

**UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO**

**THE GOVERNING COUNCIL**

**REPORT NUMBER 96 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD**

**January 16, 2001**

To the Governing Council,  
University of Toronto.

Your Board reports that it held a meeting on Tuesday January 16, 2001, at 5:00 p.m. in the Governing Council Chamber at which the following were present:

Mr. Brian C. Burchell (In the Chair)  
Professor Ian Orchard, Vice-Provost,  
Students

Ms Susan Addario, Director,  
Student Affairs

Mr. Muhammad Basil Ahmad

Dr. Robert Bennett  
Professor Marion Bogo

Ms Jennifer Carson

Ms Susan Eng

Dr. Shari Graham Fell

Mr. Ljupco Gjorginski

Ms Margaret Hancock

Professor Bruce Kidd

Mr. Vivek Krishnamurthy

Dr. Heather Lane

Mr. Darren R. Levstek

Ms Karen Lewis

Mr. Paul McCann

Mr. Fayez A. Quereshy

Mrs. Susan M. Scace

Non-Voting Members:

Mr. Louis R. Charpentier, Secretary of the  
Governing Council

Miss Janice Oliver, Assistant Vice-  
President, Operations and Services

Secretariat:

Ms Margaret McKone

Regrets:

Ms Yvette Y. Ali

The Honourable William G. Davis

Professor Ian R. McDonald

Ms Nancy L. Watson

Ms Szu-Mae Yoon

In Attendance:

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* Services, University of Toronto at Scarborough

Professor Rosemary Gartner, Committee to Review Police Services

Ms Susan Girard, Chief Returning Officer and Assistant Secretary of the Governing Council

Ms Rae Johnson, Coordinator, Student Crisis Response Programs

Ms Elizabeth Martin, Coordinator, *AccessAbility* Services, University of Toronto at  
Mississauga

Ms Janice Martin, Coordinator, *DisAbility* Services for Students`

Mr. Liam Mitchell, Chair, Council on Student Services

Ms Jan Nolan, Director, Family Care Office

Ms Cristina Oke, Assistant Vice-Provost, Professional Faculties

Professor Kent Roach, Chair, Committee to Review Police Services

In Attendance (cont'd):

Ms Paddy Stamp, Sexual Harassment, Education, Counselling and Complaint Officer  
Ms José Sigouin, Acting Status of Women Officer  
Ms Jude Tate, Coordinator of Programs and Resources for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual,  
Transgendered and Queer Students (LGBTQ)

**ALL ITEMS ARE REPORTED FOR INFORMATION.**

**1. Reports of the Previous Meetings**

The Chair noted that approval of the Reports of the meetings held on November 7 and December 13, 2000 would be sought at the next meeting of the Board.

**2. Business Arising from the Reports of the Previous Meetings**

**(a) *Special Committee to Review the Code of Student Conduct***

At the invitation of the Chair, Dr. Heather Lane noted that she and Mr. Muhammed Ahmad had agreed to serve as Co-Chairs of the committee and that the other members would be Mr. Darren Levstek, Ms Karen Lewis, Professor Ian McDonald and Ms Szu-Mae Yoon.

A member recalled the Board's discussion at the previous meeting concerning the membership of the special committee and noted that the Board could have chosen to amend the membership to include representatives of the Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students, Graduate Students' Union, and the Students' Administrative Council, as had been suggested by some members. He recalled that the Chair had ruled against an amendment to the committee membership. He would raise the matter again once the report of the previous meeting was available.

**(b) *Web-based Voting***

The Chair noted that during the Governing Council's consideration of the Elections Guidelines for 2001, which had been endorsed by the Board at its previous meeting, it had been asked if electronic polling stations could be set up at locations where the ballot boxes had previously been located. Mr. Charpentier reported that the Chief Returning Officer had since confirmed that three locations had the appropriate connectivity for web-based voting: the lobby of the Sidney Smith building on the St. George Campus, and the Meeting Place at the Scarborough and the Mississauga campuses.

A member asked if it would be possible to extend a connection from the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor to the lobby of the Medical Sciences Building. Mr. Charpentier replied that, while it would be possible, the computer lab was readily accessible and the expense and necessary security precautions of extending the connectivity during the election period would not necessarily be the best use of resources.

A member asked if there were facilities on the east side of the campus. Mr. Charpentier replied that voting was currently possible on the east side of campus at the various Information Commons sites.

**3. Equity Offices: Annual Reports, 1999-2000**

**(a) Coordinator of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgendered and Queer Resources and Programs**

The Chair welcomed Ms Jude Tate, Coordinator of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgendered and Queer Resources and Programs.

