

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

REPORT NUMBER 124 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD

November 9, 2004

To the Governing Council,
University of Toronto.

Your Board reports that it met on Tuesday, November 9, 2004 at 4:30 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, with the following members present:

Dr. Robert M. Bennett, In the Chair
Mr. Ari D. Kopolovic, Vice-Chair
Ms Susan Addario, Director of Student
Affairs, Acting for the
Vice-Provost, Students
Ms Anne E. MacDonald,
Director, Ancillary Services
Ms Mubarka Alam
Ms Katherine Anne Boyd
Mr. Shaun Chen
Dr. Claude S. Davis
Ms Margaret Hancock
Ms Shaila R. Kibria
Professor Bruce Kidd
Dr. Joel A. Kirsh
Mr. Chris McGrath
Dr. John P. Nestor
Ms Teresa Pun

Mr. Tarek Saghir
Ms Rebecca Spagnolo
Ms Maggy Stepanian
Ms Preet Viridi
Dr. John Wedge

Professor Ian Orchard, Vice-President
and Principal, University Of Toronto
at Mississauga
Ms Marilyn Van Norman, Director,
Student Services
Professor Ronald D. Venter, Vice-Provost,
Space and Facilities Planning

Secretariat:

Mr. Neil Dobbs
Mr. Andrew Drummond

Regrets:

Mr. Christopher M. Collins

Professor David Farrar

In Attendance:

Professor Angela Hildyard, Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity
Dr. Beata FitzPatrick, Assistant Vice-President and Director, Office of the President
Ms Christina Sass-Kortsak, Assistant Vice-President, Human Resources
Ms Tina Doyle, Manager, *AccessAbility* Services, University of Toronto at Scarborough
Ms Kaye Francis, Director, Family Care Office
Ms Connie Guberman, Status of Women Officer
Mr. Paul Holmes, Chief Returning Officer, Governing Council elections
Ms Myra Lefkowitz, Manager, Health and Well-Being Programs and Services
Ms Elizabeth Martin, Manager, *AccessAbility* Resource Centre, University of Toronto at
Mississauga

REPORT NUMBER 124 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – November 9, 2004

In Attendance (Cont'd)

Ms Rosie Parnass, Quality of Work Life Advisor and Special Assistant to the Vice-President,
Human Resources and Equity
Ms Caroline Rabbat, Community Safety Coordinator
Ms Paddy Stamp, Sexual Harassment Officer
Mr. Mahadeo Sukhai, President, Graduate Students' Union
Ms Jude Tate, Coordinator, The Office of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer
Resources and Programs
Professor Charmaine C. Williams, Race Relations and Anti-Racism Initiatives Officer

ITEM 2 CONTAINS A RECOMMENDATION TO THE GOVERNING COUNCIL FOR APPROVAL. ITEM 3 CONTAINS A CONCURRENCE WITH A RECOMMENDATION OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD.

1. Report of the Previous Meeting

Report Number 123 (September 28, 2004) was approved.

2. Election Guidelines, 2005

The Chair conveyed the regrets of Professor Michael Marrus, the Chair of the Elections Committee, who was unable to be present at this time because of an academic commitment.

Mr. Holmes presented the proposed *Election Guidelines, 2005*. They had been developed after consultation with the University community, including a public meeting held on October 4, 2004. The proposed amendments to the *Guidelines* reflected suggestions by students who had gone through the election process as well as experience with the current *Guidelines*. The vast majority of the changes represented clarifications and updating of practice. The three major changes were as follows. First, the campaign period for web-based voting had been reduced to two weeks, the second of which corresponded with the voting period. The campaign period had been two weeks prior to 2004, when it had been increased to three weeks including the voting period. The reduction represented a return to earlier practice of a two-week campaign period, but with the inclusion of the one-week voting period. Second, candidates would be permitted to claim expenses incurred prior to the campaign period but following the announcement of the candidates. Examples of such expenses included the costs of designing and printing posters and establishing web-sites. Third, to address privacy concerns, voters' lists and mailing labels would no longer be made available to candidates. Mr. Holmes said that he had made every effort to coordinate the timing of the Governing Council student elections with those of the Students' Administrative Council elections.

