

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

REPORT NUMBER 135 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD

April 25, 2006

To the Governing Council,
University of Toronto.

Your Board reports that it met on Tuesday, April 25, 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
Miss Coralie D'Souza
Ms. Margaret Hancock
Professor Bruce Kidd
Dr. Joel A. Kirsh
Professor Ian R. McDonald
Mr. Chris McGrath
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. Jim Delaney, Assistant Director, Student
Affairs
Mr. Tom Nowers, Assistant Principal, Students
and Executive Director, Student Affairs,
University of Toronto at Scarborough

Secretariat:

Mr. Andrew Drummond, Secretary

Regrets:

Mr. Husain Aboghodieh
Mr. Shaun Chen
Mr. Christopher M. Collins

Mr. Brian Davis
Mr. Sam Rahimi

In Attendance:

Ms. Burkha Gupta, University of Toronto at Mississauga Students' Union
Professor Angela Hildyard, Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity
Ms. Julie McAlpine-Jeffries, Legal Counsel, Office of the Vice-President, Human Resources and
Equity
Mr. Robert Wulkan, Student, University of Toronto at Scarborough
Ms. Joyce Zhang, Chief Returning Officer, Referendum, Scarborough Campus Community Radio

ITEM 3 CONTAINS A RECOMMENDATION FOR GOVERNING COUNCIL APPROVAL.
ALL OTHER ITEMS ARE REPORTED FOR INFORMATION.

REPORT NUMBER 135 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – April 25, 2006

1. Report of the Previous Meeting

The Chair reported that one change was required in the report of the previous meeting. Report Number 134 (March 21, 2006) was approved, as amended.

2. Business Arising from the Report

The Chair reminded members that, at the meeting of March 21, 2006, Professor Farrar had undertaken to return to the Board with a statement on future prospects for child care services as the University of Toronto at Mississauga. Professor Farrar reminded members that the *Policy on Child Care* mandated the existence of a Child Care Advisory Committee, which would be meeting in May, 2006. In addition, Professor Farrar reported that he had consulted with the Vice-President and Principal, University of Toronto at Mississauga, who had indicated that the administration at that campus was examining its needs, including potential locations for a child care facility and the model of care to be provided. The circumstances surrounding child care development, however, were heavily dependent on the federal government, which appeared to be in the midst of changing policies on the topic; as a result, there was uncertainty on prospects for funding.

3. Policy on Student Housing

Professor Farrar reminded members that, two years previously, the Task Force on Student Housing had produced a report that had recommended an update to the 1989 *Policy on Student Housing*. The Task Force had been a highly collaborative, consensus-building exercise, and that consensus had been reflected in its report. Five principles had emerged from the Report of the Task Force:

- Student housing should be used as a tool to attract and retain the best students;
- Student housing should be developed as educationally purposeful communities;
- Although each residence should develop its own character and local distinctiveness, there should be clear minimum standards under which all student housing should operate;
- Student housing should be sensitive to the need to accommodate students with diverse needs and requirements; and
- The responsibility for Student Housing should fall under the purview of the Vice-President and Provost.

The proposed *Policy* addressed each of these issues. In addition, the *Policy* allowed for the creation of *Guidelines* to be set by the Student Housing Advisory Committee. The *Guidelines*, which were before members, were meant to operationalize the *Policy* and to instantiate its principles.

During discussion, a member asked about the University's capacity to house students with families. Professor Farrar responded that the Charles Street Residences contained 760 units providing for student families, and that the University of Toronto at Mississauga had the capacity to offer space to students with families. The member then asked if students from individual faiths or spiritual practices could be segregated from other people, if they so desired. Professor Farrar responded that assignment of spaces was not based on the cultural backgrounds of students. Ms. Addario added that administrators did not know what faiths were professed by applicants to the system, but that there were methods of accommodating students appropriately in other ways: for example, if a student noted that he or she prayed daily in the morning, they would not be matched with someone for whom that would present difficulties in cohabiting. Mr. McGrath, speaking as a residence administrator, stated that staff would do their best to accommodate students if preferences were disclosed, but that one of the elements of

3. Policy on Student Housing (cont'd.)

REPORT NUMBER 135 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – April 25, 2006

residence life was the encouragement of students from differing backgrounds living in common, shared spaces. Frequently, accommodations revolved around dietary restrictions of students.

