

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

REPORT NUMBER 87 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD

September 28, 1999

To the Governing Council,
University of Toronto.

Your Board reports that it held a meeting on Tuesday, September 28, 1999, at 5:00 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, at which the following were present:

Mr. Brian C. Burchell (In the Chair)
Ms Nancy L. Watson (Vice-Chair)
Professor Ian Orchard, Vice-Provost,
Students
Ms Susan Addario, Director,
Student Affairs
Professor Ethel Auster
Dr. Robert Bennett
Mrs. Shari Fell
Ms Margaret Hancock
Professor Bruce Kidd
Mr. Vivek Krishnamurthy
Ms Heather Lane
Ms Alicia Maund
Professor Ian R. McDonald
Mr. Jonathan Papoulidis
Ms Rosie Parnass
Ms Mary Ann Pilskalnietis

Mr. Kashif S. Pirzada
Ms Grace Subrata
Ms Wendy Talfourd-Jones
Ms Sally Walker

Non-Voting Members:

Professor David Cook, Vice-Provost
Dr. John G. Dimond, Secretary of the
Governing Council
Mr. Louis R. Charpentier, Deputy Secretary
and Secretary - Designate of the
Governing Council

Secretariat:

Ms Margaret McKone

Regrets:

The Honourable William G. Davis
Mr. Robert G. Spencer

In Attendance:

Professor Rona Abramovitch, former Status of Women Officer; Provost's Advisor on Proactive Faculty Recruitment
Mr. Kelvin Andrews, Race Relations and Anti-Racism Initiatives Officer
Mr. Jim Delaney, Manager, Liaison and Campus Life Services, Office of Student Affairs
Ms Tina Doyle, Coordinator, AccessAbility Service at the University of Toronto at Scarborough
Professor Judith Globerman, Status of Women Officer
Ms Teresa Jose, Acting Coordinator, AccessAbility Resource Centre at the University of Toronto at Mississauga
Mr. Lee McKergow, Manager, Campus Police
Mr. Len Paris, former Community Safety Officer; Manager of Police Services at the University of Toronto at Mississauga
Ms Helen Simson, Convenor, Equity Issues Advisory Group, and Coordinator, DISABILITY Services for Students
Ms Jan Nolan, Family Care Advisor
Ms Paddy Stamp, Sexual Harassment Officer

In Attendance (cont'd):

Ms Jude Tate, Coordinator of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgendered and Queer Resources and Programs
Ms Marilyn Van Norman, Director, Student Services and Career Centre

ALL ITEMS ARE REPORTED FOR INFORMATION.

1. Chair's Remarks

The Chair welcomed everyone to the first meeting of the Board for 1999-2000 and repeated an invitation to a reception immediately following the meeting at which members and guests would have the opportunity to meet one another and the directors and managers of various services. He anticipated the meeting would be over no later than 7:00 p.m.

The Chair invited members to introduce themselves and to indicate their constituencies. The role of the assessors was explained and members were reminded to contact the Board Secretary if they had questions about items of business before the Board. The Chair recalled that the Board endeavored to hold at least one meeting every year on one of the University's suburban campuses. It was his intention to continue this practice where possible.

The Chair drew members' attention to the organizational chart outlining the responsibilities of Professor Ian Orchard, the Board's senior assessor. Invited to comment, Professor Orchard indicated that the organizational chart illustrated the full extent of his portfolio and reflected the outcome of recent organizational change. The re-organized portfolio was wide-ranging and included activities from student recruitment through to convocations. In addition to serving as Senior Assessor to the University Affairs Board, Professor Orchard also sat as a non-voting assessor to the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs and the Academic Board. He also served on the Provost's internal planning group, which undertook academic planning and budgeting and policy development. Professor Orchard noted that the overall goal of the many offices within his portfolio was to enhance the student experience at the University. Professor Orchard recalled that the position of Assistant Vice-President, Student Affairs, had been eliminated, thus necessitating the organizational change undertaken during the past year. As a result of this re-organization, the new position of Director, Student Affairs had been created. Professor Orchard welcomed the first incumbent of this position, Ms Susan Addario, noting that she would be serving as a voting assessor to the Board.

