

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL
REPORT NUMBER 104 OF
THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD

January 22, 2002

To the Governing Council,
University of Toronto.

Your Board reports that it held a meeting on Tuesday, January 22, 2002, at 5:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers, at which the following were present:

Dr. John P. Nestor (In the Chair)
Dr. Shari Graham Fell, Vice-Chair
Dr. Thomas Simpson, Vice-Chair,
Governing Council
Professor Ian Orchard, Vice-Provost,
Students
Miss Janice Oliver, Vice-President,
Operations and Services
Mr. Muhammad Basil Ahmad
Dr. Robert M. Bennett
Professor Marion Bogo
Ms. Aisling Burke
Mr. Jacob Glick
Ms. Margaret Hancock
Professor Bruce Kidd
Ms. Karen Lewis
Mr. Paul McCann
Professor Ian R. McDonald
Ms. Gail Paech
Mr. Kashif S. Pirzada

Ms. Parissa Safai
Ms. Wendy Swinton
Dr. John Wedge

Non-voting Members:

Ms. Susan Addario, Director of Student
Affairs
Mr. Louis Charpentier, Secretary of the
Governing Council
Professor Vivek Goel, Vice-Provost,
Faculty
Professor Ron Venter, Vice-Provost,
Space and Facilities Planning

Office of the Governing Council:

Ms. Susan Girard
Mrs. Beverley Stefureak, Secretary

Regrets:

Ms. Geeta Yadav

In Attendance:

Mr. David Melville, Member, Governing Council and Treasurer, Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students
Mr. Paul Carson, Executive Assistant to the Dean of Physical Education and Health
Mr. Jim Delaney, Assistant Director, Student Affairs
Ms. Agata Durkalec, University Affairs Commissioner, Students' Administrative Council
Mr. Andrew Lefoley, Student, Woodsworth College
Ms. Joan Griffin, Manager, Public Affairs, Faculty of Physical Education and Health
Mr. Don Guthrie, University Counsel
Ms. Liz Hoffman, Assistant Dean, Programs, Faculty of Physical Education and Health
Ms. Andrea Howard, President, Residence Council, New College
Ms. Jennifer Jones, Director, Communications, Faculty of Physical Education and Health
Ms. Rae Johnson, Co-ordinator, Student Crisis Response Program
Mr. Paul Kendall, Deputy University Affairs Commissioner, Students' Administrative Council
Professor Helen Lenskyj, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education/University of Toronto
Mr. Ashley Morton, Student, Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering
Ms. Cristina Oke, Chief Returning Officer, Governing Council Elections

In Attendance: (cont'd)

Ms. Mary Anne Pilskalnietis, Special Assistant to the Dean, Faculty of Physical Education and Health

Mr. Terry Rubinstein, Manager, Administrative Services, Faculty of Physical Education and Health

Ms. Emily Sadowski, President, Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students

Mr. Jorge Sousa, President, Graduate Students' Union.

ITEM 3 IS RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL.

1. Reports of the Previous Meetings

Reports Number 102 of November 5, 2001 and Number 103 of November 26, 2001 were approved.

2. Business Arising from the Reports of the Previous Meetings

The Chair invited the Secretary of Governing Council to report on follow-up to the November 5 meeting with respect to possible participation by the students in the Transitional Year Program and the Academic Bridging Program in Governing Council elections. Mr. Charpentier informed the Board that he had met with Professor Rona Abramovitch and would be meeting with her and the TYP class on January 23. He had also met with Professor Mariel O'Neill-Karch, Principal of Woodsworth College, where the full class in the Academic Bridging Program would be surveyed during the week of January 28. He expected to know the results of the survey within three weeks, after which he hoped a report and recommendation would go forward to the Elections Committee.

