr. Christopher M. Collins
Dr. Shari Graham Fell
Mr. Mike Foderick
Ms. Margaret Hancock
Professor Bruce Kidd
Ms. Karen Lewis
Professor Michael Marrus
Mr. Sean Mullin
Dr. John P. Nestor
Ms. Parissa Safai
Ms. Rebecca Spagnolo
Dr. John Wedge

Regrets:

Mr. John Badowski
Mr. Jason Hunter
Ms. Maggy Stepanian

In Attendance:

Professor Angela Hildyard, Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity
Mr. Kelvin Andrews, Race Relations and Anti-Racism Initiative Officer
Mr. Jim Delaney, Associate Director of Student Affairs
Ms. Tina Doyle, Access*Ability* Services Coordinator, University of Toronto at
Scarborough (UTSC)
Mr. Ken Duncliffe, Director, Centre for Physical Education, Athletics and Recreation,
University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM)

Non-voting Members:

Ms. Susan Addario, Director of Student
Affairs
Mr. Louis R. Charpentier, Secretary of
the Governing Council
Professor Ian Orchard, Vice-President
and Principal, University of Toronto
at Mississauga
Ms. Marilyn Van Norman, Director of
Student Services
Professor Ron Venter, Vice-Provost,
Space and Facilities Planning
Professor John Youson, Interim Vice-
President and Principal, University
of Toronto at Scarborough

Office of the Governing Council:

Mrs. Beverley Stefureak, Secretary

In Attendance: (cont'd)

Ms. Kaye Francis, Family Care Office
Professor Connie Guberman, Status of Women Office
Mr. Dave Hamilton, Secretary of Finance, (UTM) Athletics Council
Ms. Janice Martin, Accessibility Services Coordinator, University of Toronto St. George Campus
Ms. Elizabeth Martin, AccessAbility Resource Centre Coordinator, UTM
Ms. Huda Mohammad, President (Interim) and Vice-President, UTM Athletic Council
Mr. Ashley Morton, President, Students' Administrative Council
Mr. Pardeep Nagra, former Diversity Relations Officer, UTM
Ms. Jan Nolan, Director of Faculty Renewal
Mr. Mark Overton, Dean of Students and Assistant Vice-Principal, UTM
Ms. Caroline Rabbat, Community Safety Coordinator
Ms. Rosie Parnass, Quality of Work Life Advisor and Special Assistant to the Vice-President Human Resources and Equity
Mr. Chris Ramsaroop, President, Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students (APUS)
Mr. Gengiz Seyhun, Vice-President, UTM, Students' Administrative Council (SAC)
Ms. Paddy Stamp, Sexual Harassment, Education, Counselling and Complaint Office
Ms. Jude Tate, Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgendered & Queer (LGBTQ) Coordinator of Resources and Programs

ALL ITEMS ARE REPORTED TO THE GOVERNING COUNCIL FOR INFORMATION.

1. Report of the Previous Meeting

Report Number 117 of October 28, 2003 was approved.

2. Reports of the Equity Issues Advisory Group

The Chair welcomed members of the Equity Issues Advisory Group (EIAG) and the Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity to the meeting, and invited President Birgeneau to give introductory comments.

Professor Birgeneau recalled that, during his interviews for the presidency, it had been a pleasure to discover that equity issues and resources were receiving serious and significant attention at the University of Toronto. These were important matters in the pursuit of excellence at a university and he enjoyed interaction with the members of the EIAG. He offered personal congratulations to each of them for the positive way in which they dealt with complicated issues to ensure a safe and open environment at the University. The President noted that the Governing Council had demonstrated its commitment to equity in adding equity to the title of Professor Angela Hildyard who was now Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity. Professor Hildyard would have overall responsibility for the University's equity initiatives and would be establishing a task force to review how the University might improve and build on the strengths already developed in equity services.