A member inquired as to the difference between the positions of Director, Student Affairs and Director, Student Services. Professor Orchard responded that Student Services provided direct services to students in specific areas (e.g. Career Centre, housing, off-campus housing, etc.). Student Affairs was responsible for University-wide policy development and implementation. The Director would have direct interaction with students, but in particular would undertake research in various areas within the University that might lead to new policy developments or implementation of policies. He undertook to distribute to the Board the final position description for the newly created position of Director, Student Affairs.

The Chair referred members to documentation within the agenda packages on the general work and proceedings of the Board. This provided a succinct description of the scope of the Board's work and procedures. Finally, the Chair noted that items of business were normally brought to the Board by its administrative assessors (voting and non-voting). Following the introduction of items, he would invite questions for clarification and then call for discussion and debate. He requested members to address their questions and comments through him as Chair, following which he would invite an assessor to respond or direct further direct and discussion as appropriate. He hoped this procedure would allow for/permit productive discussions throughout the year.

2. Report of the Previous Meeting held June 1, 1999

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

Report Number 86 of the University Affairs Board
(June 1, 1999).

3. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting

Item 9 – Capital Project: Users’ Committee for Varsity Stadium and Varsity Arena – Report

The Chair noted that Professor Orchard would be providing an update on the development of the Varsity Stadium site under his Senior Assessor’s Report [item 6(d)].

Item 7 – College of Electors: Constitution – Revisions

Dr. Dimond recalled that at the previous meeting, the Board had approved revisions to the membership of the College of Electors, the body that elected alumni governors and the Chancellor. The overall thrust had been to reduce the number of seats on the College. Previously, many professional programs in the Faculty of Medicine had each had their own representative. The revisions to the College had led to a reduction in the Faculty’s seats from 6-7 to 3. A question had been raised at the previous meeting as to the distribution of these seats. He was pleased to report that during the summer, a proposal to various groups involved had been accepted. One representative would come from the MD graduates (the largest body in terms of numbers associated with the Faculty), one representative would come from the undergraduate professional programs (Physical Therapy, Occupational Therapy and the Radiation Sciences Program, which would have graduates in 3-4 years) and finally one representative would come from the collection of small graduate professional master’s programs (their alumni taken together were equal in size to the undergraduate professional programs). This distribution had been deemed acceptable by the alumni groups.

A member noted that a new fee had recently been approved by Council for medical internes and residents. Given that they were now paying fees and being treated as students, the member wondered if they would now qualify as a representative group under the College of Electors. Dr. Dimond took notice of the member’s question, noting that he would endeavour to provide a response at the next meeting.

4. Equity Offices: Annual Reports, 1998-1999

The Chair noted that he was very pleased that the Board was receiving the Annual Reports of the University’s Equity Officers at its first meeting. The Board was responsible for consideration of policy of a non-academic nature concerning the University community and for monitoring matters within its area of responsibility, many of which were touched upon in these reports.

With members’ permission, he moved item 5 (i) The Annual Report of the Status of Women Office to item 5 (a), as the Report’s author had another engagement at 5:30 p.m.

4. Equity Offices: Annual Reports, 1998-1999 (cont'd)

(a) Status of Women Office

Professor Orchard welcomed Professor Rona Abramovitch, formerly Status of Women Officer and currently Provost's Advisor on Proactive Faculty Recruitment, and Professor Judith Globerman, the new Status of Women Officer.

Invited to comment, Professor Abramovitch noted that she believed the Report to be self-explanatory and welcomed any questions members might have. She drew specific attention to a brief statement at the Report's conclusion which summarized her feelings of the time spent serving as Status of Women Officer. It had been a great privilege to have served in a position which she believed to be very worthy. While some progress had been made, there remained a great deal more to do. In conclusion, Professor Abramovitch thanked members for their continuing support of the Office.

