UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

REPORT NUMBER 89 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD

January 11, 2000

To the Governing Council,
University of Toronto.

Your Board reports that it held a meeting on Tuesday, January 11, 2000, at 5:00 p.m. in the East
Common Room, Hart House, at which the following were present:

Mr. Brian C. Burchell (In the Chair)
Ms Nancy L. Watson (Vice-Chair)
Professor J. Robert S. Prichard, President
Ms Susan Addario, Director,
    Student Affairs
Professor Ethel Auster
Dr. Robert Bennett
Dr. Shari Graham Fell
Ms Margaret Hancock
Professor Bruce Kidd
Mr. Vivek Krishnamurthy
Dr. Heather Lane
Ms Alicia Maund
Professor Ian R. McDonald
Mr. Ahmed Rafi Mian
Mr. Jonathan Papoulidis
Ms Mary Ann Pilskalnietis

Mr. Kashif S. Pirzada
Mr. Robert G. Spencer
Ms Wendy Talfourd-Jones
Ms Sally Walker

Non-Voting Members:

Mr. Louis R. Charpentier, Secretary of the
   Governing Council
Miss Janice Oliver, Assistant Vice-President
   Facilities and Services
Ms Marilyn Van Norman, Director, Student
   Services

Secretariat:

Ms Margaret McKone

Regrets:

The Honourable William G. Davis
Professor Ian Orchard, Vice-Provost, Students
Ms Rosie Parnass

In Attendance:

Mr. Elan Ohayon, member, the Governing Council
Professor Adel Sedra, member, the Governing Council, and Vice-President and Provost
Dr. Jon S. Dellandrea, Vice-President and Chief Development Officer
Professor Carolyn Tuohy, Deputy Provost
Mr. Tad Brown, Finance and Development Counsel
Mr. Jim Delaney, Manager, Liaison and Campus Life Services, Office of Student Affairs
Ms Rivi Frankle, Director of Alumni and Development
Ms Susan Girard, Chief Returning Officer, Governing Council Elections
Mr. Paul Kutasi, Vice-President, Students' Administrative Council
Ms Manon Le Paven, President, Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students
Mr. Kasi Rao, Director of the Office of the President and Director of Government Relations
Ms Angela Snikkar, Student Information Systems
Mr. Paul Tsang, President, Graduate Students' Union

1. **Report of the Previous Meeting**

   The Chair drew attention to two minor amendments respecting a member's name and a guest's title.

   > On motion duly moved and seconded,
   >
   > YOUR BOARD APPROVED
   >
   > Report Number 88 of the University Affairs Board (November 1, 1999), as amended.

2. **Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting**

   Item 5 - Expanding Residence Capacity at the University of Toronto

   The Chair recalled that at the previous meeting a member had suggested that the use of undesignated funds raised from the campaign for down payments towards new residences would greatly enhance the affordability of residences for students, a key objective to the development of new residences.

   Invited to comment, Professor Sedra noted that student residences had not proven to be an attractive priority for prospective major donors, many of whom preferred to designate their donations towards endowed chairs. Undesignated funds previously raised under the campaign amounted to approximately $27 million. The Governing Council had recently approved the use of these funds for matching purposes. Professor Sedra provided assurance that the University was very much committed to providing new residences that were affordable to students. While funding sources for down payments had not yet been identified, he gave his commitment that residences would be affordable and would not be more expensive than existing residences. As well, assistance under the University's *Policy on Student Financial Support* would be available to those students unable to meet their residence costs.

   Dr. Dellandrea agreed that it was not easy to raise funds for residences. The vast majority of funds raised were designated by donors towards other academic priorities.

   The member who had raised the matter at the previous meeting suggested that when approached by future benefactors who had not yet determined the designation of their donations, the administration encourage them to consider designating all or some of their donation towards residences. For example, a $2 million donation towards a down payment would help lower residence fees considerably.

   A member asked if there was a perception among potential benefactors that residences were considered to be a second-class priority for the University.

   Dr. Dellandrea indicated that this was not his impression. He clarified that he did not advise potential donors who had not yet determined a designation for their funds. Rather, Professor Sedra provided guidance based on the approved campaign priorities which, in turn, were derived from divisional academic plans.

