



TO: Executive Committee

SPONSOR: David Naylor, President

DATE: October 15, 2007 for October 17, 2007

AGENDA ITEM: 9

ITEM IDENTIFICATION: Office of the University Ombudsperson

- (a) **Report of the Interim University Ombudsperson (July 1, 2006 – June 30, 2007), and Administrative Response** (for inclusion on the agenda of the Governing Council)
- (b) **Interim Report of the University Ombudsperson (28 September 2007), and Administrative Response** (for information)

JURISDICTIONAL INFORMATION:

Section 5.1 of the Terms of Reference of the Office of the University Ombudsperson (approved on December 14, 2006) state that the Ombudsperson shall make a written annual report to the Governing Council, and through it to the University community, as well as such other special reports as may be required from time to time by the Governing Council. Section 5.2 states that, in addition, the Ombudsperson shall, early in the governance cycle, provide an interim written report to the Executive Committee of the Governing Council.

BACKGROUND:

In 1994, the Executive Committee decided that Council should receive the Report and the administration's response simultaneously so that members of the Governing Council could comment on particular issues with full knowledge of both the Ombudsperson's and the administration's response.

PREVIOUS ACTION TAKEN:

The Governing Council received the Report of the University Ombudsperson, 2005-06, with the Administrative Response, at its meeting of December 14, 2006.

HIGHLIGHTS:

n/a

FINANCIAL AND/OR PLANNING IMPLICATIONS:

n/a

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Report of the Interim University Ombudsperson (July 1, 2006 – June 30, 2007) and Administrative Response be placed on the agenda of the Governing Council meeting of October 30, 2007.

REPORT OF THE
INTERIM
UNIVERSITY OMBUDSPERSON

FOR THE PERIOD

JULY 1, 2006 – JUNE 30, 2007

Ian McDonald
October 2007

Report of the Interim University Ombudsperson for the period July 1, 2006 - June 30, 2007

I. Background to the report

Ms. Mary Ward, who had served as University Ombudsperson since 1998, left the position at the end of October 2006. I was appointed Interim Ombudsperson by Governing Council at its meeting of November 2, 2006 effective from that date and continuing until a University Ombudsperson had been appointed and taken office. In view of my other University commitments I assumed the position on a part-time basis.

At its meeting of June 25, 2007 Governing Council appointed Professor Emeritus Joan Foley as University Ombudsperson effective July 1, 2007 and continuing to June 30, 2010. My term was thus completed at the end of June 2007.

Ms. Ward prepared her annual report to Governing Council for the period July 1, 2005 to June 30, 2006 in October 2006. It was received at Council's meeting of December 14, 2006, at which time also the separate *Report of the Committee to Review the Office of the University Ombudsperson 2006* was approved. Ms. Ward's report, although it covered statistically only the 2005-2006 academic year, reflected broadly on her experience over her entire tenure in office.

For the sake of completeness this report presents statistics for the whole period July 1, 2006 to June 30, 2007 but includes commentary only for the period of my tenure as Interim Ombudsperson from November 2006 to June 2007.

II. Statistics and highlights

There was a surprising and unforeseen drop in the number of cases dealt with between 2005-2006 and 2006-2007: from 297 to 209, the lowest number since record keeping began in 1975-76. Of the latter, 92 arose in the period July 1 to October 31 (during Ms. Ward's tenure) and 117 from November 1 to June 30. Inevitably some cases opened by Ms. Ward remained active at the time I assumed the position, just as others opened by me had not been resolved when my term ended and were left to be dealt with by Professor Foley.

Whether this dramatic reduction in the number of cases is in some way reflective of the change in incumbency or of my own appointment being part-time is impossible to say. There may well be other factors about which one may only speculate. Certainly it stands in contrast to the year-over-year caseload comparison between 2004-2005 and 2005-2006, when the numbers were virtually identical (301 vs. 297).