Mr. Holmes took under advisement two questions, and undertook to provide answers to the members. First, would it be possible to provide information concerning the level of voter participation on the three campuses? Second, what was the reason for the discrepancy between

REPORT NUMBER 124 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – November 9, 2004

2. Election Guidelines, 2005 (Cont'd)

the number of part-time students eligible to vote in the Governing Council elections in 2004 and the substantially larger membership of the Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students?

On the recommendation of the Elections Committee,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the proposed *Election Guidelines 2005*, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix “A”, be approved.

THE FOLLOWING ITEMS ARE REPORTED FOR INFORMATION.

3. Capital Project: University of Toronto at Scarborough Food Services Revitalization

Professor Venter said that the past few years had seen the completion of a number of buildings at UTSC to accommodate a substantial increase in enrolment. It was clear that, following that expansion, there was an inadequate number of food-service places at the campus. In 2000-01, there had been 471 cafeteria seats to accommodate over 4,600 students or 9.8 students per seat. The new Student Centre, opened in 2004, contained a further 200 seats, but at the same time enrolment had increased to nearly 7,400 students meaning 11 students per seat. Enrolment was projected to grow even further. Therefore UTSC was looking to establish more cafeteria spaces, which would also serve as student space at times other than mealtimes. The proposal was to convert space in the original building that had previously served as a cafeteria to that use again. The outcome would be to restore availability to nine students per seat. While that outcome would still be inadequate, it would represent a major improvement. Professor Venter had been asked at a previous meeting if there were benchmarks for the appropriate number of food-service seats. There were no such benchmarks because a great deal depended on location. On the St. George Campus, for example, there was a large number of inexpensive restaurants within easy walking distance. The situation at UTSC was not comparable. The funding sources for the proposed project were listed and did not include additional borrowing.

A member observed that the funding sources included \$200,000 from the catering company that provided the food service at UTSC. Would that result in higher prices to student users? Professor Venter replied that the caterer's contract required contributions to cover part of the cost of providing food-service equipment.

REPORT NUMBER 124 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – November 9, 2004

3. Capital Project: University of Toronto at Scarborough Food Services Revitalization (Cont'd)

On the recommendation of the Vice-Provost, Space and Facilities Planning,

YOUR BOARD CONCURS

with the prospective recommendation of the Academic Board

THAT the Project Planning Report for the University of Toronto at Scarborough Food Service Revitalization Project be approved in principle.

4. Report of the Elections Committee

(a) Report Number 36 - September 24, 2004

(b) Report Number 37 - October 18, 2004

The Board received for information Reports Number 36 and 37 of the Elections Committee. Report Number 36 included the Report on Elections, 2004, and Report Number 37 included the proposed *Election Guidelines* for 2005 (see above).

5. Chair's Remarks

The Chair observed that this meeting was one of the most significant meetings of the year of any Governing Council Board. The report on the work of the equity offices was growing in importance each year, and that work clearly set the standard for most post-secondary institutions. He specially welcomed Professor Orchard to the meeting, and noted that his previous service as Vice-Provost, Students had been a major factor in the University's achievements in the area of equity. The Chair reported that it had been his intention that the full meeting would be devoted to the report of the equity offices. While it had proven necessary to take care of a few other items at this meeting, the Chair hoped and anticipated that those items would be dealt with expeditiously. The report of the equity offices would remain the main focus for the meeting.

The Chair reported that he had received the following letter from the President.

Because I will be speaking at the memorial service for the Reverend A.B.B. Moore, a distinguished Canadian and former Chancellor of the University of Toronto, I cannot attend the meeting of the UAB on November 9, 2004.