   A member asked if there was a donation threshold that would provide for the naming of a residence after a major benefactor. Dr. Dellandrea responded in the affirmative, noting that there had been at least one instance in which discussions had taken place with a potential donor for the naming of a new residence. Regrettably, these discussions had not come to fruition.

3. *Election Guidelines for 2000* - Introduction of Web-based Voting

The Chair noted that editorial or updating amendments to the election guidelines were approved by the University Affairs Board. Major amendments to policy or procedures relating to the conduct of elections required the approval of the Governing Council, as was the case with this recommendation. He invited Ms Wendy Talfourd-Jones, Chair of the Elections Committee, to introduce the proposal.

(a)   Introduction

Ms Talfourd-Jones noted that she was pleased to bring to the Board for its consideration a recommendation that the undergraduate student elections for the Governing Council for the 2000-01 election be conducted by web-based voting. The second part of the recommendation concerned the approval of the Election Guidelines, incorporating that method of voting.

She continued that methods of electing the undergraduate students had changed several times over the past fifteen years. Until 1987, ballots had been mailed to the undergraduate students. Then there had been a change to ballot box elections, held in conjunction with the Students' Administrative Council. With the advent of the TCard and the loss of the registration sticker, interim measures to vary the ballot box elections had been proposed for last year's elections and for the past fall's by-election. Both measures had had their problems and had been viewed as interim. As early as 1992, the Elections Committee had been looking for an alternative method of voting; now an alternative had become a necessity with the TCard, which, she noted, had not been designed with elections in mind. Last year, the Committee had reported that it was looking at the feasibility of web-based voting, and she was pleased to present the report, recommending web-based voting, to the Board. She emphasized that web-based voting was being proposed for undergraduate students only; graduate students would continue to receive their ballots by mail.

Staff members of the Student Information Systems were currently finalizing the program for web-based voting. It would use the new student record system, ROSI, to verify the validity of voters. It would use the definitions of full-time and part-time students which were part of the Election Guidelines. Students would be asked to provide their ROSI login ID or student number and a PIN. For those students who had not previously used ROSI, the PIN would be their birthdate in the first instance and then they would be asked to select a new PIN. She noted that all students were required to maintain their addresses on ROSI and use it to order transcripts. The use made of ROSI to add or delete courses depended on decisions made by the various faculties or programs. The familiarity with ROSI might vary among the students, but the voting program would be simple and easy to follow.

Ms Talfourd-Jones noted that Ms Susan Girard, the Chief Returning Officer of Governing Council Elections, and Ms Angela Snikkar, from Student Information Systems, were both present to answer any questions members might have. She noted one minor editorial change to the *Guidelines*. With the approval of the new *Policy and Procedures on Academic Appointments*, the definition of "teaching staff" on page 6 should be revised to include the new designations of Lecturer and Senior Lecturer.

> It was duly moved and seconded,
>
> THAT the 2000 election for undergraduate student representatives on Governing Council be conducted by web-based voting.
>
> THAT the Election Guidelines 2000, dated December 9, 1999, as amended, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 19 of the Election Committee as Appendix "A", be approved.

3. *Election Guidelines for 2000* **- Introduction of Web-based Voting** (cont'd)

(b)　　Addresses by Non-members

During the course of the Board's discussion on the merits of the proposal, the Chair recognized the following non-members.

Mr. Paul Kutasi, Vice-President, Students' Administrative Council

Mr. Kutasi agreed that the introduction of the TCard had posed problems for the voting process; however, he did not know why the Elections Committee had not consulted directly with the Students' Administrative Council. The proposed changes affected both full and part-time undergraduate students. He continued that SAC had been approached by a representative of the Office of Student Affairs during the summer to discuss a pilot-project for running the fall by-election. Web-based voting had been one of the many options being pursued by SAC. He wondered if the Governing Council would provide financial assistance so that the SAC elections could also be run by web-based voting consecutively with the Governing Council web-based elections.