3. Report of the Special Committee to Review the *Code of Student Conduct*

Noting the responsibility of the Board for non-academic discipline, the Chair recalled that the University Affairs Board had appointed a Special Committee of its members in December 2000 to review the *Code of Student Conduct* to determine if there was need for revision and, if so, to make recommendations. He invited the Co-Chair, Mr. Muhammad Basil Ahmad, to introduce the Report (attached hereto as Appendix "A") on behalf of the Special Committee and Professor Ian Orchard to comment on behalf of administration.

Mr. Ahmad asked that the "Action Sought" be amended to reflect that the Report would be received but that the recommendations therein and the revised Code would be recommended for approval. He then reviewed briefly the reasons why the Committee had been established, the membership and an overview of the recommendations. In the view of the Committee, the following revisions to the *Code* were significant in responding to concerns that had been expressed by students and divisional heads:

- inclusion of a provision to allow divisional heads to apply interim conditions or interim measures where that may be necessary;
- the creation of a centralized pool of investigating and hearing officers;
- strengthened guidelines for the maintenance and use of records;
- the addition of "sex and sexual orientation" as the basis for vexatious conduct;

3. Report of the Special Committee to Review the *Code of Student Conduct* (cont'd)

- clarification of responsibility where jurisdictions intersect or overlap relative to this *Code* and others;
- addition of time limits to the conclusion of a case; and
- addition of a paragraph to the Preface that speaks to behaviour related to the use of computers and information technology, and the use or misuse of alcohol.

Mr. Ahmad thanked members of the Committee, the Office of Student Affairs and the Office of the Governing Council for the work that had produced a report which he was pleased to support.

Professor Orchard congratulated the Co-Chairs and members of the Committee on an outstanding report. The Committee had been thorough in its process and he appreciated the efforts they had undertaken to be inclusive by reaching out to the University community for written and oral input, and by extending deadlines for comment to allow for extensive participation. The Report had come forward with recommendations that were appropriate and logically argued. He agreed with the recommendations and he was very pleased to support a recommendation that the Report be approved by the Governing Council.

Professor Orchard noted that some of the recommendations did not speak directly to revisions to the *Code*. The administrative response to these was outlined in his memorandum of January 22, 2002 (attached hereto as Appendix "B") which had been placed on the table. He undertook to ensure follow-up on these recommendations.

Professor Orchard again commended the Committee for the consultative way in which it had accomplished its task. The Report had been presented to Principals and Deans and feedback from that group was positive. The University counsel had reviewed the final draft and provided his comment. Professor Orchard believed that what had emerged was a revised *Code* that provided greater protection to all community members, as well as more fairness to students who were charged under the *Code*. He reiterated that the administration was fully supportive of the Report and its recommendations and closed with expressing thanks to the Offices of Student Affairs and the Governing Council for their assistance to the Committee.

The Chair said that three non-members had requested permission to speak to the Board, and he would recognize these individuals now.

Mr. Jorge Sousa, President of the Graduate Students' Union (GSU), said he would not ask Board members to vote for or against approval of the Report of the Special Committee. He applauded the work of the Committee and the spirit of the review but, in his view, the recommendations fell short of protecting the students who are charged. He was particularly concerned about Recommendation 21 which provided for recording a suspension on a student's transcript. This was punitive and had not maintained what, in his view, should be a separation between non-academic and academic sanctions. Further, there should be concern that this recommendation gave latitude to the Vice-President and Provost in deciding how long the suspension should be recorded. Finally, he recognized the arguments for a *Code* but he could not support it in its present form.

3. Report of the Special Committee to Review the *Code of Student Conduct* (cont'd)

Mr. Paul Kendall, Deputy University Affairs Commissioner of the Students' Administrative Council (SAC), focused his concerns on what, in his view, were elements of unfairness to a student who had been charged. In particular, he hoped amendments could be made which would place time limitations within which a student could be charged; that there could be a mechanism to protect a student against "double jeopardy"; and, that the *Code* could be rewritten to apply universally to students, staff and faculty. He recommended that the *Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters* be similarly reviewed and that the review committee include representatives of the three student governments. He hoped Board members would amend the proposed motion to refer the item back for further consideration.

