

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

**REPORT NUMBER 100 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD**

**June 5, 2001**

To the Governing Council,  
University of Toronto.

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

Mr. Brian C. Burchell (In the Chair)  
Mr. Fayez A. Quereshey, Vice-Chair  
Ms. Wendy M. Cecil-Cockwell, Chairman  
of the Governing Council  
Professor Ian Orchard, Vice-Provost,  
Students  
Ms. Susan Addario, Director,  
Student Affairs  
Mr. Muhammad Basil Ahmad  
Dr. Robert Bennett  
Professor Marion Bogo  
Ms. Susan Eng  
Dr. Shari Graham Fell  
Mr. Ljupco Gjorgjinski  
Ms. Margaret Hancock  
Mr. Vivek Krishnamurthy  
Dr. Heather Lane

Mr. Darren R. Levstek  
Ms. Karen Lewis  
Mr. Paul McCann  
Ms. Szu-Mae Yoon

Non-Voting Members:

Mr. Louis Charpentier, Secretary,  
the Governing Council  
Miss Janice Oliver, Assistant Vice-President  
Operations and Services

Secretariat:

Mrs. Beverley Stefureak, Secretary  
Ms. Cristina Oke

Regrets:

Ms. Yvette Y. Ali  
Ms. Jennifer Carson  
The Honourable William G. Davis  
Ms. Naana Afua Jumah

Professor Bruce Kidd  
Professor Ian R. McDonald  
Mrs. Susan M. Scace

In Attendance:

Mr. Amir Shalaby, Chair, the Business Board  
Ms. Wendy Talfourd-Jones, Chair, the Elections Committee  
Mr. Elan Ohayon, member, the Governing Council  
Mr. Andrew Morgan, Member-elect of the Governing Council  
Mr. Tad Brown, Finance and Development Counsel, Development and University Relations  
Mr. Jim Delaney, Assistant Director, Student Affairs  
Ms. Agata Durkalec, University Affairs Commissioner, Students' Administrative Council  
Dr. David Neelands, Director, Toronto School of Theology  
Ms. Carmel O'Sullivan, President, Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students  
Ms. Elizabeth Sisam, Director, Campus and Facilities Planning  
Mr. Kyle Winters, Associate Director of Marketing and Licensing Programs,  
Development and University Relations

ITEM 7 IS RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL. ALL OTHERS ARE REPORTED FOR INFORMATION.

ITEM 1, 2 AND 3 WERE CONSIDERED *IN CAMERA*.

**1. Council on Student Services (COSS): Appointment of Chair**

The Board considered a recommendation from the President through Professor Orchard for the appointment of a Chair for the Council of Student Services (COSS) for 2001-02.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED:

THAT Mr. Ted Everson be appointed Chair of the Council of Student Services for 2001-02.

The Chair reported that the motion had been carried unanimously.

**2. Report of the Striking Committee**

**(a) Appointment of Co-opted Members for 2001-02**  
(\*indicates member of 2000-01 Board)

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

The following co-opted members of the University Affairs Board for 2001-02:

<i>Professional and Administrative</i>	Mr. Paul McCann* Ms. Aisling Burke
<i>Alumni</i>	Ms. Gail Paech
<i>Teaching Staff</i>	Professor Marion Bogo*
<i>Students</i>	Mr. Muhammad Basil Ahmad* Mr. Jacob Glick Mr. Fayez Quereshy* Ms. Parissa Safai

The Chair reported that the motion had been carried with two abstentions.

**2. Report of the Striking Committee (cont'd)**

**(b) Appointment of Members to the 2001-02 Discipline Appeals Board**  
(\*indicates current member of Discipline Appeals Board)

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED:

THAT the following be appointed to the Discipline Appeals Board for 2001-02:

Professor Ethel Auster,\* former member Governing Council  
Ms. Jenny Carson, current member Governing Council (student)  
Ms. Margo Coleman,\* former member Governing Council  
Mr. Vivek Krishnamurthy, current member University Affairs Board  
(student)  
Mr. Kashif Pirzada,\* former member, Governing Council (student)  
Mr. Faisal Raja,\* former member, Governing Council (student)

The Chair reported that the motion had been carried with one abstention.

**3. Appointment of Chief Returning Officer**

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT Ms. Cristina Oke be appointed Chief Returning Officer, effective July 1, 2001

The Chair reported that the motion had been carried unanimously.

THE BOARD MOVED INTO OPEN SESSION.