Mr. Paul Tsang, President, Graduate Students' Union

Mr. Tsang explained that web-based voting was an issue on which the GSU had been working for a number years. He noted that there had been no consultation on the proposal with the GSU or SAC. He continued that the Board should give very serious consideration to the proposal as it was being asked to make a decision that would affect the future of the democratic process for election of students to the Governing Council. He noted that some students had limited access to computer terminals and there were often long line-ups for their use. Not all students had access to computers at home, and of those who did, not all had access to the web. Also, gaining access to the web from home was not always possible. Students with minimum or no technological experience might have difficulty in following the program for web-based voting. Mr. Tsang suggested that the administration should focus instead on the issue of the TCard. He noted that a recommendation of the TCard Review Committee had indicated that voting in student elections was not a TCard issue; however, this had not proven to be the case. As well there were other problems associated with the use of the TCard.

(c)　　Discussion

Several members expressed reservations about the proposed move to web-based voting and raised the following concerns:

- a web-based system posed a potential for fraudulent voting (computer hackers could get into the system and cast illegal votes);
- there were accessibility concerns (i.e. access to computers was affected by class and income because not all students had home computers and access to the web. Single parents were limited in the days and hours that they could utilize University services, including computer terminals, because of classes, working, and daycare hours. The proposal would, therefore, increase accessibility for some students and limit accessibility for students in poverty, a group that was already marginalized. A member noted that was a concern supported also by the Women's Centre);
- the Elections Committee had not consulted with representatives from the Students' Administrative Council, the representative organization for those students who would be affected by the proposal;
- the proposal did not also extend to the elections run by the Students' Administrative Council, which were currently run consecutively with the Governing Council elections;

3. *Election Guidelines for 2000* **- Introduction of Web-based Voting** (cont'd)

- students might be required to wait in line-ups to gain access to terminals at the Information Commons;
- while not perfect, the current system of voting that required students to vote at central locations utilizing the TCard did in fact work. The cost of $50,000 to move to the new system was, therefore, not warranted;
- there were privacy and security concerns associated with on-line voting (one member noted that his PIN had been stolen in the past, which had led to his enrolment in an unwanted course);
- the issue of web-based voting for student elections had previously been discussed by SAC, GSU and APUS. SAC and GSU had been opposed to the move because of technical and privacy issues;
- technical issues believed to be problematical included:
    - there was an on-line connection to student records, thereby posing a risk to the integrity of the student record system;
    - it was not always possible to access information systems because of system crashes and existing web problems;
- voter participation would not necessarily be increased with the move to web-based voting (this had not been the case as had been expected when mailed ballots were first introduced for graduate students);
- the nostalgia of a ballot box election was lost through mailed ballots and web-based voting;
- there might be less visibility to the elections given that there would be no dedicated polling stations.

During discussion, members offered the following suggestions for improving the voting process:

- given the stated concerns, alternative voting procedures might be preferable (e.g. having polling stations with access to the University backbone, whereby poll clerks could swipe the TCard and gain the required information about the student);
- instead of web-based voting, the administration should pursue electronic voting by setting up dedicated terminals at public locations on campus. Security would be greatly enhanced as the results would be fed into an internal University network rather than the Internet; and
- if the proposal for web-based voting was approved, the following should be undertaken
    - all computer terminals at the University should display the election web page, rather than only those computers at the Information Commons. This would greatly increase the visibility of the election process; and
    - the advertising budget should be greatly expanded to increase the visibility of the elections (e.g. hire students to hand out flyers);
- the administration should create a think-tank to address this and other problems associated with the TCard; and
- separating the identification chip from the TCard was viable and would address many of the problems that had arisen from the TCard.

Invited to respond to member's comments, Ms Girard noted that Mr. Jim Delaney could speak to consultations he had undertaken with student groups concerning the proposal. Also, Ms Angela Snikkar could address the likelihood of fraudulent voting, the potential for hacking and privacy issues.

3. *Election Guidelines for 2000* **- Introduction of Web-based Voting** (cont'd)

Ms Girard addressed the need for the move to web-based voting. The University of Toronto Act stipulated that students within each constituency could vote only for Governing Council candidates within their constituency. The TCard was problematic because it had not been designed for elections. The previous student card had had a registration sticker for each year in which the student had registered. The sticker had contained a number of boxes, one of which had been designated for notation that a student had voted in a Governing Council election. This method provided for students to vote at any polling station while it ensured that they voted only once.