A member asked if part-time students, or students in the Transitional Year Program (TYP) were eligible to apply. Professor Farrar responded that they were eligible, but were not the top priority of the system. Once the needs of full-time student applicants were met, part-time and TYP students were eligible. Academic performance played an explicit role in readmission to residences. Mr. McGrath noted that, at the University of Toronto at Mississauga, a 2.0 average in three course credits was required to return to residence, since one of the operating principles of residences at that campuses was that they be enriching academic environments.

A member, who was on the Task Force during its deliberations, congratulated the administration for crafting a policy that captured the spirit of its recommendations. He then asked what measures would be taken to accommodate a disabled part-time student, given that part-time students were considered after full-time students. Ms. Addario responded that the criteria for such individuals were that they would need to take two courses over two terms to be considered equivalent to full-time. The member then asked what happened to residents who stayed at the University during periods (such as the December holiday break) when many residences were closed. Professor Farrar responded that the University tried to accommodate such individuals, and while the task was not simple, the system in place was functional.

A member noted that the 1989 *Policy* focused on ratios of first-year to senior students and other numeric indicators. Such targets, he stated, were missing from the proposed *Policy*, and were important factors in residence matters. Professor Farrar stated that targets were left to individual residences, acting in conjunction with the Student Housing Advisory Committee. The purpose of the policy change was to state a series of underlying principles about student housing, rather than to base it on highly changeable data and targets, which should be considered as operational details that were contingent on circumstances. The member then asked where the principle of ‘mentorship’ of first-year students (by senior students) could be found in the new *Policy*. Professor Farrar responded that the second principle of the proposed *Policy*, concerning the development of educationally purposeful communities, encompassed the principle.

A member asked whether the same emphasis on educational purpose and programming applied to family housing. Professor Farrar said it did apply, but not to the same extent as other residences. Support tended to exist in other forms to accommodate the unique needs of families. The member then asked if there was tension between the guarantee of housing for first-year students was in conflict with the desire to provide communities that had a stable balance between entering students and senior students. Professor Farrar acknowledged that there was a tension between the two goals, and while recent years had seen spikes in first-year housing requirements, the demands of the first-year guarantee had diminished significantly. Despite a recent rapid expansion in student housing at the University, demand for housing had increased as well.

A member asked if the membership on the Student Housing Advisory Committee could be altered to include representatives of Hart House and Athletics. Professor Farrar responded that he felt the representativeness of the Committee was appropriate, but that he would take the suggestion under advisement.

REPORT NUMBER 135 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – April 25, 2006

3. Policy on Student Housing (cont'd.)

On the recommendation of the Deputy Provost and Vice-Provost, Students,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDED

THAT the proposed *Policy on Student Housing* be approved, replacing the *Policy on Student Housing* dated

4. Equity Statement: Discussion and Advice

The Chair welcomed Professor Hildyard and Ms. Julie McAlpine-Jeffries, Legal Counsel, Office of the Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity, to the meeting. Professor Hildyard informed the Board that she was seeking members' advice to improve the draft Equity Statement, which was designed to replace the Statement on Human Rights. The Equity Statement arose out of a recommendation of the recent Equity Review that called for a policy outlining the University's commitment to equity in the broadest sense. It was appropriate to pull together the numerous existing policies on the subject into one place. A small working group had created the draft Equity Statement under the direction of the Equity Advisory Board. The Equity Statement itself was developed by examining existing policy and numerous public statements, and incorporating many of the most salient points of those statements directly.

Ms. McAlpine-Jeffries elaborated by pointing out that the Statement was crafted from sources as varied as the Statement on Human Rights, the Statement of Commitment to Persons with Disabilities, the Statement on Freedom of Speech, the *Stepping UP* framework for academic planning, and recent Presidential statements. The *Equity Statement* was not designed to replace those policies, with the exception of the *Statement on Human Rights*, which was considered a very broad policy. Both the Equity Advisory Board and the President's and Vice-Presidents' Group (PVP) had reviewed earlier drafts and offered commentary, and the administration was now seeking commentary from the Board before seeking governance approval, which was planned for the final governance cycle of the 2005-06 year.

A member asked what 'prohibited discrimination and harassment' meant, and whether it might be too restrictive a term to meet the University's significant aspirations in terms of equity. Professor Hildyard responded, stating that it reflected grounds defined by law and statute. The University, she said, needed to be mindful of its legal requirements, and while the University wished to go beyond minimum requirements where possible, having an excessively broad commitment in this regard would be inappropriate. Another member noted that, because the University made many decisions on the basis of academic performance, that would be defined as lawful discrimination, and not at all inappropriate.