Ms. Andrea Howard, President of the Residence Council at New College, said that part of her role was to work closely with members of the administration to ensure fair enforcement of the residence regulations and the safety of all students. She had had two major concerns in the past and both of these had been effectively addressed in the recommendations of this Report.

First, Ms. Howard was pleased to see the addition of interim measures and interim conditions to the *Code*. This would be particularly helpful in the residence environment where it was sometimes necessary for residence staff to act immediately to separate individuals or defuse a situation that might be dangerous or compromising. This proposed change was, in her view, very important to improved safety of the residence community. Further, the manner in which the recommendation had been formulated allowed that immediate action without prejudice or assumption of guilt. This was good, in her view.

Secondly, Ms. Howard noted that, in the time since she had been actively involved in the administration of a residence, she had learned a lot about offences involving information technology (IT). She applauded the recommendations with respect to computing and information technology -- in particular, the exclusion of bandwidth issues. There was a need to resolve the difference between two views of IT: one that encouraged a student's use of information technology in the broadest sense as part of his/her larger life experience and the second that saw it as limited to academic use. She anticipated that this contradiction would be addressed by the reviews called for within this Report. Closing, Ms. Howard urged the Board to support the Report and the recommendations as they appeared before them.

A member asked if the Committee believed that the questions raised by SAC had been addressed. Mr. Ahmad and Ms. Addario responded. Mr. Ahmad indicated that the matter of double jeopardy and multiple jurisdiction had been discussed extensively in the Committee. Ms. Addario expanded, saying that the Committee had discussed both double jeopardy and the matter of multiple jurisdiction at length. The Committee believed that, in situations of serious misconduct, notwithstanding possible criminal proceedings it could be important for the University to lay charges under the *Code* to meet its obligation to resolve quickly matters that were deemed important to community safety. The Committee believed that there was ample protection in the *Code* to ensure fairness of process in the unlikely event that a single occurrence, involving multiple offenses, were subject to sanction under the *Code* and under another University code or policy.

3. Report of the Special Committee to Review the *Code of Student Conduct* (cont'd)

With respect to the other concerns raised by SAC, Ms. Addario said that this *Code* only applied to students because other members of the University – faculty and staff – were in a different relationship with the University and were subject to a number of varying agreements. For some, standards for their behaviour were articulated in collective agreements; for others, standards were set in written policy or memoranda.

A member asked about the rights of students to legal representation. Ms. Addario responded that this had been discussed by the Committee. Proceedings under the *Code* were administrative in nature and it was the intent to use divisional representatives as officers. Students were advised that it was appropriate to seek help from Downtown Legal Services (DLS) and from the Ombudsperson. Furthering this line of questioning, the member asked if there had been thought given to financial assistance for students with respect to legal advice. Mr. Ahmad responded that the relationship between DLS and the students was not within the jurisdiction of the Special Committee. He believed that there may be a need for the student organizations, who provided some of the funding to DLS, to discuss priorities with DLS.

A member congratulated the Committee on what, in his view, was a significant step forward in remedying difficulties with the current *Code*. He had been struck by the wide gap between the presentations by the student organizations who saw the *Code* applied capriciously and the student representative from New College in whose experience it was applied legitimately. Was there anything implied in the revised *Code* that would stifle legitimate protest?

Professor Orchard said that there was not. He confessed to being confounded by continued references to misuse of the *Code*. In fact, the yearly reports on the application of the *Code* confirmed that there were only a very small number of cases investigated annually and an even smaller number that went to a hearing. There had been absolutely no evidence of capricious application.

In further response to whether the section on interim measures could have a chilling effect on legitimate dissent, Professor Orchard did not think so. He recalled that this section was added, at the request of students, to allow for immediate action in the event of a serious and threatening incident, and that almost all complaints of the nature foreseen here had been laid by students against students. He believed that the revised *Code* provided for improved safety for students and a fairer process for students against whom a complaint was made.