I regret this very much for many reasons, principal of which is that your meeting will be reviewing the various Equity reports and developments of the University. One of the great positive changes I have seen since returning to U of T has been the

REPORT NUMBER 124 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – November 9, 2004

5. Chair's Remarks (Cont'd)

great commitment to equity issues that is reflected not only in the dedication of the talented leaders in these areas, but also the importance that the University community has given to the development and promotion of enlightened attitudes, policies and procedures in these areas.

In this respect, in my over sixteen years as a judge, I can say that I am proudest of the work I did in the areas of discrimination, equality, and human rights law. To see how the University of Toronto responds to these important issues is to me both an inspiration and continuing challenge, such that we must maintain our efforts to ensure further progress and success. For our University to be a leader in these areas of human interaction is a goal I enthusiastically endorse.

Please accept and convey my regrets to your colleagues at the Board and keep up all great work. Sincerely, Frank Iacobucci.

The Chair drew members' attention to copies of two recent numbers of the very interesting student newspaper from the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC), the *Underground*. One contained a very good article on student government at UTSC. The Chair would from time to time arrange for the distribution of publications to which members might not have easy access.

The Chair noted that Ramadan continued this week, and Muslim members were required to fast until sunset. He would, therefore, call a five-minute recess at 5:00 p.m. to enable those members to break their fast.

6. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting

Item 7 – Senior Assessor's Report – Policy on Compulsory Non-Academic Incidental Fees: Withholding of Fees from *the Varsity*

Ms Addario reported that *the Varsity* had now completed elections to its Board, and Student Affairs had asked the Student Accounts Department to commence the transfer of the student fee to support *the Varsity*.

7. Equity Offices: Annual Report

The Chair recalled that he had noted at Orientation that the University Affairs Board was responsible for consideration of matters of a non-academic nature that directly concerned the quality of life on campus. The Report of the Equity Offices addressed the quality of life for all members of the University community: students, faculty and staff, from part-time employees to senior administrators. The standards of equity/accessibility applied equally to all. For this reason, the Chair believed that the Board's attention to, and support of, those services should be

REPORT NUMBER 124 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – November 9, 2004**7. Equity Offices: Annual Report (Cont'd)**

considered among its important duties. Leveling the playing field for all who came to the University to study or to work should be of the utmost importance to the Board.

Professor Hildyard expressed her great pleasure in presenting the report to the Board. The presentation would be somewhat different this year from previous years, when it had been difficult for the Board to give full attention to a large number of individual reports – especially to those reports presented later on the agenda. For that reason, the equity officers had selected a number of critical issues that intersected all of their reports. The officers would report on each of the themes, followed by discussion of each. Members would then be invited to ask questions or make comments on the individual reports. Professor Hildyard noted that equity issues had been added to her portfolio about one year ago, and she was working to broaden the effort to address those issues by including the participation of the Assistant Vice-President, Human Resources, the Manager of the Health and Well-Being Programs and Services Office, and the Quality of Work Life Advisor. This broader focus would help to address the range of the diversity, accessibility and equity issues facing the University.

Ms Guberman said that the equity officers welcomed the opportunity to share the contents of their work with the Board. The officers assumed that members had read their reports and were aware of their activities in past year. The officers had met to identify issues affecting all of their offices. Those issues were not necessarily large ones but they could be described as simmering, systemic issues. Those issues arose across the equity offices. They were often not the presenting issues that brought individuals to the offices, but they were ones that affected the entire experience of the faculty, staff and students at the University. Those issues were: climate, safety, and parental leave / child care. Those issues manifested the complexity of working and studying in the University's environment. The equity officers hoped that by identifying those simmering issues they could be dealt with before they became too difficult. Ms Guberman noted that quite a number of University officers apart from those whose reports were before the Board were members of the Equity Issues Advisory Group and worked to achieve the objectives of that Group. They included the Manager of Health and Well-Being Programs and Services, the Quality of Work Life Advisor, the Proactive Recruitment Advisor, and the Employment Equity Advisor.