The Chair reported that the Board had approved Mr. Ted Everson as Chair of the Council on Student Services (COSS) for 2001-02. He also reported the names and constituencies of the co-opted members appointed for 2001-02, and the appointments to the Discipline Appeals Board. Finally, the Chair said that Ms. Cristina Oke had been appointed Chief Returning Officer, effective July 1, 2001. He congratulated all those appointed and thanked them for their willingness to serve.

**4. Reports of Previous Meetings**

Reports Number 98 of April 18, 2001 and Number 99 of May 1, 2001 were approved.

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

There was no business arising from the reports of the previous meetings.

**6. Special Committee to Review the Code of Student Conduct: Extension of Membership to August 31, 2001**

Professor Orchard reported that the Special Committee to Review the *Code of Student Conduct* had been meeting weekly for the last several months. The issues within its mandate were complex and required wide consultation. The Committee would have the

**6. Special Committee to Review the Code of Student Conduct: Extension of Membership to August 31, 2001 (cont'd)**

draft report and the proposed revisions to the *Code* ready soon. However, an extension had been requested to allow the report to come through the governance cycle in early autumn. Most importantly, this would allow full debate at a time when student participation was highest. It would also allow sufficient time for review by Principals and Deans and divisional offices, on whom the *Code* could have significant impact.

A member noted that, when the Committee was established, concern had been expressed about the short deadlines for input. His thought was that it now appeared as if that urgency had been unnecessary. Professor Orchard replied that it was precisely because the Committee had extended the initial deadlines and then encouraged further input beyond the deadlines that it had been unable to formulate its recommendations within this governance cycle.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the terms of reference and membership of the Special Committee to Review the *Code of Student Conduct* be extended to August 31, 2001.

The Chair indicated that the motion had been carried unanimously.

**7. Capital Project: Childcare Facilities, St. George Campus, Phase 1, Early Learning Centre - Users' Committee Report**

The Chair said that the University Affairs Board considered Users' Committee Reports for Capital Projects related to the areas of the Board's responsibility. Childcare was one of those areas. The Board would consider this report with respect to the level of service to students and appropriate use of student services fees. The Planning and Budget Committee had considered the Report on May 25 relative to the allocation of capital funds and the Committee's recommendation for approval was on the agenda of the Academic Board for its Thursday, June 7 meeting.

Ms. Addario reported that the Users' Committee Report was the culmination of four years' work. It came forward with the unanimous agreement of the childcare committee with respect to location, planning and programming. She believed that the recommendations would result in excellent childcare for students, staff and faculty. Her memorandum of May 27, 2001 and the attached Users' Committee Report highlighted the recommendations for phase 1 of the childcare renewal project on Glen Morris Avenue to co-locate Margaret Fletcher and Nancy's and to permit administrative amalgamation of these two facilities with Kidspace. The new facility would substantially increase infant and toddler spaces and would include a new Family Resource Centre. Before addressing questions from members, Ms. Addario acknowledged Dr. David Neelands, who was a guest at the meeting, for his passionate dedication to and tremendous work with the earlier users' committee.

A member asked how spaces would be allocated. Ms. Addario responded that, while current Policy had no directive to reserve spaces for any particular groups of users, in the past few years student use had been maintained at approximately 50%. Currently, Nancy's reserved most of its places for part-time students. This was recognized by the allocation of funding from student services fees to Nancy's, with the objective of maintaining affordable childcare for this group of students. The Policy on Day Care was

**7. Capital Project: Childcare Facilities, St. George Campus, Phase 1, Early Learning Centre - Users' Committee Report (cont'd)**

under review. Parents and staff were being consulted and the revised policy coming forward this autumn would address issues including the priority space allocation for different user groups on campus. At this time, she was unable to predict what the recommendation would be with respect to space for students versus staff and faculty.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD CONCURS with the prospective recommendation of the Academic Board:

THAT the User's Committee Report for the planning and construction of the Childcare facility on Glen Morris Avenue on the St. George Campus at the University of Toronto, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 107 Of the Academic Board as Appendix "F", be approved in principle;

THAT the project scope as identified in the Users' Committee Report be approved in principle at a cost of \$4.3 million;

THAT an allocation of \$4.3 million from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund to address the complete costs of the Childcare facility on Glen Morris Avenue be approved.

The Chair indicated that the motion had been carried unanimously.

A member commended the Users' Committee for a solid report and a job well done.

**8. Comments by the Chairman of the Governing Council**

The Chair recognized the Chairman of the Governing Council, Ms. Cecil-Cockwell. The Chairman said that, although she had been unable to attend University Affairs Board meetings this year because of a conflict with St. Michael's Hospital Board, she had made the special effort to be present today in order to pay tribute to two long-standing alumni governors who would be retiring as Chair of this Board and Chair of the Elections Committee this year.