Professor Globerman indicated that she looked forward to working with Board members as she undertook her new responsibilities and to meeting all the challenges within a 0.5 FTE position.

(b) Equity Issues Advisory Group, Report of the Convenor

Professor Orchard noted that the Annual Report of the Equity Issues Group had been authored by Mr. Kelvin Andrews, former Convenor of the Group; however, Ms Helen Simson, incoming Convenor, would speak to the Report.

On behalf of the Equity Issues Advisory Group (EIAG), Ms Simson thanked the Chair for the invitation to present the Annual Reports to governance and for the opportunity to do so at the beginning of the year. The Equity Officers considered this accountability to be a very important part of their portfolios. The EIAG Report represented a collaborative effort. She recalled that the EIAG had been convened approximately six years ago by the President to provide advice to the senior administration as well as to the broader community on a very broadly configured range of what were called equity issues. Historically, the EIAG comprised the Offices of Status of Women, Community Safety, Race Relations, Family Care, Sexual Harassment and the disability services offices. Members were very pleased at the recent inclusion of two new portfolios: the Diversity Office at the University of Toronto at Mississauga and the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgendered and Queer Resources and Programs. These additions would serve to strengthen EIAG and help it move forward in areas that required more work. Ms Simson welcomed members questions and comments on the Convenor's Report.

During the course of the meeting, Ms Simson introduced Ms Jude Tate, the new Coordinator of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgendered and Queer Resources and Programs.

(c) AccessAbility Resource Centre, University of Toronto at Mississauga

Professor Orchard welcomed Ms Teresa Jose, Acting Coordinator of the AccessAbility Resource Centre at the University of Toronto at Mississauga.

Invited to comment, Ms Jose noted that she believed the Report to be self-explanatory and she welcomed questions and/or comments. The Chair asked whether the definitions used within the disability categories (e.g. systemic/chronic medical, learning disability) were the same in each of the campuses' accessibility reports. Did the Officers collaborate to ensure consistency in documenting cases? Ms Jose responded in the affirmative, noting that the Officers met regularly. Ms Simson added that categories reported had been developed by a committee that comprised

4. Equity Offices: Annual Reports, 1998-1999 (cont'd)

(c) *AccessAbility* Resource Centre, University of Toronto at Mississauga (cont'd)

coordinators of all Ontario universities and in collaboration with the former Ministry of Education and Training to enable comparison across the post-secondary sector.

The Chair asked how the University of Toronto compared with other post-secondary institutions. Ms Simson responded that the University had been doing a very good job in this area. It had the largest enrolment of student with disabilities in the province and this enrolment continued to grow.

(d) *AccessAbility* Services, University of Toronto at Scarborough

Professor Orchard welcomed Ms Tina Doyle, Coordinator of *AccessAbility* Service at the University of Toronto at Scarborough. Referring to her Report, Ms Doyle drew attention to the increase in demand on her Office. She attributed this increase in part to the outreach activities being undertaken. Priorities for her Office in the coming year would include focussing on students' transition from high school to university and on student retention issues.

(e) *DISABILITY* Services for Students, St. George Campus

Professor Orchard invited Ms Helen Simson, to speak in her capacity as Coordinator of *DISABILITY* Services for Students on the St. George Campus. Ms Simson referred members to materials distributed at the outset of the meeting concerning DisAbility Awareness Day, to be held on October 13, 1999. This initiative had been organized by several members on campus with financial assistance from Professor Orchard's Office. This assistance had enabled the group to employ a former student with a disability. Three activities were planned for the event including a panel discussion on access to post-secondary education for persons with a disability for which an impressive array of speakers had been arranged. The event would be introduced by the President and moderated by Professor Orchard. She strongly encouraged members to attend what promised to be a very interesting and informative event. She also requested members' assistance in promoting the event across the University.