When the TCard had first been introduced, students who had been issued these cards had been asked to sign a statement indicating they had voted only once. For the by-election held this past fall, the TCard had been used to identify students; however students had been required to vote at their colleges where there were unique voters' lists for each college. Many students had expressed dissatisfaction with the system as they were not always in close proximity to their colleges.

One option that had been discussed by the Elections Committee was having unique listings of eligible voters at centralized locations (e.g. Sidney Smith Hall and within each of the professional faculties). This still posed issues of accessibility which needed to be addressed. With the advent of ROSI, the Elections Committee had pursued the possibility of web-based voting.

In response to some of the concerns raised, Ms Girard believed that students would not experience difficulty in following the simple program that had been designed. There would be extended hours for voting, thus maximizing the probability for increased voter participation. There was an abundance of terminals in the Information Commons and across campus on which students could vote. As well, each of the suburban campuses had a number of public-access terminals available for student use. With respect to the advertising of the Governing Council elections, Ms Girard agreed that a lot more could be done. Each candidate would be asked to flag the Governing Council web site on his or her campaign posters. The website for the Governing Council would contain an explanation of the election process and procedures. As well, more prominent advertisements could be placed in the student press and sandwich boards could be placed outside the Information Commons. With respect to accessibility, she noted that there were many terminals within the Information Commons and that the hours for voting would be from 7:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m. and would continue over seven days. This should provide adequate opportunity for students who wished to do so to participate in the election process. Voter turnout in the previous by-election had been only 2.5%. She believed that web-based voting would provide an opportunity to improve on this level of participation.

A member who had served on the Elections Committee spoke in support of the proposal. In response to a previous member's concern regarding accessibility, he suggested that the voting be extended to every computer station within the various colleges and computer labs. If students were on campus, it would take the same amount of time to vote on a computer terminal as it would to visit a polling station and cast a paper ballot. He continued that there were "fire walls" that provided extra protection against hackers. He agreed that greater publicity was required, including publications in the *Varsity* and notices/posters in the physical spaces where students would have access to computer terminals.

In response to a question from the Chair regarding the timelines associated with the proposal, Ms Girard clarified that should the proposal not be approved by the Governing Council at its next meeting, the procedures for the upcoming elections would be the same as those in the recent by-election.

3. *Election Guidelines for 2000 -* **Introduction of Web-based Voting** (cont'd)

The Chair noted that he had observed a lack of consensus and a sense of unease among Board members. At least one member had defined an option that had not been but should be explored. It was crucial that members had before them a complete set of options and advice. There had been allegations of a lack of consultation which should be addressed so that the Board could be confident that those who would be affected by the proposal had been consulted. There were also some unresolved technical questions. Debate had taken place on questions of what computers could and could not do; however, this was not the right forum for this kind of technical discussion. If it was the decision of the Board that the motion be tabled, for the sake of having elections that were legitimate and reliable, the Board might have to have a special meeting in the coming weeks prior to the next meeting of the Governing Council. He then invited a motion to adjourn the debate. This motion was non-debatable. If so adjourned, the motion would appear as a matter of course on the agenda for the next regular meeting.

It was duly moved and seconded,

THAT debate be adjourned.

The vote on the motion was taken.
The motion was carried.

4. **Hart House: Constitution - Revisions**

Ms Addario introduced the proposal. The Hart House Board of Stewards had jurisdiction to appoint and abolish Standing Committees. Under the existing arrangement, the responsibility for outreach to students at the University of Toronto at Scarborough and the University of Toronto at Mississauga fell to the student representatives on the Board of Stewards. Last year, Hart House had created a suburban campus outreach fund in its budget, to provide the resources to conduct outreach to students on the suburban campuses around Hart House programs and facilities. This fall, the Board of Stewards had been presented with a proposal by the University of Toronto at Scarborough representative to create a new standing committee, which would provide a forum for students at Scarborough with regard to Hart House activities. The Board had passed this motion at its meeting in October, 1999.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

The following revisions to the Constitution of Hart House:

1. Section 9, Subsection J: include the University of Toronto at Scarborough Standing Committee in the list of Standing Committees.

2. Section 9, Subsection K: remove this subsection which currently states "A student representative of the University of Toronto at Scarborough".