In response to a question about recording a suspension on the student's transcript for up to five years and how that figure had been determined, Mr. Ahmad recalled that five years was the length of time allowed in the *Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters* and the Committee believed it was fair to be consistent with that policy. There was further discussion about why a non-academic sanction would be recorded on an academic transcript. A member of the Board who had also been a member of the Committee responded. The Committee had believed that, since the transcript of a suspended student would reflect a significant interruption in academic progress, it was important that the document also was clear on the reason for the interruption. It was also noted that suspension or expulsion was contemplated only in very serious circumstances and occurred rarely.

3. Report of the Special Committee to Review the *Code of Student Conduct* (cont'd)

Returning to the matter of multiple jurisdiction, a member asked how evidence would be handled and, in particular, if a conviction in one jurisdiction could be used as evidence in the other.

At the invitation of the Chair, Mr. Guthrie responded. He explained that an example of multiple jurisdiction in the University context would occur when a student was charged under different policies. Proof of conviction in one jurisdiction would not be adequate to convict in the other. Evidence would have to be adduced again. Referring to the earlier question of double jeopardy, Mr. Guthrie explained that there was no issue of double jeopardy when a student was charged under the *Code* and concurrently charged under the criminal charge for the same incident. Double jeopardy occurred only when someone was charged twice for the same offense under the same law. In this example, one charge was laid under a policy of the University and the other under the laws of the state. Interests of the University and the state were quite different – where interests were different, there could be no claim of double jeopardy.

A member asked if there was an appeal process within the University against a decision by the Provost to record a suspension on a transcript for a certain amount of time. At the request of the Chair, Mr. Guthrie replied that the decision could be appealed to the President of the University as the senior officer.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the Report of the Special Committee (attached hereto as Appendix “A”) to Review the *Code of Student Conduct* be received, and

THAT the recommendations contained therein, and the revised *Code of Student Conduct* attached to the Report as Appendix 2 be approved.

4. Faculty of Physical Education and Health

4.1 Operating Plan for Proposed Varsity Centre for Field and Ice Sports

The Chair said that before a referendum for a new or an increased non-academic incidental fee could proceed, 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* required that the University Affairs Board should give provisional approval to the operating plan and the operating budget for the expenditure of the fees that would be raised in the event that the student population gave approval, through a referendum, to levying that fee. That was the limited role of the Board.

The Chair invited Professor Ian Orchard to introduce this item. Referring to his memorandum of January 18, 2002, Professor Orchard said that the capital project envisaged for the north end of the campus had evolved out of a long and exhaustive consultative process led by the Dean of Physical Health and Education. The Council of Athletics and Recreation, the Council of the Faculty of Physical Education and

4.1 Operating Plan for Proposed Varsity Centre for Field and Ice Sports (cont'd)

Education and the Council on Student Services (COSS) had debated the proposal for the capital project and a proposed student levy to help fund the project. The first two had endorsed the proposal and the levy. While the members of COSS were supportive of the project they had difficulty supporting the levy. The increased fee required either the support of COSS or the support of a majority of students in a referendum. Thus, the proposed levy would be submitted to a referendum. As required by the *Protocol* before a referendum could proceed, the Faculty was requesting provisional approval of the operating plan and operating budget for the expenditure of the fee that was contemplated.

Professor Orchard drew attention to the highlights at the bottom of page two of his memorandum which outlined the dramatic difference the proposed project would make to the availability and quality of facilities for students and members of the community. He also reviewed briefly the memoranda from Professor Kidd and Ms. Addario, which had been placed on the table, and which illustrated the large student representation on the governing bodies for the new facility.

The Chair invited Professor Kidd to comment on the proposal. Professor Kidd said he was very excited about bringing forward the Executive Summary of this proposal for a wonderful new student centre. He thought the facility would be an attractive northern gateway to the campus, that it would be both accessible and environmentally sustainable, and that it would dramatically increase the opportunities that the Faculty could provide to students across the University. He thanked the hundreds of students, faculty and staff who had assisted in developing the vision for creating a leading-edge facility for students on very scarce land.