The Chair observed an increase of approximately 20% in the budget for the Office in the coming year. Ms Simson clarified that the increase was attributable to extenuating circumstances. Approximately one year previously the provincial government had terminated a part of the Ministry of Community and Social Services' (MCSS) Vocational Rehabilitation Services. This service had been instrumental in providing support to students with disabilities in universities and colleges within Ontario. It had provided intensive support such as sign language interpreting, attendant care, transportation, specialized vehicles, and computer equipment. When the Ministry decided to close the service, the responsibilities were transferred to disability services offices in post-secondary institutions in the province. At that time, an agreement had been negotiated between the then-Ministry of Education and Training and the MCSS to identify the expenditures on direct provision of support to students with disabilities in post-secondary institutions and to transfer this amount to the former Ministry of Education and Training. This had amounted to an annual transfer of \$3 million, which had then been dispersed to Ontario universities and colleges according to a formula. This transfer had not included funding previously designated for staffing and infrastructure within Vocational Rehabilitation Services. Therefore, while the University's *DISABILITY* Service was receiving more funds, there was a corresponding increased workload and expenditures on services for students that had to be met by existing staff. She added that there was also a centralized pool of funds that had been created from the \$3 million transfer to assist universities and colleges with interpreter and intervenor costs. Last year, the University had significantly benefited from this source; however, she was not able to predict whether this would continue.

4. Equity Offices: Annual Reports, 1998-1999 (cont'd)

(e) *DISABILITY* Services for Students, St. George Campus (cont'd)

The Chair asked whether the level of service provided by the Office would be influenced by this transfer of funding and responsibility. Ms Simson responded that the Office was committed to maintaining the level of service currently provided to students; however, this remained a challenge within existing staff resources. The Provost's Office had made a commitment to fund any budget overruns related to expenditures legally required by the Human Rights Code.

In conclusion, Ms Simson noted that the University had made a very strong commitment to ensuring that students with disabilities received the services required to complete their education.

(f) Community Safety Coordinator

Professor Orchard welcomed Mr. Len Paris, former Community Safety Officer, who had recently assumed the position of Manager of Police Services at the University of Toronto at Mississauga. Mr. Paris noted that during the four years he had served as Community Safety Coordinator he had received a great deal of assistance and support from various members of the University community, including his colleagues on EIAG and the Provost's Office. Safety issues had received increased attention during this time and he hoped this would continue. An announcement would be made shortly as to the appointment of his successor.

Mr. Paris drew attention to the classification of cases summarized at the conclusion of the Report. These statistics reflected cases where he had been directly involved in providing assistance, support or intervention. While there was some degree of overlap, the majority of cases listed did not reflect those cases handled by the University Police or reported in their annual report. In addition, some of the cases might also be included in other Equity Officer Reports (e.g. sexual harassment or other forms of harassment).

In response to a question, Mr. Paris noted that the WalkSafer Program was currently underutilized. There had been a decline in demand from approximately 1600 walks in 1990-91 to approximately 840 walks in 1998-99. He attributed this to a perception of a safe campus and noted the results of a recent survey.

(g) Family Care Office

Professor Orchard welcomed Ms Jan Nolan, Family Care Advisor. Ms Nolan noted that there were many people present who had helped the Family Care Office during its first few years. She would be happy to answer questions members might have.

The Chair inquired if Ms Nolan would play a role in determining a site for the new day care facility. Ms Nolan responded that she had been involved in preliminary discussions; however, this fell within the mandate of the new Director of Student Affairs.

