

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

REPORT NUMBER 136 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD**May 30, 2006**

To the Governing Council,
University of Toronto.

Your Board reports that it met on Tuesday, May 30, 2006 at 4:30 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, with the following members present:

Dr. Robert M. Bennett, In the Chair
Dr. Claude Davis, Vice-Chair
Professor David Farrar, Deputy Provost
and Vice-Provost, Students
Ms. Anne E. Macdonald,
Director, Ancillary Services
Mr. Husain Aboghodieh
Mr. Christopher M. Collins
Miss Coralie D'Souza
Ms. Margaret Hancock
Professor Bruce Kidd
Professor Ian R. McDonald
Dr. John P. Nestor
Ms. Marvi Ricker
Mr. Faraz Rahim Siddiqui
Ms. Rebecca Spagnolo
Mr. Mahadeo Sukhai

Dr. John Wedge

Non-Voting Assessors:

Ms. Susan Addario, Director, Student Affairs
Mr. Louis Charpentier, Secretary of the
Governing Council
Mr. Jim Delaney, Assistant Director, Student
Affairs
Ms. Marilyn van Norman, Director, Student
Services

Secretariat:

Mr. Andrew Drummond, Secretary

Regrets:

Mr. Shaun Chen
Dr. Joel A. Kirsh
Mr. Sam Rahimi

Mr. Brian Davis
Mr. Chris McGrath

In Attendance:

Ms. Connie Guberman, Special Advisor on Equity Issues and Status of Women Officer
Professor Angela Hildyard, Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity
Ms. Julie McAlpine-Jeffries, Legal Counsel, Office of the Vice-President, Human Resources and
Equity
Ms Margaret McKone, Administrative Manager, Office of the Governing Council
Mr. Kyle Winters, Director of Marketing Programs, Office of the Vice-President and Chief
Advancement Officer

ITEM 4 CONTAINS A RECOMMENDATION FOR GOVERNING COUNCIL APPROVAL.
ALL OTHER ITEMS ARE REPORTED FOR INFORMATION.

REPORT NUMBER 136 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – May 30, 2006

Prior to the meeting, the Chair noted the presence of three individuals:

Dr. Alex Waugh, former University Affairs Board Chair, was present. His service to the University, and to the Board in particular, had advanced many of the policies that enriched the lives of all who worked and studied at the University, and would continue to do so. The Chair cited Dr. Waugh's contributions to equity and accessibility, and to the development of the new Woodsworth College residence (with its Alex R. Waugh courtyard) as examples of his dedication.

Dr. John Nestor, former University Affairs Board Chair and current co-opted member of the Board, had served extensively on the Board and on Governing Council, and had contributed many valuable insights throughout his period. The Chair wished him well, and presented him with a University of Toronto jacket on behalf of the alumni members of the Governing Council.

Mr. Christopher Collins had won the extremely prestigious Adel S. Sedra Distinguished Graduate Award scholarship for his doctoral studies. Mr. Collins was both an excellent student as well as a dedicated volunteer whose work at the Graduate Students' Union and, more recently, as Chair of the Hart House Board of Stewards, had benefited the University community greatly.

Members welcomed and applauded these three individuals.

1. Report of the Previous Meeting

The Chair reported that one change (in the 'attendance' portion) was required in the report of the previous meeting. Report Number 135 (April 25, 2006) was approved, as amended.

2. Business Arising from the Report

There was no business arising from the Report of the previous meeting.

3. Code of Conduct for Trademark Licensees – Annual Report

The Chair welcomed Mr. Kyle Winters, Director of Marketing Programs, Office of the Vice-President and Chief Advancement Officer, to the meeting. Mr. Winters briefly summarized his report, noting that it was the sixth one presented to the Board. In the reporting year, the University had focused on retail vendors of apparel products. The University had bettered its factory certification processes, and had worked in consultation with the Fair Labour Association and the Workers' Rights Consortium in order to consolidate tracking of manufacturers in a more robust system. As a result of the University of Toronto's leadership, Canada was the first country in the world to create a system that ensured ethical manufacturing for all universities. The University's objective was to be Canada's leader in ensuring ethical conduct in all trademark licensing matters.