In this regard, it may be worth repeating a paragraph from the Administrative Response to the Report of the University Ombudsperson: 2005-2006:

It is pleasing to see a further small decline in the total number of cases dealt with by the Office of the Ombudsperson with a significant decline in non-academic issues brought to her attention. This evolution is noteworthy. It can support the argument that everything is working better than in the past; or, it might equally reflect a dynamic situation in the context of an increased number of equity officers working at the University of Toronto. It is entirely possible, and in fact this is suggested by the Ombudsperson, that individuals who in the past might have seen the Ombudsperson's Office as their only option, are now able to have issues effectively addressed by other University offices.

Nevertheless, the reduction in *caseload* ought not necessarily to be equated with a commensurate reduction in *workload*. Although many cases can be (and were) resolved relatively quickly, a small number were exceedingly complex and entailed several lengthy meetings with the principals and others involved in a given case, as well as a great deal of "behind-the-scenes" work.

All of the above notwithstanding, the question may still be asked: do we really need an Ombudsperson? In an institution with some 70,000 students and almost 12,000 faculty and staff, the statistics on the number of clients served by the Ombudsperson's office may appear so small as to be trivial. However, my unequivocal answer to this question is yes. In essence, my reasons are these:

1. There is a small but extremely important group of clients who have genuinely "fallen between the cracks". They have exhausted every apparent possibility in finding the help and answers they need, and out of a sense of institutional fairness they deserve to have their needs met. Although it may never be possible totally to satisfy every individual with a complaint or concern, in many cases the Office of the Ombudsperson can and does truly help. Having the Ombuds option conforms entirely to the spirit of making the University the best possible place to study, to research and to work.
2. The sorts of issues raised in cases dealt with by the Office of the Ombudsperson spark the kinds of questions about policy that the Office is now firmly committed to review and make recommendations on. The Ombudsperson is able to take an impartial and over-arching view of the entire institution; it is hard to imagine a better perspective on issues that need to be addressed.
3. The Office of the Ombudsperson provides a valuable form of risk management, in that it is often able to work out a solution to a problem that keeps an individual from pursuing an issue in the press, the courts or other public forums. This is surely to everyone's advantage.

III. Caseload by constituency

Disparities in absolute numbers notwithstanding, breakdown of the caseload by constituency has remained remarkably consistent over the last five years, with just over half of the cases dealt with in 2006-2007 involving undergraduate students. More precisely, the 2006-2007 caseload breaks down as follows:

Undergraduate students:	117	(55%)
Full time:	107	(92%)
Part time:	10	(8%)
Graduate students:	47	(22%)
Academic staff:	10	(5%)
Administrative staff:	19	(5%)
Others*:	27	(13%)

* includes former students and employees, medical residents, parents of students and similar constituencies, not of all which have the right to the services of the Ombudsperson.

IV. Caseload by campus

The Ombudsperson is specifically charged with ensuring that his/her services are widely advertised on all three campuses and with being available to meet with clients on any campus. Although facilities for the Ombudsperson's use are available on each campus, overwhelmingly clients chose to meet with me in the Ombudsperson's office at 222 College Street. I did meet with clients on a few occasions at Scarborough, but although willing to do so I did not visit the Mississauga campus at any point. For various reasons I met with several University faculty or staff who were not clients but were involved in a given case at other locations on campus than the College Street office. In 2006-2007 the caseload breakdown by campus was this:

St. George:	80%
UTM:	11%
UTSC:	9%

V. Student caseload by issue (undergraduate and graduate)

(195 cases closed at June 30, 2007. Note: totals exceed 100% because in many cases there was more than a single issue in one case)

Policy interpretation/advice:	51	(26%)
Academic concerns (e.g. teaching):	40	(21%)
Academic policy/procedure: (e.g. petition denials)	24	(12%)
Administrative policy/procedure: (e.g. bureaucracy issues)	23	(12%)
Grading dispute/concern:	13	(6%)