Professor Williams addressed the question of the social climate of the University. The matter of climate affected the work of all of the equity officers. The basic question was: do people feel welcome at the University of Toronto? The matter was multi-dimensional. It was necessary to ask why the University's systems and environment worked for some people and not for others. Why did some people feel a part of the University and others not? The University's systems were rather complex. They served many students, but the kind of students attending the University was changing. A far smaller proportion of students could be described as typical or traditional students. Many of the non-traditional students required assistance to study at the University and to obtain the formal and informal information they required to succeed. To provide that assistance, the University had to examine its systems to identify and eliminate unnecessary barriers. It had to provide an environment that was healthy and nurturing.

REPORT NUMBER 124 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – November 9, 2004**7. Equity Offices: Annual Report (Cont'd)**

While the University of Toronto was an exciting place to study and work, there were clearly drawbacks as illustrated by the need for a recent campaign to urge members of the University to take time for a lunch break. For students, barriers included difficulties in finding housing, obtaining sufficient funding, and studying without feeling discrimination and exclusion. It was important that the University work proactively to deal with those problems through education and training and through sponsorship of social events that would promote a nurturing and healthy environment and a sense of community, in which students would feel connected to the University. While there were many outreach efforts, some students were not reached and they felt excluded. In some cases, visible minority students and women concluded that their exclusion was an outcome not of general factors but rather an outcome of their race and gender. That feeling was often reinforced by the personal interactions with University staff that they perceived as negative. Because of the time pressures caused by a lack of resources, staff members might deal with students in an impersonal manner, but again the students might well conclude that their treatment was the result of their gender or race. It was very important that the University act to reduce this sense of alienation because a perceived negative climate had an impact on all members of the community. The equity officers clearly had a role to play in proactive efforts to improve the University's social climate, but they would need the support of all members of the University.

In response to a member's questions, Professor Williams and Ms Parnass provided concrete examples of the outcome of systemic and climate problems. A designated-group student with an enquiry might encounter a very busy staff member who provided only sketchy information in a rushed manner or who only referred the student to written or web-based material to find her answer. A female faculty member might encounter a lack of understanding from her chair in her efforts to combine her professional and family responsibilities. Those individuals might easily conclude that the University officers' actions were not generally rushed and insensitive but that their actions were directed only at people like them – students in a designated group or women faculty.

Ms Rabbat observed that tremendous strides had been made at the University in combating discrimination, harassment and oppression, and the University could be proud of its personal safety record relative to that in its metropolitan area. But notwithstanding the University's policies and services and educational initiatives, there remained a real concern about personal safety and the perception of risks to personal safety on campus. Dealing with this problem required more than emergency telephones and crime prevention efforts. The perception of risk to safety on the part of many members of the University involved a combination of the social climate and an individual's race, religion, gender or disability. The perception of risk to safety in turn caused fear and immobility. Remedy of this problem was complex and required work with numerous University offices including the registrars' offices and Student Affairs. Ms Rabbat provided a number of cases that served as examples of the problem. The first was of a lesbian / gay / bisexual / transgendered / queer (LGBTQ) undergraduate student who overheard fellow students expressing homophobic sentiments in discussing graffiti they had seen. The

REPORT NUMBER 124 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – November 9, 2004**7. Equity Offices: Annual Report (Cont'd)**

student, from a socially conservative family, was also enrolled in a course taught by a professor known to be unfriendly towards LGBTQ students. The student not surprisingly began to feel unsafe in relationships with other LGBTQ students and with straight students. While the homophobic graffiti were removed, the feeling of lack of safety continued and had a very negative effect on the student's academic work. Sadly, students with such experiences often did not come forward, making University action to improve the climate on campus all the more important. A second example concerned a twenty-year old woman student in an abusive relationship. The student relied on her family for financial support. Her family was unaware of her being in an intimate relationship, and because of their cultural and religious beliefs would have strongly disapproved of it. Following a particular incident, the student wished to end the abusive relationship, but she feared to do so lest the other party make her parents aware of the relationship. Her fear of the repercussions of disclosure outweighed her wish to end the relationship. Again, the problem took a toll on the student's ability to do her academic work. A final example concerned the need of a student for assistance in note-taking in class. The instructor, in a very insensitive manner, disclosed the student's need for assistance to the entire class, making the student feel insecure and unsafe in the class. In all of those cases and others, the students' perception of threat made the environment an unsafe one to pursue their studies.