There was no discussion.

The Chair thanked Mr. Winters for his report, emphasizing to the Board that the University's leadership in the area was truly a matter of which the University should be proud.

REPORT NUMBER 136 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – May 30, 2006

4. Statement on Equity, Diversity and Human Rights

The Chair welcomed Professor Hildyard, Ms. Connie Guberman, Status of Women Officer and Ms. Julie McAlpine-Jeffries, Legal Counsel, Office of the Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity, to the meeting. Professor Hildyard thanked the Board for its advice at the April 25, 2006 meeting and stated that the administration was bringing a revised policy statement for approval. She called members' attention to the change in the title of the *Statement*, which was previously known as the *Equity Statement* but was now taking the name of the *Statement on Equity, Diversity and Human Rights*. She noted that some concerns with the previous version had been expressed, most notably by representatives of the Students' Administrative Council (SAC). In response to the issues raised, the terms 'diversity' and 'human rights' were included in the title, and, furthermore, to clarify the University's commitment, a 'whereas' clause had been added to develop contextual information. In Professor Hildyard's opinion, the concerns raised had been accommodated while maintaining the core values of earlier drafts of the *Statement*.

Professor Hildyard then reminded members that the *Statement* was only one aspect of the policy framework for equity issues at the University; governance bodies received monitoring reports on the Ontarians with Disabilities Act, Equity Offices and their work, Employment Equity, and numerous other elements of the University's accountability.

During discussion, a member indicated that he was pleased with the modifications to the *Statement* since the April meeting; the changes produced a fair, workable and practical framework for equity at the University, with sound limits placed. He approved the name change of the policy and applauded the administration for including the 'whereas' clause. Another member indicated that she was very impressed with the policy and its collaborative development.

On the recommendation of the Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDED

WHEREAS, In recognition of the fact that in society at large, certain groups are treated inequitably because of individual and systemic biases,

THAT the Statement on Equity, Diversity and Human Rights be approved
AND that the Statement on Equity, Diversity and Human Rights replace the Statement on Human Rights dated June 25, 1991.

5. Recognized Campus Groups: Report #2

Professor Farrar informed members that the Reports on Recognized Campus Groups were generally routine and represented one element of the Board's oversight responsibility. During the reporting period, there were 366 groups recognized by the Office of Student Affairs.

During discussion, a member asked about the process leading to recognition of a campus group, and specifically whether the purposes of groups needed to be described in order to receive recognition. Mr. Delaney answered that groups were required to articulate, in a written constitution, their objectives. The Office of Student Affairs would look to ensure that there would be some positive contribution to the University or broader community. The member asked if there was a risk that groups would hold standards that would not meet the University's broader objectives, such as the earlier-discussed *Statement on Equity, Diversity and Human Rights*. Mr. Delaney replied that the policy for approving groups assumed that they were being created by people gathering freely to pursue legitimate objectives important to them, reflecting

5. Recognized Campus Groups: Report #2 (cont'd.)

REPORT NUMBER 136 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – May 30, 2006

the community values of freedom of speech and freedom of association. The member asked what would happen if a group held values incompatible with the University's. Ms. Addario replied that while the activities of some groups' members might come into conflict with the University's policies, the groups *qua* groups typically behaved responsibly. She noted that some groups' values conflicted with those of other groups, but that the role of Student Affairs was to help create an environment in which free and respectful discussions could take place.

A member asked if Student Affairs collected membership lists of groups, and wondered what proportion of students belonged to groups. Mr. Delaney responded that a rough estimate would be that one-third of students belonged to one of the groups, but that the number was not verified. The University's knowledge of who belonged to the groups was limited to those group members in leadership positions. The member then asked if, in the approval package, there was an indication that groups were required to abide by University policy. Mr. Delaney answered in the affirmative.

A member asked to what extent were the groups University of Toronto chapters of other organizations, and, if any were, whether Student Affairs vetted their constitutions. Mr. Delaney responded that many of the recognized groups were chapters of other organizations, but that he and his staff would look for features in the local constitutions that guaranteed a reasonable level of local control.