Fees/financial aid:	17	(9%)
Interpersonal dispute: (e.g. supervision)	10	(5%)
Harassment or discrimination:	10	(5%)
Code violations:	13	(6%)
Other (e.g. housing, libraries)	33	(17%)

About 45% of student issues could broadly be characterized as “academic”. These include complaints about teaching, grading, violation of academic policies and accusations of academic misconduct. Many of these I regard as valid, especially cases in which allegations of cheating or violations of the Grading Practices Policy were dealt with inappropriately. In spite of the wide dissemination of the Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters and the continuing efforts on the part of the Provost’s Office to identify and correct flaws in its administration, it is clear that some faculty continue to act outside established processes.

It was surprising to me to see how many students brought an issue to the Ombudsperson’s office because they were reluctant – and sometimes afraid – to bring a matter to the attention of a department chair or dean, or even of their own instructor. Although as a matter of general policy complainants are expected to pursue every other possible avenue before coming to the Ombudsperson, on some occasions it was clear to me that in the mind of a student, for a variety of reasons, there really was no other option than to approach our office. In these cases it was often possible by encouragement and advice to enable a client to resolve his or her issue without any direct intervention from me.

In a few instances a student (or a group of students with a similar concern) was unreasonably being denied access to a senior member of faculty or staff who had the power to deal with a problem. A single phone call from me to the relevant party usually opened a closed door.

A typical complaint was that a student felt that he or she had been “misled” by an instructor or an administrator with respect to administrative or academic requirements or by unannounced or unexpected program changes.

In some instances, students who were technically in violation of a requirement were allowed to continue in violation with the apparent knowledge of those who might have corrected it, sometimes with serious consequences for the student.

Holding students strictly responsible for compliance with some technical requirements may on occasion appear arbitrary and unfair, especially as strict application of some policies can result in severe academic and/or financial harm to the student. More consistency may be needed in the way in which some policies and regulations are enforced.

On the other hand, some issues related to inconsistent application or enforcement of requirements proved to be rooted in the failure of the authority involved to be acquainted with (or even to understand) relevant policy or regulations within his or her own Division. This includes, for example, lack of knowledge about permitted weighting and timing of assignments or tests.

Of course, there is no reason to suppose that on the basis of the small number of valid complaints in this vein there is widespread failure in this regard across the University. However, I dealt with enough cases of this kind to suspect that there are many areas in which we could do better.

A continuing, and perhaps inevitable, concern are issues arising from graduate student supervision. Of particular interest in this area are issues regarding the roles of the parties and a need to better safeguard academic and financial interests of students when supervision arrangements change or need to be reexamined. In spite of substantial intervention, I was unable to arrive at resolutions satisfactory to all parties in these matters.

Several cases involved tuition and incidental fees, refunds and issues respecting registration status. It is (reasonable) University policy that refunds outside the published schedules are given only where there is evidence of error on the part of the University, just as students are responsible for their own registration.

Although policies in these areas are generally sound and create a reasonable distribution of responsibility between the University and students, close examination of technical requirements reveals areas with potential for unfairness. For brevity, I will set out one example: in at least some divisions, students who wish to drop from full time to part time status must do so within the period in which a 100% refund of fees would be available or they remain liable for full-time incidental fees.

Another situation where technical adherence to practice impacts students involves the issuing of off-cycle diplomas. Students who have completed degree requirements sometimes need diplomas before scheduled convocation. In exceptional cases such requirements can be accommodated, but not easily enough. This situation calls for a principled approach to such needs as and when they arise. I will make a recommendation on this matter (see below).

V. Academic and administrative staff issues

Cases involving academic and administrative staff were less numerous and generally less serious than those involving students. These included payroll issues, difficulty obtaining answers to questions about University processes and conflicts between staff. For the most part, these cases involved process rather than policy.

Some of these were resolved, sometimes after the passage of an exceedingly long time, and one difficult matter was ongoing when my term ended.