The Chairman first paid tribute to the long service and many contributions of Ms. Wendy Talfourd-Jones. She recalled the various roles that Ms. Talfourd-Jones had served during her eight years, five as a part-time student and three as an Alumni Governor. In the past two years, she had served as Chair of the Elections Committee during the challenging transition to web-based voting. She concluded by saying that Ms. Talfourd-Jones had been a great ambassador for the University and a great supporter of its governance system. The Chairman hoped that she would continue to be involved in University events.

The Chairman then recognized Mr. Brian Burchell who was, with distinction, one of the longest serving members of the Governing Council since its inception in 1972. Mr. Burchell had served a total of eleven years, first as a full-time undergraduate student and then as an alumnus. She noted Mr. Burchell's significant contribution to governance through service on the Balfour Committee, the Senior Salary Committee, the Policy Review Committee and most of the Council's boards and committees. She believed that governance had benefited as a result Mr. Burchell's advice to the Chairman and his thoughtful interventions at appropriate times, and she wished him much success in future endeavours.

**9. Accessibility: Draft Report of the Working Group – St. George Campus**

The Chair said that over the past several months a working group composed of members of the administration and student leaders at St. George campus had been engaged in an accessibility audit of randomly selected buildings. The report would be presented to the Planning and Budget Committee this month, together with a response from the administration on the resource implications of addressing accessibility concerns.

Ms. Addario reported that the Working Group, at its conception, had agreed to audit recently-completed buildings and to conduct a review of standards with respect to barrier-free design. She indicated that much of the responsibility for addressing recommendations of the working group was within the mandate of the Planning and Budget Committee. She hoped that the Board would provide comments and advice that could be incorporated into the administrative response to the Draft Report going forward to that Committee. Influence of the Working Group was already evident in, for example, the greatly improved accessibility to the Bahen Centre and Koffler Student Services' Centre that would result from the link approved recently at an additional cost to the project of approximately \$1.0 million.

Ms. Oliver noted that the audit had addressed issues that were not often readily thought of, such as the needs of visually and hearing impaired users. She noted that the checklist in the Report would be particularly useful in assisting architects and the University staff to focus on important accessibility criteria. The checklist would be used in all future capital projects, whether for the construction of new buildings or renovations to existing buildings. It was her view that the efforts undertaken by the working group had been an extremely valuable exercise which would have lasting implications for accessibility at the University.

Responding to a member's request for clarification, Miss Oliver confirmed that only a partial audit had been undertaken, that the list of projects identified within the Report was not comprehensive and that there was the need to develop a framework within which to evaluate projects and establish priorities. Ms. Addario added that the Students' Administrative Council Wheelchair Access Committee (SACWAC) had undertaken to address criteria by which prioritization of projects could occur. It was proposed that the standing committee recommended in this Report would review the findings of SACWAC and look to that group for input, as well as to the equity officers, Facilities and Services and members of the student governments. She hoped this identification of criteria could occur quickly.

The Chair recognized Agata Durkalec, University Affairs Commissioner, Students' Administrative Council. Ms. Durkalec said that SAC was committed to an inclusive campus, where all students felt accepted and able to access facilities of their choice. She was pleased that the report before the Board was comprehensive and she saw the collaborative efforts of the Working Group as positive. The checklist was important as was the intent to address accessibility in existing buildings.

Continuing, Ms. Durkalec noted that the concern of individual students about accessibility was evident by the \$30 a year, three-year levy approved by student referendum in 1990 which has funded a variety of projects and left an endowment with which SAC would be able to continue financial assistance in this very important area. She saw much to be done and hoped that the momentum that produced this Report would continue and result in allocations to address the many needs.

A member pointed to the recently constructed student centre at the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM) where the elevator posed a number of barriers to accessibility. This illustrated for the member the importance of having users who required barrier-free

**9. Accessibility: Draft Report of the Working Group – St. George Campus**  
(cont'd)

access to the facilities involved in the accessibility surveys and in early stages of construction to ensure that the many varying and unique needs were addressed.

Miss Oliver assured the member that the checklist should prevent a future problem similar to that posed by the UTM student centre elevator. In addition, Ms. Addario noted significantly increased awareness among Facilities and Services staff and credited this higher level of sensitivity for several notable improvements in existing buildings and in those under construction.