Noting that the *Equity Statement* included the commitment to increase diversity where possible, a member stated that it sounded as though diversity were quantifiable in some sense. He asked if the University had some means to quantify diversity. Professor Hildyard responded that the University did complete an annual employment equity report, that would proceed to the Business Board and the Academic Board before going to the Governing Council for information. This report was extensive and reported in great detail on faculty and staff quantification. Professor Farrar informed the Board that, for students, it was not possible to break down student data beyond whether students were in visible minorities or not. It was, however, possible to gain some additional information on students using geodemographic data (defined by postal code) to assist in gaining a greater understanding of entering classes.

A member advised Professor Hildyard to consider the addition of a statement indicating that the University was committed to monitor the realization of its goals with regard to equity. He then advised

4. Equity Statement: Discussion and Advice (cont'd.)

REPORT NUMBER 135 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – April 25, 2006

Professor Hildyard to include, as an educative measure, a footnote explaining what the prohibited grounds for discrimination were.

A member congratulated the administration on the preparation of what appeared to be a very good policy. He asked whether it would be appropriate to define 'equity' in the document. He then advised the administration to take the salient points of the draft *Statement* and collate them into a broad statement of rights for members of the University community. He encouraged the implementation of the *Statement* to include monitoring and compliance, and for the administration to consider how to implement it with regards to its fit with operational policies. Lastly, he stated his belief that the statement that the University "hope[d] to mirror the diversity of the community" was insufficiently strong.

Professor Hildyard reminded members that many of the policies referenced by the document, on matters such as persons with disabilities, discrimination, freedom of speech, etc., were not meant to be eliminated, and that the implementation of the *Equity Statement* would not replace existing specific expectations and accountabilities. She was unsure if it would be possible to make the 'hoping' statement referred to earlier stronger.

The member then asked how long members had to comment prior to the *Statement's* being finalized. Professor Hildyard stated she would take suggestions until May 8, 2006.

The Chair thanked Professor Hildyard and Ms. McAlpine-Jeffries for attending.

5. Compulsory Non-Academic Incidental Fees: Student Society Fees

(a) Report on Financial Statements and Internal Auditor's Opinion

The Chair reminded members that the *Policy on Compulsory Non-Academic Incidental Fees* required that, where the University collected a compulsory non-academic incidental fee on behalf of a student society, the society had to present financial statements audited by an independent public auditor licensed under the Public Accountancy Act, though for smaller groups, the society could be exempted from doing so by the University's Internal Auditor, who had to satisfy himself that the society was maintaining proper books of accounts and supporting documentation. Professor Farrar reminded members that the report before them was distributed to the Board annually.

A member, noting that the Medical Society was the group with the largest amount of withheld money, asked how it became the case that its funds were withheld, and how long the society could survive without the remittance of funds. Mr. Delaney informed the member that the society had a 'catch-up' plan, and had been working to address successive years effectively. Unfortunately, when one year's accounts (for any society) were declared not in order, then those accounts needed to be put in order and cleared prior to the disbursement of funds in successive years.

(b) Student Society Proposals for Fee Increases

Professor Farrar noted that there were some changes to the recommendations contained in the material, and referred members to new documentation provided to them at the meeting table. Mr. Delaney noted that, in particular, the Graduate Students' Union had lowered its request for an increase because of its achievement of a better negotiated result for a health plan. He noted that Schedule I had been revised, and had been replaced. Lastly, he drew members' attention to a memorandum on the Scarborough

5. Compulsory Non-Academic Incidental Fees: Student Society Fees (cont'd.)

REPORT NUMBER 135 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – April 25, 2006**(b) Student Society Proposals for Fee Increases (cont'd.)**

Campus Community Radio (SCCR). In particular, he informed them that a complaint about the elections process for the referendum in question had been dismissed on the grounds that there was no evidence that the election result was affected by poor procedures; however, the administration was recommending that approval be granted on the condition that the SCCR's referendum procedures be improved.