(h) Race Relations and Anti-Racism Initiatives Office

Professor Orchard welcomed Mr. Kelvin Andrews, Race Relations and Anti-Racism Initiatives Officer. Mr. Andrews noted that there had been substantial progress made under several headings, as was outlined in his Report. With the assistance of Professor Orchard and with the participation of several individuals who had taken an interest in his Office, he had been able to secure a coordinator for the outreach and mentoring programs which had become essential to the University. In addition, he continued to see great benefits accruing from the Ethnocultural

4. Equity Offices: Annual Reports, 1998-1999 (cont'd)

(h) Race Relations and Anti-Racism Initiatives Office (cont'd)

Academic Initiatives Fund. Appendix 3 to his Report provided an account of Fund allocations for 1999-2000. Not listed on that table was a recent allocation of \$10,000 to the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering in support of trips made to the northern territories to recruit aboriginal students. In conclusion, Mr. Andrews reiterated his belief that the University was making progress in a number of areas. He and his EIAG colleagues hoped that there would be continued funding to provide continued benefit from these initiatives.

A member noted that the Report had indicated that the six-year collaboration between the University's Transitional Year Program (TYP) and the Toronto Board of Education on the Steps to University Program had ended last year. This change was coincident with the Board's replacement by the massive Toronto District School Board. The Report had further indicated that a judgement about the continuation of the Program was expected soon. The member asked if there had been further developments since the issuing of the Report. Mr. Andrews responded that he believed discussions were still underway. This program had been integral to the work of his Office and he very much hoped that the resources and determination would be found for it to continue in some form.

The member also asked for further information concerning the analysis of failure rates provided in the 1998 TYP report. Specifically, those students enrolled and retained in the 1997W session had a failure rate of 35.3%, a substantially larger percentage than for the same group in 1996W (14.4%) and 1995W (16.7%). Mr. Andrews replied that he believed this increase to be an aberration and that it was not an indication of any lack of success of the TYP. In signaling the issue in his Report, Mr. Andrews had wished to ensure that the TYP was fulfilling its recruitment objectives as well as preparing its students for university. He was confident that this issue and others would be addressed by the Program's Director, Professor Rona Abramovitch.

Professor Orchard commented on the remarkable successes of the TYP, including the recent designation of one of its alumni as a National Scholar.

(i) Sexual Harassment Education, Counseling and Complaint Office

Professor Orchard welcomed Ms Paddy Stamp, Sexual Harassment Officer. Invited to comment, Ms Stamp addressed the statistics presented in her Report as well as those of her EIAG colleagues. As Mr. Paris had clarified, the statistics within his Report overlapped with those of the Campus Police as well as with other Equity Reports. This was also true of the statistics within her Report, which overlapped with those reported by the Community Safety Coordinator as well as the Race Relations and Anti-Racism Initiatives Officer. Her client base overlapped with these portfolios as well as that of the three disability services offices and the Family Care Office. This spoke to an increasing need for the EIAG to be very astute in assisting people who approached their Offices to ensure that the most appropriate avenue of remedy was identified. Often complainants who approached her Office were confronted with a number of inter-related issues. In seeking assistance, these complainants had often spoken with many University officials prior to arriving at her Office. Even then, her Office was not the most appropriate place to ensure that the majority of the complainants' concerns would be addressed. Appropriate referrals were therefore of critical importance to the work of EIAG. Ms Stamp believed the University was providing a disservice to students and staff members when it required them to find the most appropriate source for assistance on their own. It was incumbent upon the administration to be as familiar as possible with the types of resources provided to save time and grief to those with legitimate complaints and concerns.

4. Equity Offices: Annual Reports, 1998-1999 (cont'd)

(i) Sexual Harassment Education, Counseling and Complaint Office (cont'd)

Ms Stamp added that she believed the overlap in cases spoke well of the high degree of cooperation between Offices within the University. This cooperation was absolutely critical to the effectiveness of EIAG. She would not be able to provide useful and appropriate assistance to the majority of people who sought it from her Office if she could not rely on the assistance of her colleagues across the University. In conclusion, Ms Stamp noted that the creation of the new Offices within EIAG was probably going to increase the Group's collective caseload. Again, she viewed this a function of the value and importance of cooperation. For example, the creation of a Coordinator of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgendered and Queer Resources and Programs would undoubtedly increase the number of referrals to her Office concerning harassment related to sexual orientation. She believed that, without qualification, this was a good thing. Such instances, while known, were not being reported and, therefore, not being addressed.