Professor Venter was asked to comment and added his endorsement to what Professors Orchard and Kidd had described. From his perspective, this student facility was the centerpiece of a substantial project to be located on the northern campus. This was the first of three elements, the other two being surrounding residences and a parking facility. He thought this would benefit students in particular, and the whole community in general.

The Chair recognized the first of seven individuals who had asked to speak to this item and reminded speakers to focus on the question before the Board, which was approval of the operating plan and operating budget and not the proposal for a referendum.

Mr. David Melville, member of the Governing Council, circulated a four-page document addressing the question of the proposed referendum. He disagreed with any implication that COSS wanted a referendum. He thought the money proposed for a referendum could be better used in lobbying for government funds or in other ways which would more directly benefit students. In his view, the athletic fee was already too high and there was no need for another athletic facility. He thought construction costs should not be borne by students and he resented the attempt to confuse this levy with housing issues.

Ms. Emily Sadowski, President of the Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students, informed the Board that APUS was opposed to the levy. Students should not be paying for buildings. APUS was against the referendum and against the project

4.1 Operating Plan for Proposed Varsity Centre for Field and Ice Sports (cont'd)

plans. Who said that the University was in need of another athletic facility? Why was this not being funded by SuperBuild or other government funding? In her view, input on this project had been restricted and there needed to be a complete review of student services to determine exactly what were the needs of students.

Mr. Sousa allowed that the operating plan was not bad and that its presentation was consistent with others that had come forward. However, he believed that a new vision was needed and that there had been problems with the process that led to this proposal. He questioned why plans were continuing for a referendum when COSS had voted against the project and student leaders were united in their opposition. In his view the *Protocol* had already been violated. He had serious concerns with the manner in which the levy had been set and thought the financial plan represented a "best estimate". He was appalled that the Faculty had \$200,000 set aside for expenses related to a referendum and thought discussions to this point had been in bad faith. He urged members to table the operating plan and encouraged the Faculty to engage students as stakeholders in future discussions.

Ms. Agata Durkalec, University Affairs Commissioner, SAC, had concerns about the operating plan from the perspective that it did not seem to address who would be in charge of the facility. This was purported to be a student-centred, student-oriented project for which students were being asked to put up two-thirds of the capital cost. That, she thought, should correlate to a ratio of two-thirds students in the management body. The primary concern of SAC was that students would have an operational voice proportionately equal to the capital cost they would be asked to assume.

Professor Helen Lenskyj fully supported the previous speakers. She thought the project confused needs and priorities with "wants", and that it was insensitive, during this time of crisis in fees, to ask struggling students to pay a levy when their priorities should be food, shelter and educational costs. She understood why a "state-of-the-art" facility might be a legitimate "want" but suggested that a more modest plan could obviate the need for a levy. The connection between residences and the athletic facility was, in her view, a false one. Further, the sports that would be served by this new facility suggested to her a backward step with respect to equity.

Mr. Andrew Lefoley informed the Board that he was a full-time student, supporting himself, with significant OSAP debt. The proposed levy was a significant amount to him and he would miss the money. But he thought the proposed new facility would be worth the sacrifice. He confirmed that this proposal came about following a very comprehensive and exhaustive consultative process. In his view, it was only fair that the question now be put to the students and he wondered why so many student leaders were concerned about proceeding with this ultimate test of whether students wanted the facility or not. He recalled that students had refused corporate sponsors, that applications to SuperBuild has been turned down and that other avenues of government funding had been denied. If this facility were to be realized, funding would need to come from the students. He was fully supportive of this facility, as was everyone to whom he spoke. He urged Board members to approve the operating plan

and operating budget, thus allowing the student body, as a whole, to democratically express its view on the acceptability of a levy.

4.1 Operating Plan for Proposed Varsity Centre for Field and Ice Sports (cont'd)

Mr. Ashley Morton spoke of his keen interest in intramural sports and his view of the benefit derived by students from intramurals. Recently, usage of the current athletics facilities had increased markedly. The proposed facility would be of particular benefit to intramurals who were suffering from lack of space. Admittedly, he would rather see the money come from somewhere or someone else, but the reality was that the project would not happen if it was not paid for by the students. All students to whom he had spoken had been in support of the project and, in his view, it would be tragic not to have a referendum to decide the question.