There may be a need for administrators to be better informed about policies and processes and to be more transparent and helpful when dealing with staff who need process or administrative assistance or answers to questions.

However, it is clear that in cases where there is demonstrable, if sometimes inevitable, error on the part of the University every effort must be made to make amends. From my (admittedly brief) experience as Interim Ombudsperson, I would suggest that this is not always the case.

In her report for 2005-2006 Ms. Ward referred to the Ombudsperson's Office "as a confidential and impartial consultation resource." My understanding of this is that the Office was from time to time approached for advice on how to handle a given situation. At no point in my own tenure of office was I approached for this reason.

VI. Ombudsperson's Involvement

In spite of my holding the Ombudspersons' position only part time, I am happy to say that the service standards of the office were well maintained, thanks largely to the excellent work of the office assistant, Linda Collins. In over 90% of cases the time from an approach to the office to initial response was within 48 hours. In 67% of cases the time to a first meeting with the Ombudsperson was a week or less. In over 80% of cases the time to resolution was within thirty days; in a quarter of cases this was within a single day. I would reiterate Ms. Ward's assertion that feedback received, both direct and indirect, makes clear that the opportunity the Office provides for clients to be heard and understood is very much appreciated.

Of course, the degree of direct involvement of the Ombudsperson depends on many factors, including the willingness of clients to have the Ombudsperson contact other members of the University about an issue. In fact, one of the frustrations of the job is the unwillingness of some clients to let a matter be brought forward – even in the strictest confidence - to individuals or departments which could most likely resolve a problem.

Just under 40% of the cases in 2006-2007 were resolved after an individual consultation; the others entailed mediation or facilitation of some sort, multiple contacts with individuals or departments or a meeting with an administrator to discuss trends related to his or her area of responsibility. I can say that I received excellent cooperation from virtually every member of the University whom I approached with an issue; many expressed gratitude that I had drawn a situation or policy to their attention. Very often my contacts welcomed my suggestions as to how an issue might be resolved and readily followed up on them. From my experience in this Office which requires numerous contacts in a very wide variety of divisions, units and departments, there is an obvious

determination virtually everywhere in the University to serve students, faculty and staff to the highest standard.

VII. Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act

Early in my tenure I met with the University's FIPPA Director, who made a number of helpful recommendations about case handling in the Office. As a result, some small modifications in practice were made. However, some related matters remain to be addressed, among them the length of time and conditions under which the Office's files are kept.

VIII. Report of the Committee on the Office of the University Ombudsperson

As noted above, the *Report of the Committee on the Office of the University Ombudsperson* was approved by Governing Council in December 2006. The Report made a number of recommendations, the implementation of which I felt lay outside the mandate of an interim and part time appointment. However, to the extent that it was possible to apply the spirit of those recommendations in my work, I did so.

IX. Recommendations

Given the brief nature of my tenure as Interim Ombudsperson I do not feel that I can reasonably make extensive recommendations on policy issues. Certainly, as I have observed in one way or another above, the University must maintain and secure its commitment to excellent service to its members in every constituency. Happily, this is the norm. However, on the strength of my experience I would say that it is equally clear that at least in some parts of the University there is room for improvement in two areas in particular:

- strong, effective and user-friendly communication of policies, regulations and procedures, especially as they apply to students. Often it was only with great difficulty that I was able to find information that students in particular need to know. Some Divisions are much better than others in this regard; best practice ought to be sought out and emulated.
- appropriate response when there is University error. In any large institution mistakes will be made; what matters is the spirit and also the timeliness of correcting and as far as possible making up for them. It was disappointing to see in a few instances a grudging and defensive apology for something that could have been acknowledged more generously.

Apart from these two general observations, I do wish to make two specific recommendations:

1. that the University explore the possibility of issuing diplomas at times other than the annual Convocations in cases where a student has completed the requirements for a degree and needs the diploma as proof of it;
2. that the University examine its policies governing the assessment and refund of incidental fees, particularly as they apply to part time students.