A member asked if the working group or the administration had established a timetable for meeting the objectives outlined in the Report. The member wondered when the specific recommendations would go forward, to which Committee they would go and if action would be taken within the next budget cycle.

Miss Oliver responded that these were the specifics that would come forward in the administrative response to the Report. The Chair added that as future specific project recommendations went forward to the Planning and Budget Committee, the University Affairs Board should be asked for its concurrence.

The Chair recognized a member of the Governing Council. The member expressed thanks to the Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students and the Graduate Students' Union, as well as to SAC, for their continuing focus on this important area. It was the member's view that this Report should be seen as a living document, updated and distributed annually. The member saw value in the proposed standing committee and the monitoring function it could perform. Finally, he was of the opinion that the list provided as "examples" on page 7 of the Report should be recommended for allocations.

A member asked how the Board might express support for the report and proposed adding a motion of endorsement to the Agenda. The Chair indicated that such a motion would require a two-thirds majority to be considered. Since the motion to add to the Agenda was not debatable, he suggested that the member inform the Board why a motion of endorsement should be placed before members. The member expressed strong conviction that it was important for the Board to be seen as formally supportive of the Report of the Working Group.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT a motion be added to the Agenda.

The Chair indicated that the motion had been carried with the required two-thirds majority.

It was duly moved and seconded,

THAT the University Affairs Board endorse, in principle, the report of the Accessibility Working Group for the St. George Campus entitled "*U. of T. Barrier-Free*", including, but not limited to, the accessibility retrofitting of projects identified by the Accessibility Working Group.

**9. Accessibility: Draft Report of the Working Group – St. George Campus**  
(cont'd)

Ms. Addario cautioned the Board about proceeding with a formal endorsement of the Report in this manner. In particular, she was concerned about endorsing the list of projects. The Report, which had consensus approval of the Working Group, clearly had identified the list of projects as examples not intended as an exhaustive inventory. No attempt had been undertaken to prioritize these projects. Some of the projects on the list were either underway or already going forward and the University community had not been given the opportunity to identify projects that could be of a higher priority than some of those in the sample. She urged the Board to allow time for a continuing committee to identify an inclusive list of what was needed campus-wide. This Report would go to the Planning and Budget Committee in late June with the considered administrative response and that was the appropriate route to move forward.

The member who proposed the motion hoped that the Board's endorsement would permit the Report to go to Governing Council at its late June meeting. The Chair reminded the member that any such motion would not normally go to Governing Council. Nor would the motion go to the Planning and Budget Committee. The Board's support for the Report would be transmitted to the Planning and Budget Committee through the administration, and this would occur with or without a motion.

Miss Oliver confirmed that the administrative response would go to the Planning and Budget Committee on June 27, sponsored by the Vice-Provost, Space and Facilities Planning. She could not presume the specifics of that response, but continued momentum, prioritizing and timetables would certainly be part of what was considered in the response.

Several members spoke of their discomfort in supporting any action that referred to specific projects. They thought it was important to signal the support of the Board for action toward the objective of significantly improved accessibility. However, they saw the need to respect the governance process so as to ensure that the achievements of the Working Group were not undermined by intemperate action on the part of the Board.

Professor Orchard agreed that it was important to be respectful of process and strongly supported views stated by Ms. Addario and other members. He expressed gratitude for what seemed to be overwhelming support of the Board. In the context of understanding the University's commitment to accessibility and complementary to Ms. Durkalec's presentation, Professor Orchard thought that it was important for the Board to be aware that support for accessibility projects by student groups was matched dollar for dollar by the University.

Professor Orchard illustrated how any motion endorsing the list of projects on page 7 of the Working Group Draft Report was not only premature but inappropriate. Two of the projects on the list – First Nations' House and the Bahen Centre – had already been funded and were underway. A third, Hart House, would not be in a position to proceed because of timing and funding issues. He concluded by noting that the positive response of this Board would be communicated to Planning and Budget and that accessibility would remain a high priority at the University.

A member spoke in favour of the proposed motion, inclusive of the reference to specific projects. The member agreed that the appropriate route for the Report was to go to the Planning and Budget Committee with an administrative response but saw the proposed motion as one of support in principle. This did not preclude the attention of the Planning and Budget Committee.



**9. Accessibility: Draft Report of the Working Group – St. George Campus  
(cont'd)**

Several members restated the hope that the Board's support could be signaled without clouding the issue with specifics on which it was untimely to comment, thereby meeting the apparent intent of the majority of members without endangering the momentum that the Working Group had gained.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was RESOLVED to amend the motion to:

THAT the University Affairs Board endorse, in principle, the report of the Accessibility Working Group for the St. George Campus entitled "*U. of T.: Barrier-Free*".