Scarborough Campus Community Radio

The Chair welcomed Mr. Robert Wulkan, a student at the University of Toronto at Scarborough, to the meeting. He summarized the complaints made about the SCCR referendum: first, the hours during which the voting booth was open were extended unilaterally; secondly, the ballot box was opened with no scrutineers present, and the ballots were attended by individuals Mr. Wulkan believed were sympathetic to one side in the referendum. Although it was possible that the vote would have had the same outcome, he argued that the process issues rendered the referendum tainted.

The Chair invited Ms. Joyce Zhang, Chief Returning Officer for the SCCR Referendum, to speak. She noted that the ballot box had indeed been opened during the elections process, in order to accommodate space in the box for additional votes to be received in the second day of voting. All the ballots had been sealed within another box and put under lock and key to avoid tampering; the location of the ballots were not known to anyone outside the elections staff.

During discussion, it was agreed that the SCCR motion be voted upon separately from the rest of the motions before members.

A member pointed out that it would appear that low turnouts in referenda were frequent. He stated that, in examining the data before him, the SCCR question stood out for him on the slimness of the margin of victory. Mr. Delaney reminded members that the Board had discussed the issue of voter turnout at previous meetings. He then informed the Board that his investigation into the complaints received had revealed nothing suggesting that what had happened in the conduct of the election had led to any impact, and that there was, in his opinion, insufficient cause to recommend against adoption. He noted that the recommendation was contingent upon the development of revised guidelines for the conduct of referenda at SCCR, which he felt would sufficiently address the concerns raised.

A member noted that he shared the concerns over the small margin of victory, and was made uncomfortable with the fact that a ballot box had been opened during a voting period. He felt that it would be appropriate to re-conduct the referendum with the procedures revised to avoid any perception of tampering.

Another member noted the generally small turnout in referenda and posited a lack of passion by students for the existing processes to raise fees. He believed that the entire process for increasing student society fees should be re-examined.

University of Toronto at Mississauga Students' Union

A member asked whether the portion of the University of Toronto at Mississauga Students' Union (UTMSU) fee dedicated to the student centre was increasing. Mr. Delaney clarified that that component of the fee was remaining the same. The Chair invited Ms. Burkha Gupta, UTMSU, to speak briefly to the point. Ms. Gupta indicated her alarm at the size of the fee, especially for the student centre portion,

5. Compulsory Non-Academic Incidental Fees: Student Society Fees (cont'd.)**(b) Student Society Proposals for Fee Increases (cont'd.)**

REPORT NUMBER 135 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – April 25, 2006

and asked whether the UTMSU was responsible for the collection of those fees or whether the University was. Mr. Delaney responded that the fees were paid to a University account as a result of an agreement between the parties involved.

Graduate Students' Union

A member congratulated the Graduate Students' Union (GSU) on its creation of a dental plan, and was pleased to see it supported by such an emphatic margin.

On the recommendation of the Deputy Provost and Vice-Provost, Students,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT beginning in the fall 2006 session, (a) the Canadian Federation of Students (CFS) – CFS-Ontario portion of the **Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students** (APUS) fee be increased by \$0.07 per session; (b) the Accident & Prescription Drug Plan portion of the APUS fee be increased by \$2.62 (including provincial sales tax); and (c) the Dental Plan portion of the APUS fee be increased by \$2.75 (including provincial sales tax). If approved, the total APUS fee will be increased to \$76.42 per session, charged to all part-time undergraduate students.

THAT beginning in the fall 2006 session, the society portion of the **Engineering Society** fee be increased by \$0.43 per session. If approved, the total Engineering Society fee will be increased to \$104.65 per session, charged to all full-time Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering students.

THAT beginning in the fall 2006 session, (a) the Library Enhancement Fund portion of the **University of Toronto at Mississauga Students' Union** (UTMSU) fee be eliminated; (b) a new portion of the UTMSU fee of \$3.25 per session for the Blind Duck Pub be established; and (c) a new portion of the UTMSU fee of \$1.26 per session for Club Funding and Resources be established. If approved, the total UTMSU fee will be increased to \$42.84 per session, charged to all full-time University of Toronto at Mississauga students.

THAT beginning in the fall 2006 session, the society portion of the **Graduate Business Council** (GBC) fee be increased by \$10.00 per session for full-time students (\$5.00 per session for part-time students). If approved, the total GBC will be increased to \$30.00 per session for full-time students (\$15.00 per session for part-time students), charged to all Rotman School of Management students.