2.1 Community Safety

Ms. Rabbat presented her report, reviewing the overall responsibility of the Community Safety Coordinator. The case load had increased significantly over the past four years and she cited ways in which the Office was working to deal effectively with and reduce the number of cases. Ms. Rabbat reviewed the goals of the office for this year and responded to questions. One of the challenges continued to be community awareness of the services provided by the office and efforts were underway to improve that.

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

2.2 Diversity, University of Toronto at Mississauga

Mr. Nagra indicated that he was now working elsewhere in Peel Region but was happy to be here to speak to the report covering his final year in this portfolio. He added that Mr. Overton would respond to questions related to current or future endeavours.

Mr. Nagra presented his report and cited a particularly exciting development in diversity at UTM. Requests for faith accommodation for students had increased dramatically. The Registrar's Office had become effective in dealing with these positively, in many cases needing only to touch base with the Diversity Office. In his view, this was clear evidence of a break-through in creating an environment where students were comfortable in requesting accommodation and where the administration was supportive and knowledgeable in responding. Generally, the year had been positive and successful in putting a face on diversity on the campus of UTM, with only two of the priorities identified for the year still under consideration.

Mr. Nagra responded to questions about the self identification survey undertaken last year. About 1500, or 90%, of first-year students had responded to the anonymous survey which had been handed out in registration line-ups and dropped off following completion. By any measure, this was a highly successful return. A new format was under development, hopefully to be administered next year, and expanded for use at the other two campuses.

A member asked about plans for the office now that Mr. Nagra had moved to another position. Mr. Overton replied that the position has been reviewed and redrafted, a search was underway and he hoped that someone could be in place by mid-February.

2.3 Family Care

Ms. Francis commented briefly on her written report and then focused continuing remarks on two cases that were indicative of the range of matters in which the office was routinely involved. Looking to the future, she hoped that a better network for childcare could be developed. There had been success in developing flex arrangements for staff and faculty to provide for improved childcare. Budget concerns for the office were still a challenge. Ms. Francis responded to questions about services to the east and west campuses and the conditions under which international students could expect to register children in the public school system with no fees.

2.4 Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgendered & Queer (LGBTQ) Programs and Resources

Ms. Tate, speaking first as Convenor of the EIAG, recommended that the Convenor be invited to meet with the Board's Agenda Planning Group prior to this annual meeting to assist in the planning of the meeting and to explain the role of the offices. She presented her report, expressing thanks to members of the University community whose willingness to work cooperatively enabled her to do her job. It had been a difficult year, given the level of debate in Ontario and across Canada on same-sex marriage. But there had also been wonderful successes over the year.

There were questions and discussion on partnerships with support groups, progress on achieving social spaces and how allies and supporters could most effectively be engaged. With respect to social spaces, some partners had responded well, e.g. Hart House, and Student Affairs had worked hard to meet this challenge. There had been great hopes with the purchase of 89 Chestnut but the space there was not conducive to this need and was expensive.

2.5 Race Relations and Anti-Racism Initiatives

Mr. Andrews noted that his report was in much the same format as it had been in the past several years. The report was not intended to be exhaustive but to be representative of the main initiatives

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

2.5 Race Relations and Anti-Racism Initiatives (cont'd)

undertaken over the year. He highlighted the very successful Summer Mentorship program which had resulted in an increasing number of Black students admitted to and successfully graduating from the Faculty of Medicine. One thing missing from his report was the update on the Ethnocultural Academic Initiatives Fund which had provided seed money for a number of projects. The Fund was currently under review to make it more relevant to the University. He hoped next year to see the emergence of significant assistance under this Fund.

Several members applauded the excellent work that Mr. Andrews had done in developing a model that should be emulated in universities everywhere. The Dean of Graduate Studies noted that Mr. Andrews would be retiring next year and took the opportunity to thank him for his tremendous cooperation with the School over the years.

2.6 Sexual Harassment Education, Counselling and Complaints

Ms. Stamp presented highlights from her report noting that the use of various electronic media for harassment continued to escalate. She had requested assistance from this Board last year and had been pleased at the expertise that had been offered. With the rapid evolution in technology, she hoped that participation in finding solutions would again be forthcoming from members of the Board.