Invited to comment, Ms Tate noted that the position of Coordinator of Programs and Resources for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgendered and Queer (LGBTQ) Students had been created effective July 1, 1999 on a part-time basis for a two-year period. The position had been expanded to full-time status in June 2000. She was the first incumbent of the office and this was her first report to the Board. The objectives of her office were as follows:

- develop and implement initiatives to provide information and programs in support of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgendered, and queer students, staff and faculty of the University;
- work in partnership with departments and offices on campus to provide academic, social, and cultural support to LGBTQ students;
- respond to heterosexism and homophobia at the University through individual and group educational processes, professional development of students, staff and faculty, and to increase community awareness regarding the policies and commitments of the University;
- raise awareness and increase the capability of students and staff to respond to heterosexism and homophobia on campus;
- develop and implement outreach strategies for new students, staff and faculty, which inform members of the University community of policies and resources which supported LGBTQ individuals; and
- develop materials that effectively fulfill the needs of the University community.

Ms Tate continued that the core services of her office were to provide information, education, direct services (such as counselling, referral, outreach and programming), and leadership development, and to develop and execute programs and events to enrich the University community.

Ms Tate reported that the office had completed a successful year by broadening the awareness and raising the visibility of issues relating to lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgendered and queer students at the University of Toronto. As the presence of the office became known, the provision of information to the University community related to LGBTQ concerns on campus, and in relation to student life, had rapidly increased.

In response to a question from a member of the Board, Ms Tate reported on the successful involvement of her office in a national conference hosted by the Faculty of Forestry last Spring. The office had hosted a wine and cheese party that had been open to all conference participants, and which had been well attended.

Ms Tate responded to a number of questions concerning her annual report and her portfolio. During the course of the discussion, she noted the following. Differences in cultures led to unique challenges on each of the University's three campuses. While her office did not have a specific mandate to deal with faculty and staff, she did work in cooperation with other offices, including the Equity Issues Advisory Group.

**3. Equity Offices: Annual Reports, 1999-2000 (cont'd)**

**(b) Race Relations and Anti-Racism Initiatives Officer**

The Chair welcomed Mr. Kelvin Andrews, Race Relations and Anti-Racism Officer. Mr. Andrews focused his remarks on the extent to which the concerns which he had raised in his report last year had been addressed. With respect to outreach and mentoring, the effort to reach out to students from groups that were still under-represented in several faculties had been given a much-needed boost as a result of a \$35,000 allocation from the Vice-Provost, Students. The Transitional Year Programme (TYP) had just completed its most successful year -- 80 percent of the students still registered in the TYP by mid-October had been recommended for either full or part-time studies. In his previous reports, Mr. Andrews had called for the establishment of a math/science option in the TYP curriculum to accommodate students who wanted to pursue degrees for which these subjects were prerequisites. The hiring last year of an instructor to teach mathematics, combined with the appointment of a recent graduate of OISE/UT, would enable TYP to provide a mathamatics/science option for its students. New faculty appointments to the TYP would make it possible to devote almost a full FTE to working with the TYP students when they entered their first year at University.

Mr. Andrews noted that the greatest challenge currently facing the University was the opportunity to increase the diversity of the professoriate given the number of faculty members that the University would be hiring in the next few years. He commended the multi-year funding now available to the Ethnocultural Academic Initiatives Fund and described the support provided by an anonymous gift, which had provided annual awards to Black students who might otherwise not have been able to attend the University of Toronto.

Mr. Andrews concluded his remarks by noting that the University must find alternate ways to fund targeted awards for needy Black students and for its highly successful mentoring and outreach programmes. He urged that these initiatives be made a top priority in the Campaign.

A discussion ensued during which Mr. Andrews responded to a number of questions for clarification. During the course of his remarks, he clarified that his mandate included education, counselling, mediation, providing advice to faculties on curriculum and serving on University-wide committees.

**(c) AccessAbility Services Coordinator, University of Toronto at Scarborough**

The Chair welcomed Ms Tina Doyle, Coordinator of AccessAbility Services, University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSc). Ms Doyle reported that the number of students requiring the services of the office was increasing, while staff levels had increased only marginally. The number of students who had registered at UTSc in the past five years had almost doubled. The office provided support to a total of 111 students in 1999-2000. The office was examining best practices across Canada to find ways of improving service delivery. The office would also look to increase its partnerships with other services to further improve its delivery of service.