Ms Francis addressed the need for child care as an important equity issue. She stressed, however, that the equity needs extended beyond child care to the broader subject of managing and balancing family responsibilities including, for example, the need of a faculty member for accommodation to provide elder care or care for a child with a disability; a student's need for accommodation from a professor to care for a sick parent; a staff member's need for a flexible work schedule to pick up a baby from day care; or a faculty member's need for departmental support in connection with maternity leave.

Ms Francis said that the University of Toronto had demonstrated its commitment to child care accessibility for students, staff and faculty. In the past two or three years, the University had established the Early Learning Centre; relocated the Campus and Community Co-op daycare to ensure its continuing affiliation with the University; initiated a relationship with George Brown College to provide a child care centre in the Family Housing buildings; renovated that site to provide places for infants in the next year; established a joint committee of faculty, staff and students to examine the need for an on-campus daycare at the University of Toronto at Mississauga; and contracted with the child care provider Kids + Company to assist staff and faculty requiring back-up emergency child care. However, even with those advances, there remained a disparity between the need and availability of child care, and between financial cost and the resources available, especially to students, to meet their needs. For some student parents, the cost of child care disrupted their studies and even prevented their ability to continue in University. Potential students viewed the cost of child care, combined with tuition fees, as too high a hurdle to overcome. Waiting lists for child care sometimes impeded efforts to recruit and retain students, staff and faculty. Graduate students and younger faculty, including some men,

REPORT NUMBER 124 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – November 9, 2004**7. Equity Offices: Annual Report (Cont'd)**

often expressed concern about starting a family, wondering whether the social climate at the University would allow them to take a leave and raise a child without impeding their careers.

Ms Francis concluded that while the University had invested a substantial amount of money in child care, there were still students, staff and faculty who were looking for more on-campus daycare places, with extended hours and better subsidies. Others struggled with a social climate that did not welcome students, staff or faculty members' being pregnant, raising a family, or caring for an aging relative, and they struggled with situations in which the necessary flexibility and accommodation were not available. It was important that the Board and the University work to attract and retain students, staff and faculty with family responsibilities and work to establish a social climate that was family-friendly.

Ms Lefkowitz concluded the equity officers' report by saying that she hoped that the Board had had the opportunity to see the range and complexity of the issues faced by the equity offices, the interaction of the issues and the offices, and the range of resources available to students, faculty and staff. She hoped that the Board would have learned not only of the work of the individual offices but also of the institutional perspective on equity issues. The officers had endeavoured to point out the persistence of systemic barriers. While it was easy to conclude that the University had come a long way with the establishment and successful work of so many equity offices, there was still a long way to go. Equity issues were dynamic; when some issues were addressed, they evolved into something new. The University's academic plan, *Stepping UP*, had stated the University's ambitions in the area of equity. Achieving those ambitions would require the work not only of the equity offices but of all members of the University.

Among the more general matters that arose in discussion of the oral presentations and the equity-office reports were the following.

(a) Expressions of gratitude. In the course of discussion, several members thanked the officers for their work and congratulated them on its quality. It was highly beneficial to the University to have those services in place. A member particularly thanked Professor Williams for her work in carrying out her duties as Race-Relations and Anti-Racism Initiatives Officer more extensively than hitherto at the Mississauga and Scarborough Campuses and for making real progress in that work.

(b) Criminal harassment. A member observed that the Report of the Community Safety Coordinator showed an alarming increase in the number of cases of criminal harassment from 20 in 2002-03 (and a similar number in earlier years) to 53 in 2003-04. Ms Rabbat replied that the increase probably represented an increase in the number of incidents reported to her Office rather than an increase in the number of incidents actually taking place. The recent expansion of educational efforts had made the community more aware of the services available, likely leading to an increase in reporting.