2.7 Status of Women

Professor Guberman reviewed her 2002-03 report, touching on the history of the office, its long-term goal, results of the 1999 review, and advances made toward meeting that goal during the past year. The goals for this year included hosting and coordinating events to celebrate the 120th anniversary of women being admitted as students to the University of Toronto, greater outreach to the east and west campuses and working in partnership with the offices and units involved in implementing objectives and strategies identified in the White Paper. In closing, Professor Guberman indicated that the data showing that women comprised over 50% of the student population in both undergraduate and graduate programs were encouraging. However, there was a long way to go since the data did not reveal the complications and challenges that some women faced in their day-to-day student life. She hoped that future reports would give some sense of that.

2.8 Accessibility:

2.8.1 AccessAbility Resource Centre, University of Toronto at Mississauga

Ms. Elizabeth Martin reviewed her report, speaking to funding sources, initiatives undertaken over the year, and the reporting structure. She was pleased with the progress that had been made toward examination accommodation during the past year and with the acquisition of assistive learning technology. Space and staffing concerns continued to be a challenge for which she hoped some resolution might be found this year.

2.8.2 AccessAbility Services, University of Toronto at Scarborough

Ms. Doyle provided highlights from her report and expressed her excitement at the manner in which University of Toronto at Scarborough had embraced accessibility. The need for the office in some areas had diminished as more and more divisions were taking the initiative in identifying the need for and providing accessibility services. This was important for students who often did not feel comfortable asking for help and responded well to supportive faculty and staff. There were still challenges but she looked forward to this year with the assurance of cooperation and the possibility of increased resources.

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

2.8 Accessibility: (cont'd)

2.8.3 Accessibility Services, University of Toronto, St. George

Ms. Janice Martin reported a number of important successes, one of which was the evidence that students now were choosing the University of Toronto because of its accessibility services. She applauded the growth in student leadership citing, in particular, the example set by the success of Students for Barrier-Free Access conference hosted recently by the University of Toronto. She gave examples of change toward a positive environment and what she hoped would be the future direction of the services offered by Accessibility Services, but noted that the need for more space was becoming critical.

Given that equity was a major issue in the current round of academic planning, a member asked if the Provost was aware of the funding, space and staffing needs in the accessibility services offices. He was assured that she was.

A member commended the accessibility coordinators for the remarkable progress that had been made in the past two years in the numbers of students registered in particular programs. This, in his view, was an obvious sign that their efforts were succeeding.

A member asked for the group's assessment of safety on campus. Noting that this was an issue that was high on the list of questions asked during student and faculty recruitment, she wondered how it would be answered. Ms. Rabbat responded that safety was contextual, and questions about a safe campus were largely based on perception and experience, as were the answers. Safety was usually defined as the absence of fear. Based on anecdotal surveys, the overall theme in talking with students and reported student experience, the campus was perceived usually to be very safe. Ms. Tate added that students regularly reported feeling unsafe about coming out to classmates, family members, or members of the University community but that seemed largely related to religion and family values.

Another member asked how students perceived their safety on campus compared to what they encountered when they graduated to working and living in the larger community. Ms. Stamp responded that reports back from individuals who had experience with her office indicated that, comparatively, they felt very well looked after while at University.

There was discussion about safety on campus compared to adjacent areas downtown, in Scarborough and in Mississauga. Ms. Rabbat responded that crime reports statistics were lower on campus than for any of the urban or suburban areas adjacent to the three campuses. She believed that the personal safety initiatives had helped to keep the campuses safe. Further, she noted that where there were concerns for personal safety these usually involved interpersonal relationships among members of the University community.

The Chair thanked the members of the Equity Issues Advisory Group for their participation and their reports and, speaking on behalf of the Board, looked forward to meeting with them again next year.