A member expressed her appreciation of the Equity Officers, noting that they were a tremendous source of support and guidance for the members of the University community.

The Chair and Professor Orchard thanked the Equity Officers for their thorough Reports and for attending the meeting. There would be opportunity for further informal discussion at the reception following the meeting.

5. Items for Information

(a) Calendar of Business, 1999-2000

Professor Orchard referred to the Calendar of Business for the coming year, which included the following highlights:

- *Code of Student Conduct*: Annual Report on Decisions of Hearing Officers;
- Capital Project: Parking Garage;
- Elections Committee: GC Faculty Constituency Numbers;
- Service Ancillaries Review Group (SARG): Appointment of UAB Members;
- Striking Committee: Appointment of Members;
- Operating Plans for Student Services:
 - St. George Campus;
 - UofT at Scarborough;
 - UofT at Mississauga;
- Operating Plans for Service Ancillaries:
 - Hart House;
 - Other Service Ancillaries - parking, food and beverage, residences, etc;
 - Operating Plan for Athletics and Recreation ;
- Compulsory Non-Academic Incidental Fees: Individual Requests for Increases;
- Discipline Appeals Board: Appointment of Members; and
- Striking Committee: Appointment of Co-opted Members

5. Items for Information (cont'd)

(a) Calendar of Business, 1999-2000 (cont'd)

Items planned but not yet scheduled for specific meetings included the following:

- Day Care Planning;
- Users' Committee Reports;
- Varsity Stadium and Arena;
- Woodsworth College Residence;
- Licensing: Policy (new);
- Residence Expansion Planning; and
- Student Societies: Approval of By-law Changes.

A member referred to the Calendar, noting that in some instances the Board's concurrence, rather than its recommendation, would be sought. Invited to provide clarification, Dr. Dimond noted that this typically occurred when a matter came to governance through the Planning and Budget Committee of the Academic Board (e.g. capital projects). When these projects concerned matters within the terms of reference of the University Affairs Board (e.g. residences and athletics facilities), the advice of the Board was sought before the proposal was forwarded to the Governing Council for final consideration. He continued that in the event the Board did not concur with a recommendation of the Planning and Budget Committee, the Chair would provide an explanation to the Executive Committee and the Governing Council. The Governing Council would then consider the advice in its deliberations.

6. Report of the Senior Assessor

Professor Orchard reported on the following matters.

(a) Student Financial Aid

An information sheet containing facts about student financial support within the University had been distributed for members' information. A priority for Professor Orchard would remain the implementation of the *Policy on Student Financial Support*, approved by the Governing Council in 1998. As a supplement to the information provided in the handout, Professor Orchard referred members to the Report of the previous meeting (pages 12 – 14), which contained highlights from various surveys undertaken. Given members' interest, he would continue to share information on this very important element of his portfolio.

A member asked if the administration would be providing a review of the University's financial aid counselling services and a rating of their effectiveness. The provision of financial aid was very important; however, of equal importance was the delivery of the counselling service. Professor Orchard agreed, noting that the administration had provided funds to each division for the enhancement of financial counselling. In addition, a second workshop was to be offered the following week for all financial aid counsellors. He welcomed the suggestion that the administration produce a report that attempted to assess the adequacy of financial aid counselling in various divisions and thanked the member for the comment.

6. Report of the Senior Assessor (cont'd)

(a) Student Financial Aid (cont'd)

A member noted that the handout on financial support indicated that, on average, students in first-entry programs estimated that by graduation they would owe \$277 in non-OSAP loans. She asked about the source of this information. Professor Orchard responded that the information provided in the handout was based on results of a recent survey of students. The survey had sought to identify student debt, both as a result of loans from OSAP and from other sources. In the survey of first-entry students, students had been asked to indicate loans received from sources other than OSAP and the predicted debt level of these upon graduation. The average response of those students with and without loans from OSAP was that referred to by the member. In response to a query, Professor Orchard clarified that the debt load for those students not eligible for loans under OSAP was a similar amount.