REPORT NUMBER 124 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – November 9, 2004**7. Equity Offices: Annual Report (Cont'd)**

(c) Safety and sexual orientation. A member asked what steps could be taken to prevent students' feelings of insecurity arising from their sexual orientation. Ms Tate replied that achieving that objective would require very broad-ranging action to educate all members of the community on how people would be made to feel welcome in the community. No single tool would suffice. Ms Rabbat stressed the importance of forming a partnership with the University's faculty to help students to feel safe. That involved the promotion of broad understanding and dealing with students within their cultural and religious frameworks.

(d) Assisting students who feel unsafe. In response to questions, Ms Rabbat and Ms Guberman commented on the steps that were taken when students reported a threat or the perception of threat. A first step was to demonstrate the willingness of the University community to provide support and to take the matter seriously. It was necessary to explain to students their options - the courses of action that could be taken by them or on their behalf. It was not possible for the Community Safety Coordinator, for example, to impose a solution. Students who felt unsafe would not necessarily go to the Community Safety Coordinator. All of the equity officers (and other University staff) might deal with students who felt unsafe, and all would work to seek a resolution, often taking advice from the Community Safety Coordinator.

(e) Assisting students who require accommodation in courses. A member asked how the accessibility officers would deal with any case where students encountered difficulty in making requests for accommodation in courses. Would the officers work through the appropriate departmental chair to ensure appropriate arrangements? Ms Doyle replied that the best initial approach was to the instructor. Sometimes, the instructor was unaware that her/his response to a request was inappropriate. Only if that approach failed would an officer approach the department chair. Ms Doyle noted that there were also occasions where a student feared an approach to an instructor, lest there be repercussions to the student's grades. Professor Hildyard added that the administration had built appropriate segments into training programs for new faculty and new administrators. It was often relatively easy, through training efforts, to prevent the occurrence of problems. Ms Addario added that the Vice-Provost, Students had been invited to speak with the chairs of the departments of the Faculty of Arts and Science about the need to provide accommodation to students with special needs. This had led to the idea, emanating from the chairs themselves, of appointing accessibility advisers in each department. Through training and discussion, the University's faculty and academic administrators were proving to be willing to be actively engaged in finding solutions.

(f) Child care at the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM). In response to questions, Professor Orchard said that the child-care facility at UTM had closed two and one half years ago. It had been under-utilized and had not proven viable, and the student organizations had withdrawn their funding support. The population at UTM had grown since that time, and the Dean of Student Affairs had established a committee to review the needs and financial viability of a new on-campus daycare service. That Committee had consulted widely, including student groups and leaders. It was well known at UTM that the committee had been established and it

REPORT NUMBER 124 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – November 9, 2004**7. Equity Offices: Annual Report (Cont'd)**

would welcome further advice. It would also report to the Erindale College Council through its appropriate committee.

(g) Child care for graduate students at the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC).

A member observed that the Scarborough Campus Students' Union was undertaking efforts to make graduate students feel more included in the life of UTSC, and a concern for them was the availability of on-campus child care. Invited to respond, Ms Francis said that the mandate of her Office was at this time limited to the St. George Campus. The absence of Family Care Office services on the UTM and UTSC campuses represented an unfortunate gap.

(h) Back-up child care for student parents. A member noted that the University had engaged a service to provide emergency back-up care for the children of faculty and staff. Was such a service available to students? Ms Francis replied that such a service was not available for students at this time. She had raised the issue as one of concern.

(i) Advocacy efforts. A member observed that the success of equity efforts was influenced a great deal by the general social environment and by public authorities' handling of larger issues. Did the equity officers use their considerable expertise to contribute to the University's advocacy for favourable political outcomes? Professor Hildyard replied that the University had traditionally not played a broad advocacy role per se, but rather looked at advocacy within a higher education context. She added that Professor Farrar, Professor Hillan and herself were completing a review of the equity services infrastructure. One of their key recommendations would be the establishment of an Equity Advisory Board, a broadly representative group with representation of faculty, staff, students and scholars in the area of equity studies. That group would be a good source of advocacy within the University, providing advice to the senior administration. It was anticipated that the group would prepare an equity statement, linking activities to promote equity to the University's academic mission. That group would also capitalize upon excellent research on equity issues at the University. The establishment of the Advisory Board would lead to an interactive process for the discussion of equity issues at the University.