3. Section 19: include the University of Toronto at Scarborough Standing Committee in the list of Standing Committees.

5. **Policy on Licensing of the University of Toronto Name**

The Chair welcomed Dr. Jon Dellandrea, Vice-President and Chief Development Officer.

Dr. Dellandrea noted that responsibility for use and licensing of the University of Toronto name fell within the jurisdiction of the University Affairs Board. The responsibility for the day-to-day administration of this rested within his portfolio. He then provided members with the following background information.

In the fall of 1998 it had become apparent that there was need for the University to look at the issue of developing a policy on licensing the University's name and insignia. Shortly thereafter, various student groups had offered their assistance in the development of a policy, which the administration had been pleased to accept. The issue of sweatshops had become increasingly important to students across North America and the University had created an *ad hoc* task force composed of faculty, student leaders, and administrative staff. This task force had examined the issue from a variety of perspectives from the fall, 1998 to the spring 1999, at which time it had brought forward its initial thinking on what shape a policy might take. Since the spring, 1999, additional information had come to light, highlighting the complexity of the issue. This was further confirmed by events at the World Trade Organization Summit held recently in Seattle.

Dr. Dellandrea proceeded to outline the administration's present thinking.

1. The University will take a principled stand on the issue of trade marks and licensing of its name in a manner consistent with its core values.

2. The University recognizes that the manufacturing conditions under which apparel that bore its name and or the University logo should be a reflection of its values. Accordingly, it should do everything in its power to purchase apparel made under conditions deemed acceptable to the University.

3. It was appropriate for the University to attach certain conditions to its licenses with manufacturers.

The task force had consulted broadly on this issue with non-government organizations and other groups and students involved in the sweatshop movement. These consultations had revealed real complexities.

First, the total annual net licensing revenues to the University amounted to only about $60,000 per year. There was, therefore, need to balance the University's social responsibility against the financial magnitude of this issue.

Secondly, it was sometimes difficult to trace the manufacturing of all or part of a piece of merchandise back to its country of origin, in part because of sub-licensing.

Thirdly, the task force had discovered there were two widely divergent points of view on this issue. One school of thought was that the University should impose highly restrictive North American standards of conduct on manufacturers. This system of protectionism was viewed by some to be strident, accomplishing the opposite of what was intended. It was deemed to be over restrictive and would harm, rather than be of benefit to, those the University wished to help. The second school of thought was the course of action the University now wished to pursue. That is, it would set standards that would assist workers in developing countries. These would include the fundamental principles of core labour rights, freedom of association and the right to organize, and restrictions on child labour.

5. <u>**Policy on Licensing of the University of Toronto Name**</u> (cont'd)

The next step would be broader consultation within the University community. Dr. Dellandrea would convene a forum on campus to bring to the table all the relevant points of view, including those of unions, labour organizations, and non-government organizations working with developing countries.

Following this input, the task force would develop a final recommendation for a policy on licensing, which would be brought to the University Affairs Board for approval. While there had been concerns expressed that the administration was not moving fast enough on this issue, Dr. Dellandrea believed that given the many complexities, the University had been well served by the extensive consultations to date. It was important that the issue was dealt with correctly with a view to the long-term.

In the interim, the administration had issued a moratorium on additional licensing. As well, the following day Dr. Dellandrea would issue a letter to the University's current licensees requiring full disclosure on where apparel bearing the University name had been manufactured. The University would not renew existing licenses in the event there was failure to comply with this request. And as previously stated, the task force would continue its consultations, including a campus forum, to develop a policy.

Dr. Dellandrea noted the presence of Ms Sue Bloch-Nevitte, Ms Rivi Frankle, and Mr. Tad Brown, all of whom had provided assistance with this process.

Dr. Dellandrea responded to a number of questions for clarification. One member commended him on his report and indicated his strong support.

A member of the Governing Council noted that he was impressed with the progress to date on the issue. However, in consultation with student groups involved, he had been informed that there was disagreement about a preliminary draft that had apparently been developed by the parties. Also, the member urged that the student groups involved be invited to participate in future Board discussions of this issue.

Dr. Dellandrea responded that the draft policy mentioned by the member had been developed at an early stage in the task force's deliberations, prior to its full understanding of the matter. The task force would continue to work with the student groups to find a successful resolution to the issue.