3. Compulsory Non-Academic Incidental Fees: Request from Student Services, University of Toronto at Mississauga - Wellness Centre (Student Levy)

Professor Orchard reviewed his memorandum of November 21, 2003 outlining the recommendation for an increase in the compulsory non-academic incidental student fees supporting the University of Toronto at Mississauga Centre for Physical Education, Recreation and Athletics. He thanked the agenda planning group of the Board for allowing this item to be brought forward to what was normally a dedicated meeting to receive equity reports. This was a

3. Compulsory Non-Academic Incidental Fees: Request from Student Services, University of Toronto at Mississauga - Wellness Centre (Student Levy) (cont'd)

time sensitive matter and it required consideration today so that a recommendation to execute the project could be taken to Business Board in January.

In the presentation of his report, Professor Orchard emphasized that this Centre was a vital component of UTM's expansion. He acknowledged the leadership of Mr. Duncliffe, Mr. Overton and the student leaders at UTM without whom the project could not have gone forward. Two of those leaders were present and he introduced Mr. Dave Hamilton, Secretary of Finance for the UTM Athletic Council and Ms. Huda Mohammad, President (Interim) and Vice-President of UTM Athletic Council. Professor Orchard recalled the broad community consultation underlying this proposal and the various town hall meetings and meetings with student leaders over the past eighteen months since the initial approval for a \$25 fee had been given by this Board.

The Chair recognized Mr. Seyhun. Mr. Seyhun indicated that he had been part of the decision-making process behind this recommendation and he had concerns about it. Prior to this meeting, he had been approached by students at UTM who saw a lack of democracy on the campus of UTM. In their view, this proposal represented too high a fee for students. There had been pressure on student members of the Quality of Student Services Committee (QSS) to accept this proposal. The alternative proposed by students – that this question should go to a referendum – had been discouraged. Closing, he summarized his main concerns as the impediment to accessibility that this high fee would create and what, in his view, was a lack of democracy in the process leading to this recommendation.

Mr. Morton had requested permission to speak and was invited to do so. He began by indicating that he was not qualified to speak on behalf of the UTM students and the concerns expressed by the previous speaker. However, he had general issues with the funding of projects such as this. The capped contribution was related to a 50% match and clearly it was not. The \$16 million mortgage which would be financed by student fees would incur significant interest over its term, adding to the burden being placed on students. Finally, generally he had serious concerns about the principle of expecting students to make up for what was an unacceptable level of government funding.

The Chair recognized Mr. Ramsaroop who, speaking on behalf of the Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students (APUS), indicated that the process whereby this recommendation reached the Board and the proposal itself were unacceptable to APUS. In his view, this proposal had not undergone a democratic process, and he urged the Board to refer the matter back so that a referendum could be held to democratically determine the wishes of the students.

Professor Orchard responded, noting that QSS was the democratically elected body charged with the responsibility, under the *Memorandum of Agreement between the University of Toronto, the Students' Administrative Council, the Graduate Students' Union and the Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students for a Long-Term Protocol on the Increase or Introduction of Compulsory Non-Tuition Related Fees*, of assessing students services' fees at UTM. Recommendations routinely came to the Board after they had been considered by QSS. Professor Orchard recalled that at least three years of consultation and meetings with student leaders, as well as many town hall meetings, had preceded this recommendation. QSS had been the final part of the process and their support of the recommendation, according to the process established in the *Protocol* for consideration of students fees, was the representative voice of the students.

3. Compulsory Non-Academic Incidental Fees: Request from Student Services, University of Toronto at Mississauga - Wellness Centre (Student Levy) (cont'd)

With respect to the inequity of financial contribution, while it was true that the \$16 million of funding would be through a mortgage supported by students, the \$8.5 million contributed by UTM and the central budget would be by way of borrowed money as well. Thus, interest expenses would be proportionately shared by the students and the University. Further, Professor Orchard hoped that fund-raising would be successful in providing support for two more phases in which an ice rink and a field house would be added to the facilities at UTM.