REPORT NUMBER 135 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – April 25, 2006**5. Compulsory Non-Academic Incidental Fees: Student Society Fees (cont'd.)****(c) Student Society Proposals for Fee Increases (cont'd.)**

THAT beginning in the fall 2006 session, (a) the society portion of the **Graduate Students' Union** (GSU) fee be increased by \$0.60 per session for full-time students (\$0.30 per session for part-time students); (b) the Canadian Federation of Students (CFS) – CFS-Ontario portion of the GSU fee be increased by \$0.16 per session for full-time students (\$0.08 per session for part-time students); (c) the Supplementary Health Coverage portion of the GSU fee be increased by \$15.42 (including administration fee and provincial sales tax) per session for full-time students (\$0.00 for part-time students); and (d) a new portion of the GSU fee of \$66.12 (including administration fee and provincial sales tax) per session for full-time students (\$66.12 per session for part-time students) for a Dental Plan be established. If approved, the total GSU fee will be increased to \$201.33 per session for full-time students (\$88.83 per session for part-time students), charged to all graduate students.

THAT beginning in the fall 2006 session, (a) the society portion of the **Scarborough Campus Students' Union** (SCSU) fee be increased by \$0.46 per session for full-time students (\$0.03 for part-time students); (b) the Canadian Federation of Students (CFS) – CFS-Ontario portion of the SCSU fee be increased by \$0.13 per session for full-time students (\$0.00 per session for part-time students); and (c) the Student Centre portion of the SCSU fee be increased by \$0.68 per session for full-time students (\$0.20 for part-time students). If approved, the total authorized SCSU fee will be increased to \$168.18 per session for full-time students (\$11.45 for part-time students), charged to all University of Toronto at Scarborough students.

Note: Since SCSU is electing not to charge the full authorized amounts for the Accident and Prescription Drug Plan and Dental Plan portions of the fee, the actual fee charged beginning fall 2006 will be \$146.51 per session for full-time students (\$11.45 for part-time students).

THAT beginning in the fall 2006 session, the society portion of the **University of Toronto at Scarborough Student Residence Council** (SRC) fee be increased by \$2.50 per session. If approved, the total SRC fee will be increased to \$15.00 per session, charged to all UTSC Residence students.

THAT beginning in the fall 2006 session, (a) the society portion of the **Students' Administrative Council** (SAC) fee be increased by \$0.24 per session; (b) the Canadian Federation of Students (CFS) – CFS-Ontario portion of the SAC fee be increased by \$0.13 per session; and (c) the Accident & Prescription Drug Plan portion of the SAC fee be increased by \$4.16 (including administration fee and provincial sales tax). If approved, the total authorized SAC-St. George fee will increase to \$135.44, charged to all full-time undergraduate students on the St. George Campus; and the total authorized SAC-UTM fee will increase to \$133.19, charged to all full-time undergraduate students on the U of T at Mississauga campus.

REPORT NUMBER 135 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – April 25, 2006

5. Compulsory Non-Academic Incidental Fees: Student Society Fees (cont'd.)

(b) Student Society Proposals for Fee Increases (cont'd.)

Note: Since SAC is electing not to charge the full authorized amount for the Dental Plan portion of the fee, the actual fee charged beginning fall 2006 will be \$125.40 per session for St. George Campus students and \$123.15 for UTM students.

THAT beginning in the fall 2006 session, (a) the Foster Parents Plan portion of the **University College Literary & Athletics Society (UC Lit)** fee be eliminated; (b) the Campus Safety portion of the UC Lit fee be eliminated; (c) a new portion of the UC Lit fee of \$0.13 per session for full-time students (\$0.13 for part-time students) for a UC WUSC committee be established; (d) the society portion of the UC Lit fee be increased by \$0.50 per session for full-time students (\$0.00 for part-time students); and (e) a new portion of the UC Lit fee of \$1.50 per session for full-time students (\$1.50 for part-time students) for a Student Aid Fund be established. If approved, the total UC Lit fee will be increased to \$17.63 per session for full-time students (\$8.84 for part-time students), charged to all University College students.

The Board then considered the SCCR question. The motion,

THAT beginning in the fall 2006 session, the society portion of the **Scarborough Campus Community Radio (SCCR)** fee be increased by \$1.00 per session. If approved, the total SCCR fee will be increased to \$3.00 per session, charged to all full-time University of Toronto at Scarborough students.

was defeated. Members stated that the reason for the defeat was a result of irregularities in the voting.