X. Conclusion

It was a privilege to have been able to serve as Interim Ombudsperson and I am honoured to have been given the opportunity. The significant drop in the number of cases in 2006-2007 ought not, in my view, to diminish the importance of the Office of the Ombudsperson or the regard in which it is held. Having served in this position, I am more convinced than ever both that the Office and its independence are of great importance to the University and that the University is well served by it.

It remains to thank all those with whom I had the pleasure of working while I held this office, not least the Secretary of Governing Council and my assistant in the Office of the Ombudsperson, Ms. Linda Collins.

Respectfully submitted,

Professor Ian McDonald
Interim Ombudsperson 2006-2007

Interim Report of the University Ombudsperson
28 September 2007

I assumed the role of University Ombudsperson on a part-time basis on July 1, 2007. I want to thank my predecessor, Professor Ian McDonald, my secretary, Linda Collins, and the Secretary of Governing Council, Louis Charpentier, for their support and advice in introducing me to the role and ensuring a smooth transition. This interim report to the Executive Committee is submitted as provided in Section 5.2 of the new terms of reference for the Ombudsperson approved in December 2006.

The first three months have been occupied in large part with casework, entailing contacts with some 60 complainants from the University community. This caseload is generally commensurate with that over the last decade. Consistent with past experience, the large majority have been from undergraduate and graduate students. Cases vary enormously in their complexity and in the amount of time required to address them. Among the more time-consuming complaints I have dealt with is one that proceeded to a formal review, and on which a report is currently in preparation. This complaint concerns the matter of the withdrawal of permission for the Hart House gun clubs to keep or use firearms on the University campus.

Dealing directly with a variety of complaints has helped me to appreciate more fully the dimensions of the role of the Office, and has provided the opportunity to learn a great deal about the administrative arrangements in a number of academic units with which my past experience has been more at the policy and planning level. I have been very positively impressed by the way in which both staff and senior administrators have responded to my requests for information and assistance.

Consistent with the recommendation of the Review Committee, a job description for a full-time case officer has been developed in consultation with the Secretary of Governing Council and Human Resources, and it is expected that the position will be posted shortly. After reflection on my experience with the work of the Office, I have written the description in the expectation that the current part-time secretarial position will be retained. The current budget is able to support this staffing configuration. My top priority in the immediate future will be to fill the new position and to introduce the new person to the role. The new case officer should be able to see a substantial number of cases through to resolution, and be able to exercise judgement in identifying those that might require my personal attention.

The Office currently remains at the Fields Institute building on College Street. To accommodate a request by the Institute for more space to house its academic activities, a possible new location for the Ombudsperson's Office has been identified, and it is hoped to effect a move before the end of the current academic year. We look forward to working with the Office of the Assistant Vice-President Campus and Facilities Planning to design the new space. It seems likely that the move will not be possible until some time after the new case officer is appointed. In the interim, some changes to the use of current space will be necessary, but expenditures will be kept to a minimum.

The reorganization of the office will enable me to pay more attention to other recommendations of the Review, some of which were concerned with visibility and access.

At this stage, meetings have been requested with senior administrators at both UTM and UTSC, and these will be followed up by requests to meet with student organizations on both campuses. I have met with the group of Equity Officers to exchange information about roles and responsibilities, and to introduce myself to those I have not already met. I will be seeking meetings with other key persons and groups throughout the University.

An unexpected development has been independent approaches from two professional programs on the St. George Campus to discuss the creation of a local Ombudsperson position to serve students in the respective programs. In one case, the position was actually established a year ago, and the incumbent was seeking advice on formalizing the terms of reference and in performing the role. While it is obviously desirable that there be local mechanisms in place to address and resolve problems experienced by these students, it is by no means clear that the usual criteria for the role of Ombudsperson can be fully satisfied at the local level. I plan to continue discussions with both of these programs to clarify the role that is wanted locally, and to ensure that their students are aware of the services that can be provided by the University Ombudsperson. I expect these discussions to be very helpful in developing a communications plan for the Office that can be applied on a wider front.