A member asked if the list provided represented the St. George campus recognized groups only. Mr. Delaney responded that recognition allowed groups the right to use the University of Toronto name and to access resources available to them. Many groups, however, chose to be recognized within the context of a single division. For example, Law, Engineering, Scarborough and Mississauga students all had local groups that did not receive recognition from Student Affairs. The member then asked if one-third of all students belonged to a recognized group, and if the total number of students involved in non-recognized groups were added, a huge proportion of students would be participating in extra-curricular student clubs. Mr. Delaney agreed, noting that the report did not consider involvement in, for example, Hart House clubs or in intramural sports run by the Athletic Centre.

A member asked if groups had to pay a fee to be recognized, or if the University collected fees. Mr. Delaney confirmed that they did not in either case, but did note that some groups charged a membership fee.

A member thanked the Office of Student Affairs for the report, noting it was important for community members to see the sheer range of activities available to them. He noted that it seemed to be easier to create a new group than to know what groups were already in existence, and asked what more could be done to encourage greater student involvement in existing clubs. Mr. Delaney, in response, noted that the numerical growth of clubs did not necessarily mean that the student experience was better. He informed members that the Office of Student Affairs did what it could to assist in community awareness, but noted that the issue was a complex one. For example, it appeared to be the case that, on the basis on anecdotal evidence, students often wanted to be seen as the founders of new groups in order to bolster future employability. Ms. Addario added that that phenomenon existed at other campuses as well, citing an example of a California University with approximately 6000 students that had 600 clubs.

A member applauded the Office of Student Affairs for its efforts to affirm and recognize the diversity of interests among students, but, with the apparent proliferation, and possible splintering, of student groups, wondered what kinds of bridging organizations or tactics could be employed to help students come together in common cause. Mr. Delaney agreed that the large number of groups did sometimes complicate matters; trends in recent years had been towards the creation of smaller, specialized groups with interests in specific

5. Recognized Campus Groups: Report #2 (cont'd.)

REPORT NUMBER 136 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – May 30, 2006

issues, rather than larger ‘umbrella’ groups (such as the 20-year old Ontario Public Interest Research Group (OPIRG)). He did worry that students appeared to want to isolate themselves in groups rather than experience the full and rich range of options available to them. Professor Farrar added his concern to that prospect, and wondered what could be done to convince students of the value of extensive interaction. Other members encouraged Professor Farrar and his staff to continue their efforts in encouraging interaction among students.

6. Report of the Senior Assessor

Professor Farrar presented no report to this meeting.

7. Date of Next Meeting

The Chair informed members that the next meeting would take place in the fall of 2006, but that the schedule had not yet been set.

8. Other Business

Professor Farrar informed the Board that an anonymous donation, supporting a staff member’s participation in the Friends for Life Bike Rally in support of the Toronto People with AIDS Foundation, had been made in the name of the University Affairs Board. This support recognized the Board’s concern for the community’s quality of life both on and off the campus. This donation was reported for information and had no financial consequence to the University.

Seeing no other business, the Chair offered the following observations. The Board’s 2005-06 year had been remarkable, with growing maturity and a level of effectiveness previously unseen by the Chair. The Chair extended his thanks to both members and guests throughout the year who had brought relevant information and opinion to bear on the discussions of a very important and unique governance body. The mandate of the University Affairs Board, to be ‘responsible for all matters of non-academic nature that directly concern the quality of student and campus life’, meant that the Board played a very significant role in all those who worked and studied at the University. The Chair invited members to examine the range of issues discussed at the Board during the 2005-06 year and consider the role the Board played in helping to provide a safe, healthy intellectual community.

The Chair thanked the staff of the Office of the Governing Council, who prepared volumes of material for the Board in short order, noting the planning process needed to integrate scheduling and reporting among the various committees and boards which brought to governance accurate recommendations for consideration. In particular, the Chair singled out the Secretary of the Governing Council, Mr. Louis Charpentier, as well as Andrew Drummond, Margaret McKone, Henry Mulhall, and Neil Dobbs, for their assistance to the Chair.