Ms Stamp added that the individual officers were engaged in advocacy activities, promoting the adoption of best practices in dealing with equity issues. In part, that advocacy was internal, for example working with registrars' offices and deans of residence. In part, their efforts were focused on more general education with respect to equity issues and advocacy of appropriate policy.

Ms Guberman also noted that the equity officers were members of various national and provincial associations, and worked through those organizations to advocate change.

REPORT NUMBER 124 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – November 9, 2004**7. Equity Offices: Annual Report (Cont'd)**

(j) Accessibility services on the three campuses. A member observed that there were separate accessibility services on the three campuses. Was there cooperation and leverage of resources among them? Were the three services able to provide an equal level of service? Ms Doyle replied that the offices were funded separately and reported to different individuals, but the officers did work co-operatively, identifying various themes and discussing best-practice actions.

Professor Orchard added that each service was mandated to respond to demand on its campus. Accessibility services were funded by the Government of Ontario, and the funding was distributed to the three campus-based services on a pro rata basis. Government funding was distributed among institutions on the basis of population rather than need; the outcome was that the level of funding at the University of Toronto, with its larger proportion of students requiring assistance, was insufficient. Therefore, it had become necessary for the all three campuses to provide a subsidy for their services. For example, the University of Toronto at Mississauga had provided a \$200,000 subsidy to its service in the current year – a substantial subsidy but one that was still insufficient.

The member who raised the question wondered whether the students using the services on the three campuses perceived that their needs were being met equally with those of the students on the other campuses.

Ms Addario said that, owing to students' choices, the distribution of students requiring the assistance of the accessibility offices was not evenly distributed among the three campuses. For example, because of their more recent construction, the UTM and UTSC campuses were better for undergraduate Arts and Science students with mobility limitations and chronic disabilities, while almost all students with hearing deficits enrolled on the St. George Campus. Providing sign-language services to such students was costly, in particular for graduate students who occasionally attended scientific or other scholarly conferences in other countries. The outcome was significant deficits for the accessibility services, which had to be met by the operating budget.

Ms Doyle reported that the administration at UTSC also provided funding to supplement that provided by the Province. In addition, the Scarborough Campus Students' Union provided funding to support certain services beyond the minimum required, for example the establishment of support groups.

(k) Other services on the three campuses. A member noted that there were accessibility services on all three campus. With some of the other services, there was a single University-wide service that provided assistance to members of the University at UTM and UTSC. Ms Francis had acknowledged that the Family Care Office provided service only on the St. George Campus. She asked about the Sexual Harassment Education, Counselling and Compliance Office.

Ms Stamp replied that she made regular visits to the UTM and UTSC campuses. A real

REPORT NUMBER 124 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – November 9, 2004**7. Equity Offices: Annual Report (Cont'd)**

concern, however, was the absence of office space available to her on those campuses – an important factor given the need for privacy for people who wished to consult her.

(l) Services to students with learning disabilities. Ms Addario said that the Government of Ontario had funded special assistance for secondary-school students with learning disabilities. That very successful program had led to a substantially greater number of such students gaining admission to the University of Toronto. The University had an obligation to provide accommodation and services to that larger number of students.

(m) Poster series. Professor Hildyard said that Student Affairs was releasing a series of posters, featuring individual students, from various programs and at various levels of study, who had achieved exceptional accomplishments and who had identified themselves as having a disability. That students were willing to disclose their sometimes hidden disabilities, including depression, so publicly, demonstrated that those individuals were finding that their needs were being addressed at the University. That in turn was a credit to the efforts of the equity officers and other faculty and staff who were working with students with disabilities.

