

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL
REPORT 106 OF THE AGENDA COMMITTEE

May 22, 2003

To the Academic Board,
University of Toronto.

Your Committee reports that it held a meeting on Thursday, May 22, 2003, at 4 p.m. in the Falconer Room, Room 106, Simcoe Hall.

Present: Professor W. R. Cummins, Chair
Professor B. Corman
Professor S. Neuman, Vice-President and Provost
Professor A. Gotlieb
Professor E. Hillan
Mr. J. Hunter

Ms S. Girard, Secretary

Regrets: Professor P. Perron
Professor J. J. B. Smith
Professor C. Tuohy (on leave)

In attendance: Mr. E. Ohayon, member, Academic Board
Mr. C. Ramsaroop, member, Academic Board

1. Report of the Previous Meeting

The report of the previous meeting, Report Number 105 dated April 25, 2003, was approved.

2. Notices of Motion

- (a) THAT \$5,600,000 immediately be allocated to ensure accessibility to currently inaccessible University of Toronto facilities.

Mr. Ohayon distributed to members some documentation on this item including the material he had given to the Planning and Budget Committee when he had requested that a similar motion be discussed in May, 2000. At that time, he had asked that over \$4.0 million be allocated to accessibility projects. He said that the motion had not passed at that time. He believed that this issue had not been addressed since then. He pointed in particular to the admissions and awards building on Bloor Street which was inaccessible. He suggested that if accessibility was not improved, the University would not attract diverse faculty.

Professor Neuman responded that the University's budget was in a deficit position and to find another \$5.6 million would mean a further budget reduction of 1 %. She noted the presence of a rhetoric that the administration was doing nothing to address this issue. The rhetoric was false. The University did have problems with accessibility because of the age of its buildings. However, she noted that it was working to rectify problems where it could use some government funding and funds for renovations. Accessibility

2. Notices of Motion (cont'd)

was not only physical. Professor Neuman said that funding had been allocated to projects to help those with learning disabilities.

A member indicated that he would prefer that the motion be given to the Board so that the members could decide on the motion. It was noted that the Standing Committee on Barrier Free Accessibility of the Accommodation and Facilities Directorate was required to report annually to the Planning and Budget Committee. The report would be tabled at the September meeting of the Planning and Budget Committee and this would be the appropriate opportunity to discuss this matter. The member agreed.

It was duly moved and seconded

THAT the notice of motion not be placed on the Board's agenda.

The motion was carried.

- (b) THAT the University create a task force to implement a University-wide strategy to improve employment equity.

Mr. Ramsaroop reported that he had spoken to the President and Professor Neuman about this matter after the May Board meeting. He believed that the Board should discuss strategies for improving employment equity.

Professor Neuman responded that equity issues were a major part of the academic planning paper which was being drafted. There would be wide consultation on the paper as well as an opportunity to discuss it through the governance process. It would be possible to have a concrete discussion of this issue at that time. The Chair also noted that a large portion of the Board's May meeting had been devoted to a discussion of the Employment Equity Report 2002.

A member suggested that a large body like the Board was not an appropriate arena for brainstorming. Any discussion of this issue would benefit from a discussion paper to focus comments.

Professor Neuman said that a task force would not work well in this area. She believed it was more efficacious to meet with individuals involved with recruitment and hiring and with search committees to discuss procedures and strategies for widening pools. What was needed was enablement and accountability. Her Office rigorously reviewed appointment documentation to ensure that proper procedures had been followed.

It was duly moved and seconded

THAT the notice of motion not be placed on the Board's agenda.

The motion was carried.

3. Academic Board Agenda – June 4, 2003

The members discussed the agenda for the June 4, 2003 meeting.

3. Academic Board Agenda – June 4, 2003 (cont'd)

It was noted that two other matters were raised at the Board. On the issue of professor “emerita”, Professor Neuman said that a proposal for a revised policy was being prepared. With respect to the member’s request for information on the costs of equity offices, an answer was being prepared and would be sent to the member.

Professor Neuman said that she would report on a new SSHRC fellowship program and on upcoming dean searches.

The Chair commented on the Report from the Academic Appeals Committee, referring to the minority position given in the decision and the wording of the decision. His comments would be relayed to Professor Goel and to the Judicial Affairs Officer, Mr. Holmes.

4. Date of the Next Meeting

The Chair reported that he had been asked by Professor Goel to call a special meeting of the Academic Board to consider policies for clinical faculty. Professor Neuman added that there would also be several capital project to consider arising from the recent announcement of SuperBuild Funds. It was suggested that the Planning and Budget Committee could hold a special meeting around June 18 and the Board on June 23. The Governing Council meeting was scheduled for June 26. A brief meeting of this Committee would also be necessary to review the agenda material.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Secretary
May 23, 2003
26453

Chair