Ms Doyle outlined the functions of the office, which included:

- Service Delivery: casework, accommodations, consulting and diagnostic services, referrals to University and outside community resources, removing barriers to postsecondary education; and
- Education Initiatives: to faculty, staff, current and potential students, student leaders, university and outside community.

**3. Equity Offices: Annual Reports, 1999-2000 (cont'd)**

**(c) AccessAbility Services Coordinator, University of Toronto at Scarborough (cont'd)**

Proposed initiatives for the coming year included the following.

- The status of the Examination Officer would be increased from 80 percent to 100 percent during the period August to May and from 25 percent to 40 percent during June and July;
- The status of the Coordinator position would be permanently increased from 25 percent to 40 percent during June and July;
- The possibility of support staff would be explored (e.g. summer staff, work-study students, office assistants);
- A Web Developer had been hired to revise the current website;
- The Disability Awareness and Technology Training for invigilators would be reviewed;
- The office would continue to ensure that specialists played a role in partnerships.

Ms Doyle responded to several questions for clarification on her report.

**(d) AccessAbility Resource Centre Coordinator, University of Toronto at Mississauga**

The Chair welcomed Ms Elizabeth Martin, Coordinator of AccessAbility Services, University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM). Ms Martin noted that this was her first presentation to the Board. She reported that the number of students using the service in 1999-2000 had increased by 19, from 124 students in 1998-1999 to 143 students in 1999-2000. The main challenge faced by the Office was limited resources. The Principal of UTM was examining additional sources of funding.

Ms Martin continued that the Centre had had over 100 active volunteers in 1999-2000. These volunteers had filled the roles of note-taker, personal assistant, library assistant, and special events assistant. Accomplishments for the past year had included the purchase of new technology and equipment for students, updating of the Centre's website, and the completion of an access audit of a new residence. The Coordinator had also consulted with library staff to review best practices, assisted in the development of an evacuation plan for students, staff, faculty and visitors who had a physical disability and developed a proposal for funding from the Students' Administrative Council Wheelchair Accessibility Committee (SACWAC). Partnerships with various UTM services, the community and professional organizations had been continued.

Ms Martin reviewed the challenges that the centre would face in the coming year. The office continued to experience difficulty in staying within its budget and would have a deficit of approximately \$29,000 in 2000-2001. The office did not have a fixed test/examination site and therefore costs were incurred for booking rooms at UTM. An appropriately designed test/examination site was required. There continued to be a shortage of accessible computer stations on the UTM campus. Demands being placed on the Centre's staff included the areas of outreach and support services. In addressing these demands, the office would continue to work in partnership with other services on the campus, including the Library, Career Centre, Academic Skills Centre, Psychology Department, Student Affairs and Microelectronics / Computing Services.

Ms Martin responded to a number of questions for clarification on her report. During the course of the discussion, Ms Addario clarified the sources of funding for the University's accessibility offices. The Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities (MTCU) allocated

**3. Equity Offices: Annual Reports, 1999-2000 (cont'd)**

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

funding to support services for students with a disability. This allocation was intended to supplement any expenditures the University made from its general revenues to meet legal obligations and was not intended for capital projects. The Office of the Vice-President and Provost distributed the MTCU funding among the University's three campuses. In addition, the Office of Student Affairs made a contribution. It was difficult to assess the needs of each campus based on case load, as needs varied by constituency. For example, the needs of graduate students tended to be more complex. Professor Orchard noted he had been approached by the Principal of UTM concerning the underfunding of the accessibility offices and he had agreed to a three-campus review of funding. He hoped that this review would lead to a strategy to increase funding for these very important services.

**(e) Office of Disability Service to Students, St. George Campus**

Ms Susan Addario, Director of Student Affairs, presented the annual report for the Office of Disability Service to Students on the St. George campus. She reported that the past year had been one of transition for the Office, with the resignation of the Coordinator, and the retirement of a senior administrative staff member. A Review of the office had been commissioned, and interim staffing arrangements put in place. The office was being relocated to the Robarts Library as a result of construction around the building in which the office was currently located. In 1999-2000, the office had provided support to 716 students. In response to increased demand for psycho-education assessments, a second psychologist had been recruited to work one day a week. The office had acquired a new wheelchair-accessible van and it continued to co-sponsor a learning skills drop-in centre with the Counselling and Learning Skills Service.

Ms Addario then introduced Ms Janice Martin, the newly appointed Coordinator of Disability Service for Students, St. George campus. Ms Martin said that she was looking forward to implementing the recommendations of the Review, and raising the visibility of the office. The hours of the office would be extended to meet the needs of students. The joint program with the Transition Year Program involving deaf students would be continued.