(n) Absence of support for students' access to extracurricular activities. Ms Hancock advised the Board that funding did not extend to providing students access to clubs, committees and other aspects of University life beyond the classroom. That represented a serious inequity to students with disabilities.

(o) Child abuse and neglect. A member asked if the officers became aware of cases of child abuse or neglect and, if so, what steps were taken. Ms Francis replied that she did become aware of such cases. The Family Care office was not mandated to provide support to abused children. It did have a duty to report such cases to the appropriate authorities. Ms Addario noted that the Student Crisis Response Office and the Family Care Office participated in training the staff who offered programs that brought young children to campus, programs such as Camp U of T, operated by the Faculty of Physical Education and Health. It was important that the staff running those programs be aware of the symptoms of child abuse and that they know how to make the appropriate referrals.

(p) Format for the report and Board discussion. The Chair invited members and equity officers to comment on the new format used for the presentation of the report of the equity offices and the discussion of issues arising from the report. Those present indicated their support for the new format. The Chair invited members and equity officers to provide any specific suggestions to him. The format of the meeting would be reviewed at a planning meeting over the summer. The Chair thanked Professor Hildyard and the equity officers for their work in developing the new format.

REPORT NUMBER 124 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – November 9, 2004

7. Equity Offices: Annual Report (Cont'd)

The Chair reported that one member had found a specific matter in a report that had been a cause of great concern to her. The member had raised the matter in advance and had held conversations with the particular equity officer and the Chair, and had cleared up her concern about the matter before the meeting. He commended the member for that initiative and urged others similarly to read materials well in advance and to be in touch with assessors about specific questions or concerns.

The Chair thanked the equity officers for their very informative written reports and for their excellent oral presentation. He thanked them particularly for their great diligence in carrying out their duties and for their obvious concern for the clients they served so well.

8. Date of Next Meeting

The Chair reminded members that the next regular meeting was scheduled for Tuesday, January 18, 2005 at 4:30 p.m.

9. Other Business

Ms Addario reported that the University was in the midst of a **Peace Week** program, a week of presentations, forums, music, art and reflection on the prospect of creating a sustainable culture of peace. Sponsors included the Graduate Students' Union, the Arts and Science Students' Union, Hart House, the Social Justice Committee and the campus chaplains. She drew members attention to a poster showing the schedule of events.

Ms Addario drew members' attention to a colloquium entitled Keeping the Faith scheduled for November 18. The **colloquium** dealt with the **experience of various faith communities in using techniques of alternative dispute resolution**. The colloquium was sponsored by the Office of Student Affairs, the Status of Women Office and the Faculty of Law Diversity Committee. Again, Ms Addario drew members attention to copies of the poster for the event.

THE BOARD MOVED IN CAMERA.

On motion duly made and seconded, it was RESOLVED

THAT, pursuant to Section 33(ii) of By-Law Number 2, the Board continue its meeting *in camera* to consider the proposed appointment of the University Affairs Board members of the Service Ancillaries Review Group and of the Board's Striking Committee.

REPORT NUMBER 124 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – November 9, 2004

10. Service Ancillaries Review Group (SARG): Appointment of University Affairs Board Members

On motion duly made and seconded, it was RESOLVED

THAT the following be appointed to the Service Ancillaries Review Group for 2004-05:

Dr. Claude S. Davis (Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council appointee)
Mr. Chris McGrath (administrative staff; University of Toronto at Mississauga)
Ms Preet Viridi (student; University of Toronto at Scarborough)

11. Striking Committee: Appointment for 2004-05

On motion duly made and seconded, it was RESOLVED

THAT the following be appointed to the University Affairs Board Striking Committee for 2004-05:

Dr. Robert Bennett (Chair)
Dr. Claude S. Davis (Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council appointee)
Dr. John P. Nestor (alumnus)
Ms Teresa Pun (student)
Ms Rebecca Spagnolo (administrative staff)
Professor John Wedge (teaching staff)

THE BOARD RETURNED TO OPEN SESSION.

The meeting adjourned at 6:20 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

November 25, 2004