The Chair reminded members of the Board that their role today was not related to approving a referendum, but rather was limited to considering the operating plan and operating budget as presented in the Executive Summary attached to Professor Orchard's memorandum.

A member had been observing the progress of plans for this sector of the campus since 1999. This was a good plan and there could be no doubt that the facility was needed. However, he believed governance issues had not been addressed in the operating plan. In all of the background documentation, including what had been placed on the table, there seemed to be no clear indication of how the student body at large had input into the Committee to Allocate Student Activity Space (CASAS) or Council of Athletics and Recreation (CAR). He wondered why the Hart House model could not be used. He thought the consultative process was incomplete and, without some assurance of further study into appropriate input by students on a representative basis, he would not be able to support the proposal.

Several other members recalled being unsupportive of an earlier proposal for redevelopment of this site. However, they thought this plan was superb. The proposed facility was user-friendly and would be a magnificent gateway to the northern entrance of the campus. This was a good proposal, the facility was needed, it would be an immense benefit to the students, and they were happy to support it.

Another member spoke eloquently of her own concerns and of her appreciation of those expressed by student leaders. However, she said that one needed to give thought about what would happen to students if this facility did not materialize. The project offered basic programming support for recruitment of students, it assured continued quality of student life on campus and, though she did not like the idea of a student levy, the alternative was less attractive. Redevelopment in that part of the campus would go ahead but, without support for the athletics facility, it might do so with few student amenities. Others had warned of leaving the legacy of an annual \$70 levy to future generations of students. She had decided that her legacy would be to provide an opportunity for the St. George campus student body to be individually heard on the question of whether the proposed facility was worth the proposed levy.

A member asked if it was correct that student services fees could not be used for capital costs. Professor Orchard responded that the "Student-Service" fee levied to cover services provided by the Office of Student Affairs and the Office of Student

Services could not be used for capital expenditure. All other non-academic incidental fees (student services fees) could be expended either for operating or capital costs, and previously had been so spent, for example in Hart House or in the Faculty of Physical

4.1 Operating Plan for Proposed Varsity Centre for Field and Ice Sports (cont'd)

Education and Health. The *Protocol* had been written specifically to address the process for the assessment of these fees.

A member questioned the format of the operating budget, asking in particular why the \$14 million being contributed by the University was not reflected in the revenue. Professor Kidd explained that the University's contribution was coming from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund (UIIF), paid up front rather than amortized over 25 years. In response to further questions, Professor Venter and Professor Orchard said that the budget comprised components to cover the mortgage, increased operating costs and major maintenance to ensure the facility could be kept up.

A member asked who would be designing the referendum question. Professor Orchard responded that under the terms of the *Protocol* that task was assigned to the Referendum Conduct Committee.

A member returned to questioning why the budget had been constructed to have a planned surplus of approximately \$400,000 annually. Professor Kidd explained at length that the budget had been constructed with the guidance and expertise of individuals in the University's Planning and Budget Department in accordance with what was required by University policy. He went on to give the reasons for the mixture of operating and capital cost throughout the amortization and why the fee was indexed. He noted the unpredictability of the actual interest rate that would be in effect by 2005. Finally, he was prepared to have in place a reporting mechanism that would clearly show where the fees would go for the next 25 years and would be happy to provide that transparency annually when the operating plans and budget came forward for approval.

It was duly moved and seconded

THAT the operating plans and operating budget for the proposed Varsity Centre for Field and Ice Sports, as described in Section VIII and Appendix C of the Executive Summary of the Project Planning Committee's Report, December 21, 2001, be approved in principle.

It was duly moved

THAT debate be adjourned.

The motion to adjourn debate was defeated.