A member asked for clarification of previous action on this project. Professor Orchard replied that the Board in April 2002 had approved a \$25 student fee to support the Centre. That amount now needed to be increased to \$150 to support both the carrying costs of the mortgage and the annual operating costs. The project planning report had been considered by Academic Board and approved by the Governing Council in June 2003, subject to the financing arrangements.

A member asked about the makeup of QSS and the level of support this project had received at that body. Professor Orchard indicated that there were six students on QSS and the *Protocol* required that a majority of the students had to vote in favour of a proposal for it to be approved. The student vote on this proposal had been four in favour and two opposed. One of the six was a representative of the Erindale Part-time Undergraduate Students (EPUS) and the others were representative of the full-time student body. Four administrative staff completed the membership. However, what was important relative to this proposal was that two-thirds of the student membership voted in favour of the proposal.

To a further question, Professor Orchard said that the term of the mortgage would be determined by the Vice-President, Business Affairs. The business plan had been modeled on a 25-year term but the actual mortgage term could be anywhere from 20 to 25 years.

A member expressed serious concerns with the process underlying this proposal as well as with the short notice that members of the Board had been given to review this recommendation. He had received it yesterday and had not had the time to consult appropriately with students at UTM. In his view, given the significant amount of this increase and the uncertainty of broad student support for the proposal, there should have been a referendum. He believed that a referendum in this instance would have failed and, therefore, he was uneasy with the process that allowed four students on QSS to make such a far-reaching decision.

A member spoke in support of the proposal. In this political economy, there was clearly no other choice for funding a student facility that was urgently needed at UTM. The proposal had reached the Board through a legitimate process; there had been widespread communication in the division and the recommendation had come forward with the support of the body at UTM specifically elected to review such proposals. In his view, if you believed in representative democracy, then you had to accept that this process had been democratic.

A member noted that student experience was a very important part of acquiring a postsecondary education. This capital project was critical to making students' experience at UTM positive and one that would they would carry throughout their life. More importantly, this was about process. QSS had approved this proposal under a process agreed to by the student governments and the Board had an obligation to respect the outcome of that process.

3. **Compulsory Non-Academic Incidental Fees: Request from Student Services, University of Toronto at Mississauga - Wellness Centre (Student Levy) (cont'd)**

A member stated that, in her view, the protocol under which this proposal had come forward was problematic. It was particularly so in allowing a very small group of students to decide this question. The fee increase here was significant and elected students should not have the responsibility to make a decision once fees go beyond a certain level. On the other hand, referenda were expensive. She believed there had to be a more effective way found to allow for a broadly based student decision in cases such as this. Having said that, she agreed that the recommendation had come forward respectful of the process that was currently in place and that the Board had no choice but to accept it.

Professor Venter was invited to speak. He indicated that the Office of Space and Facilities Planning had been involved in this project for about the past eighteen months. Early on in the process, it had been clear that there was tremendous enthusiasm and significant support among UTM students for this project. While he was not particularly supportive of charging students fees for capital projects, this needed to be put into context. Students at UTM were very supportive and the facility was urgently needed.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

An increase to the fee of the UTM Centre for Physical Education, Recreation and Athletics for the construction and operating costs for a new physical education, recreation, athletics and wellness facility subject to the following terms and conditions:

THAT beginning in the fall of 2004 until and including the session in which the final mortgage payment is made, each full-time student will be charged \$150 according to the *Policy on Compulsory Non-Academic Incidental Fees* (adjusted for part-time students as called for in the policy), with the fees increasing annually pursuant to the *Memorandum of Agreement for the Long-Term Protocol on the Increase or Introduction of Compulsory Non-tuition Related Fees*.

4. **Next Meeting – Tuesday, January 20, 2004**

The Chair reminded members that the next meeting of the Board was scheduled for Tuesday January 20, 2004 at 5:00 pm.

The meeting adjourned at 7:30 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

December 8, 2003