6. Police Services: Annual Reports, 2005

- (a) St. George Campus**
- (b) University of Toronto at Mississauga**
- (c) University of Toronto at Scarborough**

The Chair welcomed Mr. Daniel Hutt, Director, Police Services, St. George campus; Mr. Len Paris, Director, Police Services, University of Toronto at Mississauga; and Mr. Darcy Griffith, Director, Police and Parking Services, University of Toronto at Scarborough, to the meeting. He invited Mr. Paris to make a presentation to the Board on behalf of all three campuses' police services.

Mr. Paris informed the Board that all three of the Police Services, even though they operated with a high degree of independence, shared a common policy and mandate, with a commitment to community safety, crime prevention, diversity and community problem solving. In achieving their mandates, the Police Services shared a commitment to excellence and leadership, with a strong focus on training and staff development. Finally, all three Services shared their expertise, information and resources with each other.

REPORT NUMBER 135 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – April 25, 2006**6. Police Services: Annual Reports, 2005 (cont'd.)**

The Services were deeply focused on developing and maintaining the high level of training evident in their officers. Training measures included courses on diversity and harassment issues and an emphasis on skills and staff development for all officers. In addition, partnerships with both the Toronto and Peel Region Police Services helped to ensure a consistently high level of service. In addition, members of the Services routinely engaged in partnerships with other internal resources at the University in order to ensure that their mandate was carried out successfully. Community involvement was another key factor for the Services, with a common theme of community safety and preventing victimization. To promote safety, the Services conducted safety audits and helped institute Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) measures. Police staff were involved in safety events, educational measures, and information booths throughout the school year and on all three campuses. Community Policing for the University remained the focus of the Services, and, despite the steadily increasing demands on the Services, it would continue to pursue a community problem-solving model.

On the subject of increased demand for the Police Services' expertise, Mr. Paris informed the Board that, because of the significant enrolment growth that had occurred at the Scarborough and Mississauga campuses, the services had put in place measures to improve policing. The St. George and Mississauga campuses' Services would see increased staff in 2006-07, while the Scarborough campus service had moved into new space in 2005. However, he noted, new space was required for both the St. George and Mississauga campuses as well. Nonetheless, criminal occurrences reported to the Police Services were down, based on population growth.

Mr. Paris then reiterated the commitment to diversity and outreach shared by all three Services. Because the University of Toronto was very diverse in its ethnic, religious and cultural makeup, it was key for officers to be sensitive to that diversity. The Police Services worked with other offices on campus to engage in coordinated response, investigation and information sharing on incidents involving harassment and hate, and formed an integral element in efforts to stop hateful behaviour. Incident investigation took place under the auspices of close cooperation with Toronto and Peel Police, as well as with University resources such as the equity offices.

The Services took pride in their professionalism. Policy and procedures were under review, and would be updated and rewritten in the near future, with a target completion date of February 2007. Along with that review, other priorities in moving forward included a continuing emphasis on strengthening community links, partnerships and programs, as well as continuing to focus on staff development and training. These priorities were designed to be incorporated into overall strategic plans that lined up with the administration's emphasis on the improvement of the student experience as outlined in the current framework for academic planning, *Stepping UP*.

Mr. Hutt stated for the record, as one example of the Services' commitment to community policing and partnerships, that the St. George Police Service had expanded WalkSafer to include disabled/mobility challenged individuals, with the assistance of AccessAbility Services.

Mr. Paris then thanked members for their attention and invited questions.

Ms. Addario stated that, in her opinion, as part of enhancing the student experience, the Services should consider addressing specifically the level of bicycle thefts. Although the reported number of thefts was down from previous years, she felt that the decline was likely because thefts of bicycles had become so common that they frequently went unreported. Mr. Hutt noted that he

6. Police Services: Annual Reports, 2005 (cont'd.)

REPORT NUMBER 135 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – April 25, 2006

was unsure whether the decline in reports resulted from a decline in thefts or from a decline in reporting, but he did state that the Service had been successful in arresting individuals for theft; furthermore, the Service maintained a good relationship with local bicycle stores, which made purchase of stolen property more difficult. One possibility would be to install a controlled-access lockup with cameras, but budgetary restrictions would make such a plan prohibitive. He invited suggestions for members.