A member asked what percentage of the University's licensed products were manufactured in Canada or the United States. Dr. Dellandrea believed the answer to be approximately 80%-90%.

6. <u>**Enrolment Expansion at the University of Toronto: Discussion Paper**</u>

The Chair welcomed Professors Prichard, Sedra, and Tuohy who were present for discussion of this item.

Ms Addario introduced the discussion paper. Increases in student enrolment would of course mean more use of student services and student facilities, including those services for which the University Affairs Board had responsibility. The administration was encouraging members of the Board and staff of the services to comment on the discussion paper, and to outline the issues and requirements foreseen for the services and other facilities.

6. **Enrolment Expansion at the University of Toronto: Discussion Paper** (cont'd)

Professor Sedra commented that the issue of enrolment growth was arguably the most important issue to face the University in the next decade. For this reason, the administration was seeking to consult with as many members of the University community as possible. The paper had been published in a recent issue of the *Bulletin*, and had been discussed with: Principals and Deans; Principals, Deans, Academic Directors and Chairs; and the Senior Management Group. As well, within governance it had been vetted by the Planning and Budget Committee, the Academic Board, the Executive Committee, as well as the Governing Council. Professor Sedra regretted that there had not been a previous opportunity for the University Affairs Board to provide its input. However, the Board's advice was still timely. Armed with feedback from its consultations, the administration would produce an administrative proposal that would identify a framework for planning expansion. This framework would be released in early February and would then be brought to governance for approval. Following this process, the University's divisions which would be affected, would be invited to work with the administration to develop plans for enrolment expansion. Professor Sedra noted that the Board's comments on the affect of enrolment expansion on levels of service were very much welcomed. The administration had already benefited in this area from advice provided by members of the Senior Management Group, many of whom were managers of services.

In conclusion, Professor Sedra clarified that he did not expect to hear a detailed response from the Board at this time, as the administration had not yet provided an analysis of the effect of enrolment growth on services to inform the Board's deliberations. When working with divisions concerning their plans for enrolment growth, the impact on services would be taken into account. At that time, the divisional plans would be brought to the University Affairs Board.

Professor Tuohy spoke to the substance of the paper, noting that some Board members had been present in previous consultations. She emphasized that this was a discussion paper rather than a white paper. It set out issues for discussion and distinguished between necessary and sufficient conditions for expansion. For example, expansion might make it possible to create and sustain a critical mass in certain areas of strength at the University.

As was the case with other Ontario universities, the University of Toronto was facing an enormous increase in demand for places over the next decade. The University needed to develop a response that did not jeopardize but rather advanced its mission. She emphasized that a necessary condition under which the University would increase its enrolment was that full average cost operating funding and adequate capital funding for the necessary facilities. As well, enrolment expansion would only be contemplated where improvements would be realized. For example, expansion might make it possible to create and sustain a critical mass in areas of strength at the University.

Such circumstances might vary across campus. Arguably, neither the University of Toronto at Scarborough nor the University of Toronto at Mississauga currently had a faculty complement of optimal size to function as coherent academic communities. Development of these campuses had been arrested in the 1970s due to a lack of funding. The University was contemplating a strategy of relatively greater expansion of these campuses, designed to achieve a critical mass in areas of strength or potential strength and more focussed and limited expansion on the St. George campus. Such a strategy needed to take into account the importance of maintaining a balance across disciplines and not neglect the overall effects. Decisions to expand in various areas could lead in aggregate to diseconomies of scale. Also, increased enrolment could lead to unintended shifts in balance across areas of study.

In conclusion, Professor Tuohy noted that the paper posed various enrolment growth scenarios for discussion.