The Chair then acknowledged and thanked the Vice-Chair, Dr. Claude Davis, whose quiet intellectual style of discussion had served the Board at both its meetings and the meetings of its agenda planning group. Dr. Davis had shown the value of his dedication and experience throughout the year.

The Chair then thanked the Senior Assessor, Professor David Farrar, who had once again provided the Board with relevant information and direction, helping to make recommendations clear and accurate. The job of Vice-Provost, Students had some of the most demanding responsibilities in the University’s senior administration. The Chair felt that if leaders of student societies could observe a full day in the

REPORT NUMBER 136 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – May 30, 2006**8. Other Business (cont'd.)**

life of the Vice-Provost, Students, they would see how Professor Farrar handled a range of responsibilities and concerns, even when carefully planned schedules were disrupted by unexpected crises, and they would develop a much better understanding of and respect for the enormity of the responsibilities of the position. (The Chair added that Professor Farrar occasionally also had to endure the Chair's 'senior's moment' when he would call Professor Farrar by his predecessor's name.)

The Chair thanked the other assessors, recognizing their collective contribution to both the Board and to the University as a whole.

The Chair then informed all Board members that he had had the privilege of serving the Board for nine consecutive years and had been overwhelmed by the intellectual engagement of the 2005-06 membership. Their service had been exemplary; in particular, student members had participated in a highly informed and constructive manner, at a level that those whose lives were affected by the Board's decisions would appreciate. In that vein, the Chair thanked all the student members, and all the members of other estates for the pleasure of serving alongside them. Of all the responsibilities of governance participation, the University Affairs Board provided the best discussions and the Chair would greatly miss those discussions. The Board's advocacy for equity, accessibility, safety, personal health, and enriched student and community life at the University had been well served by the Board during the Chair's membership, and he had seen a true difference in the quality of campus life as a result of the Board's decisions.

Lastly, the Chair acknowledged and thanked all members whose terms were ending.

Professor Farrar reminded Board members that the Chair, Dr. Robert Bennett, had served on the Governing Council for nine years, the maximum allowed by legislation, and for the duration of his three terms he had served on the Board, the final two as Chair, and as Vice-Chair the year prior. Unfortunately, the Board would be losing the Chair's enthusiasm and his dedicated hard work. For the duration of his time on the Governing Council and on the Board, Dr. Bennett had been unwavering in his commitment to the improvement of the student experience and had been consistent in bringing up issues requiring attention on the subject of improving student life. Dr. Bennett, in addition, had been extremely dedicated to alumni affairs, and, in particular, was always committed to ensuring that the students with whom he came in contact would continue their relationship with the University of Toronto well past graduation. Lastly, Professor Farrar noted that Dr. Bennett's generosity was responsible for the reception to be held immediately following the meeting.

In recognition of Dr. Bennett's exemplary service to the Board as a member, as Vice-Chair, and as Chair, Professor Farrar presented him with a chair with an engraved plaque. On behalf of the Office of the Vice-President and Provost, Professor Farrar presented Dr. Bennett with a clock.

All members and guests applauded the Chair.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

The meeting continued *in camera*.

REPORT NUMBER 136 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – May 30, 2006

9. Report of the Striking Committee

(a) University Affairs Board: Co-Opted Members, 2006-07

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the following be appointed as co-opted members of the University Affairs Board for one-year terms from July 1, 2006 to June 30, 2007:

Simona Chiose
Richard Hydal
Rae Johnson
Josh Koziembrocki
Steven Kraft
Chris McGrath
Faraz Rahim Siddiqui
Melanie Tharamangalam

(b) Discipline Appeals Board: Membership, 2006-07

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the following be appointed to the Discipline Appeals Board for one-year terms from July 1, 2006 to June 30, 2007:

Muhammad Basil Ahmad
Christopher Collins
Sherwin Desser
Ran Goel
Cheryl Shook
Mahadeo Sukhai

The meeting adjourned at 5:20 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

June 7, 2006
36748v2