A member added his concern about bicycle thefts: cycling encouraged health among students and staff alike, and the lack of a safe lockup was a major deterrent. While needs were growing, many cyclists were left with few options available for lockup, and had chosen inappropriate methods of securing their bicycles, such as to trees, railings, signs, or even accessibility ramps. Another member added that there seemed to be significant anecdotal evidence that theft of bicycles was rampant, with at least 10 bicycles having been stolen from one small area of campus over a short time period. To her knowledge, none of those thefts had been reported. It would be beneficial to the community, she argued, if Parking Services and Campus Police could cooperate to assist in providing more secure lockups for bicycles.

Another member suggested that cooperation with the Sustainability Office be considered; this cooperation would have the potential to educate the community about bike safety and the effectiveness of different types of locks. She further noted that her own bicycle had been stolen two days previously.

A member wished it noted for the record his gratitude for the Scarborough Campus Police Service's efforts to reduce graffiti. He then asked why the number of individuals trespassed at Scarborough (40) was so much higher per capita than at Mississauga (12) and St. George (65), and how individuals would be charged, given that people freely walked around and through all three campuses.

Mr. Griffith thanked the member for his gratitude, noting that the Scarborough Campus Students' Union (SCSU) had taken the lead in promoting the anti-graffiti message. On the question, Mr. Griffith noted that campuses by their nature had an inherent right of access. Campus Police would not intervene until individuals drew specific attention to themselves, and usually then a warning would suffice. A number of individuals would disregard the warning, return to campus and continue the disruptive behaviour, at which point they would be charged. The concerns were predominantly 'low-level', rather than serious safety issues. Mr. Hutt stated that the St. George Service acted in a similar manner, and that Campus Police would only lay charges if individuals continued to return and behave disruptively. Campus Police operated a complaint-based system, and had investigated 1,400 incidents of disorderly behaviour, but issued only 81 cautions and 65 charges.

A member stated that he was struck by the work done by Police in designing safe buildings, and urged a continuation of those measures. He then asked if officers were ever involved in reducing the disruptive behaviour of skateboarders to ensure that they did not pose a hazard. Mr. Hutt responded by stating that the St. George Campus Police worked with Facilities and Services to tackle the issue, but that a report to the administration had detailed thousands of dollars of damage done and a risk to individuals as a result of inappropriate skateboarding.

6. Police Services: Annual Reports, 2005 (cont'd.)

A member asked about the use of batons by officers. Mr. Hutt noted that a baton had been drawn in only one incident in 2005, and used as a protective measure only. The individual threatening

REPORT NUMBER 135 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – April 25, 2006

the officer backed down as a result. He added that batons were a useful tool and were working well.

7. Student Crisis Response Programs: Annual Report, 2004-05

The Chair welcomed Ms. Rae Johnson, Crisis Response Coordinator, to the meeting. Ms. Johnson referred members to her written report, and noted for members three key points. First, she directed members' attention to material concerning an upcoming conference on student mental health, for which she anticipated an excellent mix of individuals that would stimulate dialogue and understanding of the issues at stake. Secondly, she voiced her support for ongoing efforts in developing and implementing an emergency response program for the University. She had been involved in the development and rollout of the initiative with direct and positive input. Lastly, she wanted to express thanks to the individuals and offices who had collaborated with Student Crisis Response Programs, especially Deans and Registrars, staff and faculty, Student Affairs, Student Services, Campus Police and other offices across the University. Her office was a part of the safety net that would help students in dire need; this collaborative effort displayed the value of an intertwined, effective and comprehensive service.

A member noted that Ms. Johnson was a very conscientious staff member (indeed, a 'one-woman wonder') who was readily available to assist with crises at a moment's notice. He noted a concern with an increase in the number of issues dealt with by Student Crisis Response Programs, and wondered whether a workload increase was sustainable given staffing. He urged the administration to continue to explore how its disparate elements could be even more coordinated and to ensure that the staffing levels remained at appropriate levels.

8. Report of the Senior Assessor

Professor Farrar presented no report to this meeting.

9. Reports of the Elections Committee

The Board received for information Report #43 (March 9, 2006) and Report #44 (March 27, 2006) of the Elections Committee.

10. Date of Next Meeting

The Chair informed members that the next meeting would take place at 4:30 p.m. in the Council Chamber of Simcoe Hall on Tuesday, May 30, 2006. He urged all members to attend.

REPORT NUMBER 135 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – April 25, 2006

11. Other Business

There was no other business.

The meeting adjourned at 6:25 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

May 16, 2006
36413