6. **Enrolment Expansion at the University of Toronto: Discussion Paper** (cont'd)

The President said that he very much regretted that his schedule did not permit him to stay for the Board's important discussion of this matter. To date, the administration's consultations had focussed mainly on the academic principles of enrolment expansion. However, at a recent meeting of the Senior Management Group, he had been struck by the interventions of leaders of various student services. He clarified that the administration had not yet formulated a decision on enrolment expansion; however, much of the advice offered to date indicated that the University should not significantly increase enrolment on the St. George campus. Reasons provided had included that it would not be possible to significantly expand services offered by Athletics and Recreation and by Hart House. Also, increased enrolment would prove difficult for the University's objective of increasing the percentage of its students that lived on campus in residences. It had, therefore, been suggested that significant enrolment expansion of undergraduate enrolment should take place only on the suburban campuses. Any increase in enrolment on the St. George campus would then occur only at the second-entry and graduate level. With regard to enrolment growth on the suburban campuses, there appeared to be consensus that some level of enrolment growth was desirable because it would strengthen the campuses academically and provide for improved facilities.

The President continued that members might wish to provide advice on the impact of enrolment growth on student life and governance. For example, would a strategy of greater expansion on the suburban campuses lead to a change in the governance relationship between these campuses and the Academic Board? It was possible that significant enrolment growth on these campuses could lead to a greater degree of independence and decision making. This could also have implications for the Students' Administrative Council. Also, if there was significant expansion on the suburban campuses, with commensurate increased facilities, there might be an impact on services utilized on the St. George campus by suburban campus students (e.g. a decline in the use of Hart House). The perspective of the University Affairs Board was, therefore, critical to the decision making process.

Discussion ensued on the following matters.

A member spoke of the need for increased quiet space for religious observances (e.g. multi-faith facility). The member admired the multi-culturalism of the University's student body; however, it was imperative that services and spaces recognized and provided for this diversity at the University of Toronto.

A member asked if the University would have a choice in whether it expanded to meet the ongoing demand for places. If so, would there be time for expansion to be undertaken in a sensible way. Also, had there been an exploration of the possibility of specialized campuses (i.e. moving certain programs to certain campuses as a means of creating a critical mass).

Professor Tuohy responded that the Council of Ontario Universities continued to advocate the urgency of the matter and the need for the government to make immediate decisions as to appropriate phasing of funding for enrolment expansion. With respect to the suggestion of specialized campuses, Professor Tuohy noted that expansion would be very deliberate and would take into consideration the distinctive characteristics of each campus.

A member hoped that, where expansion was undertaken, the University would be attentive to the need for increased diversity of its student population (e.g. attracting students from outside the GTA). Also, the member commented on the need for increased child care services for students on the St. George campus as well as quiet study spaces. The member echoed his colleague's earlier comments on the need for a multi-faith facility, emphasizing that that there were many chapels on campus and the lack of space for multi-faith observances should be

6. **Enrolment Expansion at the University of Toronto: Discussion Paper** (cont'd)

redressed immediately. Finally, the member advocated that services such as athletics and recreation increase offerings for students who required physical activity but were not necessarily athletically inclined (e.g. offering water aerobics).

Several members emphasized the need for additional study and activity spaces, noting that they were crucial to the campus life experience. It was imperative that the funding for these be borne by the operating budget rather than being charged to students (e.g. added to the cost of new residences or raised through student levies).

A member noted that significant expansion of the suburban campuses would have implications for the cultures of those campuses. Would the University set up colleges on these campuses? And, how would the University ensure the quality of the student experience (e.g. availability of day care spaces, study and activity spaces, residences)? The member suggested that an alternative to enrolment growth would be to raise admission standards and focus on ensuring that the University of Toronto remained a preeminent University.

A member commented on the inadequate facilities and infrastructure on the suburban campuses (e.g. day care, athletic facilities, roads and parking lots). Enrolment expansion offered a wonderful opportunity to redress many situations; however, she emphasized that the cost of these much-need improvements should not be borne by students.

A member commented on the need for improved transportation between the three campuses. She also suggested that any change in the relationship between the suburban campuses and the Academic Board might require revision to the *University of Toronto Act*.

The Chair thanked members for their comments, noting that this matter would be before the Board again in the near future.