A member asked if there was demographic information (ethno-cultural background and family incomes) for those students who had participated in the survey of first-entry programs. As well, 16% of students who had participated in a survey undertaken in 1998-99 had reported family incomes of less than \$30,000. She wondered what percentage of this student group had family incomes below the poverty line. Professor Orchard responded that data regarding OSAP debt had been obtained from the provincial government and demographic information was, therefore, not available. Surveys undertaken by the University of students in first-entry and professional programs did break down the results by students' ethno-cultural backgrounds. It might also be possible to determine family income from these results. A lot of data had been gathered that were still to be analyzed. Later in the fall he would provide a fuller accounting of these surveys to the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs, following which he would be happy to share the data with this Board. In response to the member's second question, Professor Orchard responded that students had been asked to identify only whether their family incomes were below \$30,000. This question was similar to that used by government agencies. The first round of surveys had been designed in response to suggestions of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs that the administration track accessibility, and family income to ensure increases in tuition were not affecting accessibility. It would be possible to modify surveys in future to identify further critical data.

A member asked if the percentage of respondents was available for recent surveys. Professor Orchard drew attention to the Report of the previous meeting at which he had reported a 54% response rate for the survey of first-entry programs. Also, a telephone survey had yielded an 80% response rate.

In response to a query, Professor Orchard noted that the newly implemented income-sensitive debt remission program for students in deregulated-fee programs did apply to the loans from the Nova Scotia Bank plan or the equivalent plan in another bank.

Professor Orchard expressed his gratitude to members for their comments.

(b) Report of the Task Force on Student Activity Space and Administrative Response

Professor Orchard recalled that the Board had received the Task Force Report at its previous meeting. Since that time, an Administrative Response had been prepared. Accordingly, a summary of the recommendations of the Task Force as well as the Administrative Response had been distributed to Board members for information. The President had responded favourably to the Task Force Report and had essentially agreed with its recommendations. These included a very important increase in space and infrastructure associated with student activities. Priorities included a permanent location for the multi-faith facility, expansion associated with Hart House, and a new space allocation process (with administrative

6. Report of the Senior Assessor (cont'd)

guidelines) which included a committee made up largely of students. He commended the Task Force for its work and for the creative solutions it had recommended.

(c) Beverage Exclusivity

Professor Orchard recalled that he had reported to the Board at its previous meeting that consideration was being given to a beverage exclusivity arrangement. Following extensive consultations within the University community, including discussions with the Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students (APUS), the Graduate Students' Union (GSU), and the Students' Administrative Council (SAC), the administration had concluded that the University should not pursue a University-wide arrangement. Campus press had reported on this matter in recent weeks. He clarified that there did exist a number of beverage exclusivity arrangements in various divisions throughout the University, including the University of Toronto at Scarborough, the University of Toronto at Mississauga, and the Faculty of Physical Education and Health. While these divisions would continue to leverage as much as possible from these arrangements, the central administration would not pursue a University-wide beverage exclusivity arrangement.

(d) Property: Varsity Stadium Site – Update on Planning

Professor Orchard reported that at its previous meeting, the Governing Council had accepted the advice of the administration not to proceed with the previously proposed commercial development of the north end of the Varsity Stadium site. In making this decision, Council had taken into account a number of factors which had changed since the proposal had first been considered:

- the real costs for replacement of existing facilities had decreased significantly the originally estimated profit to the University;
- *Student Housing: A Plan for the Next Phase* called for an increase of 2500 beds and the creation of a more residential campus, wherein 25% of students would be housed in residences;
- a demographic change would increase significantly the number of university applicants between 2000-2008, making it necessary for the University to consider significant expansion; and
- new government funding was now being provided to enable the construction of major new buildings on campus (e.g. Centre for Information Technology).