In recommending the restructuring of the Office, the Review Committee sought to provide for greater attention on the part of the Ombudsperson to identifying possible deficiencies in the University's policies and procedures. I will certainly be focussing more on such matters over the coming months. Some potential issues have been suggested by the cases I have dealt with to date, and others have arisen in the course of contacts with other individuals or groups. I have also noted that in her report of October 2006, Ombudsperson Mary Ward identified two outstanding issues that were the subject of recommendations she had made in earlier reports, viz., one relating to the *Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters*, and the other relating to the *Safety Abroad Policy*. Following up on this comment, I have so far had a preliminary discussion with the Vice-Provost, Academic about the former policy. I have also had occasion to note that the *Framework to Address Allegations of Research Misconduct* introduced in November 2006 provides an improved process that may offer advantages in dealing with certain matters that may in the past have been pursued directly through the procedures established in the *Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters*. I will be seeking information about the status of the development of the *Safety Abroad Policy*.

I look forward to implementing the reorganization of the Office and to completing the transition to the new terms of reference over the coming months. It is an honour to have the opportunity to serve the University in this capacity.

Joan E. Foley

Administrative Response to the “Report of the Interim University Ombudsperson, July 1, 2006 – June 30, 2007” and to the “Interim Report of the University Ombudsperson, September 28, 2007”

October 2007

Overview

This administrative response is made in accordance with the Governing Council’s direction that the University Administration respond to the Ombudsperson’s Annual Report.

Background

Professor Ian McDonald was appointed Interim University Ombudsperson in November 2006, stepping in to fill the vacancy left by the departure of Ms Mary Ward, the University’s Ombudsperson since 1998. Professor Emeritus Joan Foley was appointed University Ombudsperson effective July 1, 2007. Accordingly, the Administration has before it both the “Report of the Interim University Ombudsperson” prepared by Professor McDonald, covering the period from July 1, 2006 to June 30, 2007, and the “Interim Report of the University Ombudsperson” prepared by Professor Emeritus Joan Foley consistent with section 5.2 of the new Terms of Reference for the Office of the University Ombudsperson.

Response

The Administration offers sincere thanks to Professor McDonald for his continued dedication to the University and for his exceptional commitment to the role of Interim University Ombudsperson. The Report clearly reflects Professor McDonald’s characteristic professionalism and integrity.

The Administration welcomes Professor Emeritus Foley to the role of University Ombudsperson and thanks her for her first three months of service and for her ongoing role in leading the reorganization of the Office.

The Reports before the Administration provide a summary of the work of the Office of the Ombudsperson over the past year and three months. This Response provides an update on the University’s response to several of the issues raised in these Reports.

Statistics

Professor McDonald, the Interim Ombudsperson, reports that the number of cases dealt with in 2006-2007 by the Office of the Ombudsperson declined by roughly 30% from 2005-2006. Professor McDonald notes that the current number of cases handled by the Office “may appear so small as to be trivial” in a community of over 80,000 (less than a third of 1% of the community). While we are encouraged that effective policies, processes and personnel are contributing to a positive trend in caseload, the Administration also firmly agrees both with Professor McDonald’s assessment of the

value, usefulness and importance of the Office of the Ombudsperson and with his reasons for this assessment.

Communications

In his report, the Interim Ombudsperson makes a specific recommendation around the need for strong, effective and user-friendly communication of policies, regulations and procedures, especially as they apply to students. In September 2005, the Student Web presence available on the home page was redesigned to provide students with essential information and resources related both to academic and non-academic issues across the University. Included in this redesign was the placement of policies, procedures and guidelines in accessible locations on the Web (http://www.students.utoronto.ca/The_Basics/Rights_and_Rules.htm).