A member expressed his thoughts that this was a good plan, that he had no trouble supporting it, and that he hoped the administration would be watchful for ways to trim costs.

Professor Orchard summarized debate by noting that good points had been made and that he believed it was now time to proceed. The Faculty of Physical Education and

Health had earned an international reputation as a model for inclusiveness and equity. Every effort had been made to attract SuperBuild funds and the University had been told definitely that none would be available for this project. It was necessary to enter a

4.1 Operating Plan for Proposed Varsity Centre for Field and Ice Sports (cont'd)

partnership with the students to build it. The contribution of the University to this project was the largest of any capital project to date -- all others had government, corporate or other donor support. He thought this was a good plan and urged members to support it.

A vote was taken on the motion to approve the operating plan and the operating budget.

The motion carried.

4.2 Plan for Payment of Referendum Expenses

The Chair said that the *Protocol* also directed that the body requesting a referendum shall submit to the University Affairs Board a plan for payment of the expenses of the referendum. This item was for information only.

Professor Orchard explained that the *Protocol* called for the University Affairs Board to receive the information attached under cover of his memorandum of January 18, 2002. He had hoped that if there were need for a referendum it could have been web-based which would have cost about one-sixth as much. However, two of the student governments had declined to make this amendment to the *Protocol* and change could not be made without the agreement of at least two of the three student organizations. A Referendum Conduct Committee would set the rules and regulations for the referendum and, with the timelines currently projected, it would be completed one week before the classes ended.

The budget amount for "communications" was questioned. Adding to comments by Professor Orchard, Mr. Charpentier noted that this amount was budgeted for communications originating from the Referendum Conduct Committee. Proposals for expenses for the "yes" and "no" side did not figure into this amount, and would be guided by decisions of the Referendum Conduct Committee. Mechanisms for input into the Committee would also be the Committee's decision.

5. Report of Coordinator: Student Crisis Response Program

Professor Orchard referred to the Annual Report of the Student Crisis Response Program. He had established the program two years ago to provide support for staff who worked with students in crisis and to link the University's services for students in networks that could respond quickly, to develop new *Protocols* for crisis response and to assist the University in dealing with traumatic events through training and preparation.

The program had been very effective, as had its co-ordinator, Ms. Rae Johnson. Professor Orchard introduced Ms. Johnson and invited her to present her report. Ms.

Johnson reviewed the highlights of the report and gave anecdotal information on how the crisis response program had helped provide a safety net for students in trouble and at risk. She stressed the cooperative efforts of other services, such as the Community Safety Officer, and gave examples of where those efforts had been critical in crisis

5. Report of Coordinator: Student Crisis Response Programs

situations. In closing, Ms. Johnson noted that the success of the program had been reflective of the excellent student services at the University. Staff and faculty were very concerned individuals and that made her work easier.

A member noted that he had been personally involved in a recent crisis situation within his division and applauded the support provided by Ms. Johnson and the Community Safety Officer that had made it possible for the division to deal effectively with the crisis.

In response to a question, Ms. Johnson said that there were plans to continue extensive programming to raise the awareness of students and staff about students at risk for suicide.

6. Compulsory Non-Academic Incidental Fees: Annual Report of 2001-2002 Fees

The Chair noted that this item was for information only. In light of the late hour, he requested that any detailed or lengthy questions be directed to Mr. Delaney outside of the meeting.

7. Report of the Assessors

Reports of the Assessors were deferred to the next meeting.

8. Date of Next Meeting: Tuesday, February 26

The Chair reminded members that the next regularly schedule meeting was on Tuesday, February 26.

On motion duly moved and seconded, the meeting moved *in camera*.

9. Report of the Striking Committee

Following the *in camera* item, the Chair reported that Mr. Vivek Krishnamurthy had been appointed to complete the term of Mr. Faye Quereshy as the co-opted undergraduate student member of the Board. Mr. Quereshy's student status had been interrupted as the result of an automobile accident, from which he was recovering satisfactorily.

The meeting adjourned at 8:02 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

(18241)