7. **University of Toronto Homelessness Initiative Project: Report on Current and Future Work**

Ms Hancock reported briefly on the following initiatives that had been undertaken since her last report to the Board on the Homelessness Initiative Project:

- literature outlining various housing options for students was now available (a copy of the pamphlet was placed on the table);
- front-line staff had received additional training about the University's financial aid program;
- David Hulchansky, the University's Chair in Housing, was organizing various fora on the issue of homelessness;
- Hart House had received funds to hire a social justice interne to provide assistance with its homelessness initiative;
- a brochure entitled *Want to do something about homelessness? You can be part of the solution*, which outlined various community Out of the Cold programs, had been well received (copies were placed on the table);
- the Hart House Student Debates Committee had organized a Project Warmth event to coincide with a homelessness forum;
- the University of Toronto Food Bank had been reopened and stabilized with space provided at New College; and

7. **University of Toronto Homelessness Initiative Project: Report on Current and Future Work** (cont'd)

      - a group of University students had organized a weekly Friday night solidarity sleep-in at Allen Gardens.

    Ms Hancock noted that volunteers of the Homelessness Initiative Project would be meeting the following evening at Hart House to discuss the continuation of efforts started the previous year.

    Ms Hancock responded to members' questions for clarification on various initiatives.

                    On motion duly moved and seconded,

                    YOUR BOARD APPROVED

                    THAT the time of adjournment be extended to 7:10 p.m.

8. **Compulsory Non-academic Incidental Fees - 1999-2000**

    The Chair drew attention to a corrected version of the *Compulsory Non-academic Incidental Fees - 1999-2000* which had been placed on the table. He noted that the document was before the Board at this time for information. The fees would be before members again in April for approval.

    Ms Addario noted that the report had been produced by Mr. Jim Delaney. The corrections to the report were not substantive.

    A member requested that members receive a meeting schedule for the Council on Student Services (COSS), the forum for discussing the various fees. Ms Addario undertook to provide the schedule once it had been established.

9. **Capital Project: Users' Committee for Student Residence Expansion at University College - Terms of Reference**

    The Chair noted that the terms of references were for the Board's information and comment. The report of the users' committee would be brought to the Board for its advice when completed.

    During discussion it was noted that the version of the terms of reference provided to the Board had since been amended to include consultation with Hart House and Athletics and Recreation. The corrected terms of reference would be distributed to members.

    A member recalled a previous discussion of the Board concerning adequate space within each residence for disabled students, interim and emergency housing, and student activity space. It was unfortunate that these were not reflected in the terms of reference for this users' committee. The Chair undertook to relay the member's comment to Professor Derek McCammond, Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget.

    A member reiterated the need for student activity space within this and other residences. Given that residences were self-funded ancillaries, it was important that funding for the inclusion of this space not be charged to the residence as it would increase the cost to students. The member also encouraged the users' committee to engage the neighbourhood in the development process.

    A member implored that the users' committee not lose site of the Open Space Plan. It was crucial that the University preserve its limited green spaces.

10. **Reports of Administrative Assessors**

> On motion duly moved and seconded,
>
> YOUR BOARD APPROVED
>
> THAT the time of adjournment be further extended to 7:20 p.m.

Ms Addario reported on two matters.

a) TCard Review

The Committee which had been struck to review the TCard project had handed in its final report to the Provost at the end of December. Professor Orchard expected to hear back from the Provost shortly with regard to the findings of that committee.

b) Template for Users' Committees

Professor John Browne had reported that he had altered the templates for users' committees so that all current residence user's committees understood that they must include information about their planning for student services and student activity space in their user committee reports.

In about four weeks, after Professor Browne's broad consultation with student groups and student affairs was concluded, he planned to issue a new set of guidelines to user's committees, which would incorporate the information he had received from those groups.

11. **Date of Next Meeting**

The Chair reminded members of the Board's next meeting on Tuesday, February 29, 2000 at 5:00 p.m.

12. **Other Business**

(a) Accessibility

A member thanked Ms Hancock for the tour of Hart House which had preceded the meeting. He reiterated his colleagues' previous statements regarding the need for multi-faith and quiet study spaces, both within the House and throughout the University. It was important that the services of the House reflect its users. As well, the member spoke of the need to make the House and the campus more accessible to persons who were physically challenged. While there were provisions for new construction projects to provide for accessibility, the member suggested that this was not, alas, being done. It was incumbent upon the University and the government to provide the necessary funds to ensure the University was publicly accessible. The member urged that the Board solicit input from the Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students and the Graduate Students' Union on this important issue.

> The meeting adjourned at 7:20 p.m.

_____   _____
Secretary   Chair

January 21 2000