Furthermore, the Students site will also provide on-line versions of the print publication series entitled "Student Rights & Responsibilities". This series presently includes the two titles "Academic Integrity" and "Your Grades"; another piece entitled "Student Conduct" is also soon to be added.

In print, in addition to the "Student Rights & Responsibilities" series, the University also provides "Intuit: A Student Guide to the University of Toronto"

While these initiatives speak to the steady progress being made, the Administration also supports the importance of Professor McDonald's recommendation and reaffirms its commitment to continuing to enhance communications.

Academic Integrity

The Report also makes specific reference to student issues in relation to the *Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters* (1995). An administrative review of the *Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters*, was undertaken by the Office of the Vice-President and Provost during 2006-07. This involved wide consultation with divisions across the university to identify recurring issues with the administration of the Code, including timeliness, consistency and other process concerns. The next stage of the process is now underway. It is concerned with addressing the issues raised through the divisional consultation process and includes the development of best practice guidelines and additional training for those responsible for the administration of the Code at divisional levels.

The Administration believes firmly in proactive promotion of the institutional value of academic integrity. Part of the current consultation involves discussion of the need for integrating education and discussion of academic integrity issues as a fundamental and intrinsic part of our academic programs at all levels of the institution. The Office of Teaching Advancement hosts both an on-campus resource centre and an Academic Integrity web site providing an overview of academic integrity issues and resources for faculty, teaching assistants and students. The OTA also runs a variety of workshops and information sessions on a range of topics related to the promotion of academic integrity. Faculty, departments, and divisions are encouraged to reference this site on course outlines, in departmental handbooks and web sites, and in any other materials developed for students and faculty (<http://www.utoronto.ca/academicintegrity>). These efforts are augmented by a wide variety of educational initiatives within the divisions that

are designed specifically to raise awareness of the importance of academic integrity and to help promote the divisions' commitment to prevention.

The Office of the Vice-President and Provost organizes a number of workshops each year to assist those responsible for administering academic policies including the *Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters*, the *Code of Student Conduct*, and the *Policy on Academic Appeals within Divisions*. The content and format of the workshops are specifically targeted to different groups including faculty and staff, divisional officers, dean's designates and tribunal members. The Council on Student Experience has also provided a broader forum to raise awareness and disseminate best practices across the institution, particularly in relation to academic integrity issues.

Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy

The Office of the Vice-President and Provost has worked closely with the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Office (FIPP) to develop best practices for student-faculty interactions that occur in the course of normal university business. These were developed in light of the U of T's *Policy on Access to Student Academic Records*, the *Grading Practices Policy*, and the *Policy on Official Correspondence with Students*. The information may be found on the Provost's website:

<http://www.provost.utoronto.ca/policy/fippa.htm>

Safety Abroad Policy

The Ombudsperson's Interim Report refers to her predecessor's recommendation for the creation of a "Safety Abroad Policy." We reported previously that an initial draft of this policy had been produced by the International Student Exchange Office and that the Office of the Vice President Research had also conducted a review recommending amendments to the *Policy for Safety in Field Research* (1988). As a result of consultation on the draft policy and the recommendations from the review process, it was determined that a single overarching policy should be developed. This policy should address off-campus research and study activities whether domestic or international since many of the risk management, training and support issues were not limited to students studying abroad. A working group has been formed which is collating the necessary information and expert advice and will recommend a more general policy for off-campus activities as well as appropriate accompanying guidelines and templates. In addition, in order to address safety abroad issues, and as recommended by the Ombudsperson, detailed guidelines in the form of a Safety Abroad Manual have been developed by the Safety Abroad Office, are currently in use and are available on their website. These guidelines provide extensive assistance and best practices relating to risk management, planning, training and support for students studying abroad. Recommendations for a consolidated policy relating to off-campus activities are anticipated to be brought through governance during 2008.