The administration was considering new plans for the site and preliminary discussions had included consultations with APUS, GSU, SAC, and other groups within the University. Preliminary discussions contemplated: the replacement of the Varsity Stadium, which was badly in need of repair, in a north-south direction on this site; renovation of the Varsity Arena; the construction of a second rink to the south of the existing arena; and the construction of an innovative student residence village on this and adjacent lands. Professor Orchard was encouraged by the considerations to date and would keep this Board apprised as these plans were developed into a more concrete proposal.

6. Report of the Senior Assessor (cont'd)

(e) Homeless on Campus: Response of Campus Police

The Chair recalled that during the previous year the Board had shown a great deal of interest in the issue of homelessness, both on campus and beyond the University's borders. Ms Margaret Hancock, in response to an invitation from the President, had played a leadership role in coordinating the University community's efforts on homelessness and had provided the Board with regular updates. Resulting from this work had been a re-consideration of the way in which the University, and in particular the Campus Police, addressed this issue. In the absence of Miss Janice Oliver, Professor Orchard had invited Mr. Lee McKergow, Manager, Campus Police, to provide an update on the response by Campus Police to homeless people on campus.

Mr. McKergow said that the Campus Police approached the homeless people on campus on an individual basis, rather than as a group. There were no statistics outlining the number of instances in which Campus Police dealt with homeless people; however, the previous year 67 individuals had been dealt with under the Trespass and Property Act. Of these, 15 had provided no address. He continued that when Campus Police encountered a homeless person on campus during the winter months, they would attempt to get them to an available shelter for homeless people (published in a blue book of available shelters and assistance). In instances where the individual was emotionally disturbed, he/she would be escorted to the Centre for Addiction and Mental Health. Where relevant, Campus Police escorted homeless to a detoxification centre. In the rare instance where an individual did not accept the assistance of the Campus Police and refused to re-locate, a Trespass Notice was issued. During the day, Campus Police approached homeless people on campus only when requested to do so by members of the University community. During the evenings and in winter months, Campus Police were more proactive in their approach. While the same policy for addressing homelessness on campus had been in place for a number of years, the Campus Police now had a greater consciousness of the issue as a result of Ms Hancock's initiatives and he hoped that procedures could be improved in future.

Invited to comment, Ms Hancock noted that she was delighted at recent initiatives by the Campus Police to further develop their policy. There had been much interest expressed in this area. In particular, there were concerns over the health and welfare of homeless sleeping on campus during the cold winter months. A continued challenge for members of the University community would be in responding to homeless who wished to use University buildings as a home or shelter. Campus Police were often called by community members only when situations turned difficult and individuals refused to leave premises. She commended the Campus Police for their efforts in treating homeless as individuals.

Mr. McKergow responded to a number of questions concerning the response of Campus Police to persons with mental health problems and homeless people on non-University lands adjacent to University property. During the discussion, Mr. Paris reported on initiatives undertaken within his previous portfolio as Community Safety Coordinator, which had included training sessions concerning aggressive behaviour and mental health issues.

7. Date of Next Meeting

The Chair reminded members of the next meeting to be held on Tuesday, November 9, 1999 at 5:00 p.m.

8. Other Business

(a) Striking Committee: Appointment of Members

The Chair drew attention to a memorandum regarding the appointment of members to the Striking Committee. He invited members who wished to serve to advise him or the Board Secretary. A recommendation for the appointment of members would be brought to the next meeting of the Board for approval.

(b) Graduate/Second-Entry Residence

In response to a question, Professor Orchard reported that the opening of the new residence had been further delayed by one month. He hoped that the first phase would be ready for student occupancy in November and that the second phase in December. He attributed the delay to the poor weather in February, work stoppages and shortages in building materials in the Toronto area.

(c) Dr. John G. Dimond

The Chair, joined by members, expressed his gratitude to Dr. Dimond on his last meeting of the University Affairs Board as Secretary of the Governing Council. Dr. Dimond had served the Governing Council and its various Board and Committees with distinction for the past eighteen years.

The meeting adjourned at 6:55 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

October 15, 1999