In reply to a member's question on the timing of the relocation of the office, Ms Addario replied that meetings were scheduled with the architects and barrier-free consultants the next week, and that the move would take place after the examination period to minimize service disruption.

**(f) Family Care Officer**

The Chair welcomed Ms Jan Nolan, Director of the Family Care Office. Ms Nolan reported that the Family Care Office, which was established in 1993, provided a wide range of services to individuals and departments. On an on-going basis, she reviewed University policy, procedures and publication of their impact on those with family responsibilities and made recommendations to vice-presidents, deans, registrars and other administrators. She also acted as an advocate on behalf of University families with government and community agencies, University departments and employee and student organizations.

Ms Nolan noted that the relocation of the office to the Koffler Centre had allowed the office to work more closely with various student services, and had resulted in increased use of the office. She also noted that the web site of the office had been expanded, and that the Faculty

**3. Equity Offices: Annual Reports, 1999-2000 (cont'd)**

**(f) Family Care Officer (cont'd)**

Relocation and Support Program had successfully supported the recruitment efforts of departments and faculties. She outlined a number of new educational programs that had been offered by the office during the past year.

Priorities and initiatives for the coming year included:

- contributing substantially to the University's efforts to recruit and retain excellent faculty, staff and students;
- collaborating with other University departments on programs and services to maximize resources and their impact; and
- enhancing the Family Care Office services to the University community.

A member suggested that no attention was being given to the needs of single parent students. Ms Nolan replied that a workshop on parenting issues for non-custodial parents would be held in the Spring.

**(g) Sexual Harassment, Education, Counselling and Complaint Officer**

The Chair welcomed Ms Paddy Stamp, Sexual Harassment, Education, Counselling and Complaint Officer. Ms Stamp reported that the Office had received 246 complaints in 1999-2000, of which 40 had proceeded through to the formal complaints procedure. Because of the case load, she had to be strategic about commitments undertaken and the manner in which she conducted complaint management. She relied increasingly on mediation. She was also more strategic and pragmatic about the types of education she undertook. One of the priorities of the Office in the coming year was to address the issue of teacher-student sexual relations and the policy on conflict of interest. A memorandum would be circulated to the group of Principals, Deans, Academic Directors and Chairs to inform them of the need to ensure that all faculty understand fully the provisions of the Policy and Procedures: Sexual Harassment. She also hoped to develop literature for distribution to students on the issue. In addition, Ms Stamp would work with those involved in negotiating collective agreements to determine whether complaints of sexual harassment could be best handled under the current policy or under the grievance procedure within the agreement.

Ms Stamp emphasized the extent to which all the Equity Offices work together in partnership.

A member asked Ms Stamp how many cases of harassment were reported to the police rather than to her office. Ms Stamp replied that her office collaborated closely with the police in those cases that were reported to both agencies, but that there were probably many cases that were reported only to the police.

A member thanked Ms Stamp for drawing the attention of Board members to the collaboration of all the Equity Offices, and suggested that serious thought be given to pursuing funds on behalf of all the offices on a partnership basis.

A member noted that the majority of complaints were launched by staff rather than by students. Ms Stamp responded to a number of questions for clarification concerning her report and the statistics reported therein. In response to a member's query regarding administrative strategies for dealing with serial offenders, the Chair requested that Professor Orchard provide a response to the Board at its next meeting.

**3. Equity Offices: Annual Reports, 1999-2000 (cont'd)**

**(h) Status of Women Officer**

The Chair welcomed Ms José Sigouin, Acting Status of Women Officer. Ms Sigouin noted that she started in the position less than two weeks ago, and that 1999-2000 was the first year of Professor Judy Globerman's term as Status of Women Officer.

Ms Sigouin highlighted several initiatives in the report. Professor Globerman had convened a Status of Women Office Advisory Council to provide a formal ongoing interactive group of advisors and consultants. A variety of issues would be addressed in the coming year, including the experience of women from under-represented and marginalized groups at the University; a review of students' petitions and appeals; the development of a mentorship program for under-represented and marginalized women students on campus; and an examination of the academic / administrative workloads of female faculty. During the course of her comments, Ms Sigouin remarked upon the increased workload within the portfolio and the limited resources available. She drew attention to the request for increased staffing for the Office within the annual report.

A member noted that under-funding was a recurring theme in all the reports, and he asked if there were any ways in which additional resources could be allocated. Professor Orchard commented that this was a recurring theme throughout all the University's divisions. The appropriate mechanism for dealing with the issue would be for the Equity Issues Advisory Group to develop a request for additional funding and submit it to the President for consideration.

The Chair thanked all the Equity Officers for their informative presentations.

**4. Administrative Response to the Report of the Committee to Review the St. George Campus Police**

The Chair welcomed Professor Kent Roach and Professor Rosemary Gartner, authors of the Report of the Committee to Review the St. George Campus Police. He noted that the report had originally been placed on the table at the Board's September meeting as background to the administrative report from Ms Janice Oliver, Assistant Vice-President, Operations and Services, and that the terms of reference of the Board had included campus security. The Chair reminded members that the role of the Board was to ensure that the University was well-managed and not to manage the University and that this principle must inform the discussion of the Report.

The Chair thanked those members of the Board who had provided written questions concerning the Response, prior to this meeting.

Miss Oliver expressed concern that her terse writing style had been interpreted as being dismissive of the review, and she confirmed that she found the report valuable and its recommendations thoughtful.

Miss Oliver noted that the initial Terms of Reference for the Community Advisory Board were stated in the Response to Recommendation 5: *Advisory to the Assistant Vice-President, Operations and Services, the Advisory Board will act as a forum for the Police and Community Safety Officer to seek advice about current and prospective programs. Importantly it will also provide the community with the opportunity to provide feedback on issues of immediate and potential concern. The Board will meet quarterly.*



**4. Administrative Response to the Report of the Committee to Review the St. George Campus Police** (cont'd)

Miss Oliver announced that the first meeting of the Community Advisory Board was scheduled for January 29, 2001, and that Board members would help set the agenda of the meeting. The Board would meet more frequently if members so wished. Reports of complaints received against the Campus Police would be provided at each meeting of the Community Advisory Board.

In response to members' questions about how the Community Advisory Board would be linked to the University Affairs Board, Ms Oliver suggested that an annual report from the Community Advisory Board come forward with the Annual Report of the Campus Police.

A member asked why the federated colleges did not receive service from the campus police. Ms Oliver replied that the budget for security resided with the federated colleges. A member suggested that the impact of the relocation of several academic departments to the federated colleges be considered. Another member suggested that the issue of security in the federated colleges might be addressed through the Memorandum of Agreement with the University.

A member asked how policy concerning police services would be developed. Mr. Charpentier explained that policy was developed by the University administration, and brought forward to governance for approval. The member requested that the issues of the mandate of the Community Advisory Board and the nature and definition of governance be brought back to the University Affairs Board for further discussion.

The Chair thanked Professors Roach and Gartner for being present for the preceding discussion.

**5. Student Crisis Response Programs: Interim Report**

Professor Orchard introduced Rae Johnson, Coordinator of Student Crisis Response Programs. Ms Johnson reported briefly on her responsibilities. Programs currently in development included a student crisis drop-in centre, a pilot project for students in difficulty hosted by University College, the Network to Enhance Student Support through Information Exchange (NESSIE), a case consultation committee, and a critical incident team.

**6. Compulsory Non-academic Incidental Fees – 2000-01**

Professor Orchard presented the annual compilation of compulsory non-academic incidental fees which have been approved by the University Affairs Board. He noted that enhancements had been made in the current report in response to requests from members last year.

Professor Orchard explained that the Council on Student Services established a protocol which determined the amount of increase allowed and approval required for each campus group. A University of Toronto Index variance was assessed by each division for its own use, and this index determined the amount of increase which would be allowed for the division.

In response to a member's question, Professor Orchard undertook to provide a report on the University of Toronto Index for the next meeting.

**7. Report of the Administrative Assessors**

Professor Orchard reported on the appointment of Ms Jeevan Kemspon as Director, Office of Statistics, Records and Convocation.

**8. Other Business**

The Chair invited Mr. Liam Mitchell, Chair of the Council on Student Services (COSS), to address the Board, noting that background material had been placed on the table.

Mr. Mitchell expressed his concern that the motion passed by COSS on October 19, 2000 concerning the free daily distribution of major newspapers had not been placed on the agenda of this meeting of the Board. The Chair replied that, in the view of the agenda planning group of the Board, it was premature for the motion to come forward at this time. Professor Orchard added that a request for additional information had been made on November 3, 2000. The response from the Students Administrative Council dated January 4, 2001 did not provide sufficient additional information.

The Chair indicated that, before the motion was considered by the Board, it should be clarified, and an administrative response should accompany it. Professor Orchard suggested that COSS establish a committee to review this issue, and that the committee write to the Residence Councils, outlining its concerns. Professor Orchard offered to provide support to this initiative.

The meeting adjourned at 8:16 p.m.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Secretary

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chair

February 7, 2001