The Chair reported that the motion to amend had been carried.

The vote was taken on the amended motion. The Chair indicated that the motion, as amended, carried unanimously.

**10. Elections: Special Students – Advice from University Registrar**

Ms. Wendy Talfourd-Jones, Chair of the Elections Committee, recalled that at its meeting of March 22, 2001, the Executive Committee of the Governing Council had considered the notice of motion that had been made at the March 8 meeting of the Governing Council, concerning the status of special students. The University Registrar had been asked to determine whether special students were or could be considered to be '*in a program designated by the Governing Council as a program of post-secondary study at the University.*' The Act provided no other option for including these individuals as members of a student constituency.

It was the advice of the University Registrar that "there was no identifiable subset of 'special students' pursuing a consistent/coherent program which the Governing Council could feasibly designate as a program of post-secondary study".

On May 14, the Elections Committee met to consider the advice of the University Registrar. After considering the advice, and hearing from a number of student representatives, the Elections Committee concluded that no action could be taken with respect to the eligibility of special students to participate in Governing Council elections.

It was duly moved and seconded,

THAT, whereas the Elections Committee has received and considered the advice of the University Registrar that there was no identifiable subset of "special students" pursuing a consistent/coherent program which the Governing Council could feasibly designate as a program of post-secondary study, and

Whereas the *University of Toronto Act* provides no other option for including these individuals as members of a student constituency and, as such, eligible to participate in the Governing Council elections,

No action be taken on the matter of special students.

**9. Accessibility: Draft Report of the Working Group – St. George Campus**  
(cont'd)

A member asked what the support had been for the recommendation at the Elections Committee. Ms. Talfourd-Jones replied that it had been approved with one dissenting vote.

A member asked for a better explanation of the definition of special students. Mr. Charpentier indicated that “special students” was a commonly-used registrarial term for students who were following a self-defined set of courses. It included, for example, students taking credit courses for interest, to improve an average, or on letters of permission from other institutions. All special students fell outside the program categories.

A member noted that first-year students also were not registered in a “program of study”. Professor Orchard made the point that, while these students were not in a specific program/specialization major, they had, in fact, been admitted to the University for the purposes of obtaining a degree. Their program was not identified during their first year but their course of study towards a degree was defined.

The Chair recognized Ms. Agata Durkalec. Ms. Durkalec said that the Students’ Administrative Council was very concerned about the rights of students. From what she had observed, Governing Council was concerned as well. It was, therefore, disappointing that the recommendation of the Elections Committee had been unable to resolve the issue of an arbitrary term that defines a group of students by what they were not. She noted that the category at issue contained a significant number of students. SAC was concerned about marginalization of these students who, for all intents and purposes, had the rights and responsibilities of other students. SAC urged the Board not to accept the recommendation of the Elections Committee and to request a conclusive recommendation.

At the request of a member, the Chair of the Elections Committee restated the primary difficulty the Committee would face in reconsideration of the question. She said the Committee had discussed this issue thoroughly. Representatives from APUS and SAC had contributed to the discussions. At the end of the day, the Committee had been unable to see any other resolution except what had been brought forward today.

The Chair recognized a member of the Governing Council. The member restated concerns that had been expressed in other meetings and the view that special students should be treated as part-time students.

Several members indicated concern that, because a significant number of students was affected, they would prefer the Elections Committee to continue consideration of this question, along with policy implications. It should be referred back for clear direction.

Mr. Charpentier said that the Elections Committee had done its best to provide advice within the constraints of the *Act*. Legal advice had been that Governing Council would need to define a program of study for special students to qualify for participation and this was not possible because there was no identifiable subset under which they could be defined. If the Board were to refer this question back to the Elections Committee, he hoped it would be with particular advice on how to proceed.

**9. Accessibility: Draft Report of the Working Group – St. George Campus**  
(cont'd)

Several members expressed the thought that this issue seemed very confusing. In response, Professor Orchard offered that the advice of the University Registrar had been very clear. Within the category of special students were those who were visiting from another University, some only for the summer, and they were students for whom different rules of admission apply. Special students did not need to meet the same criteria as students who were admitted, part-time or full-time, to complete a program leading to a degree or a diploma. He had great respect for the University Registrar and he hoped the Board would accept the advice from that source.

A member noted that these students were included under the Association for Part-time Undergraduate Students and wondered why they could not be considered as qualifying under the part-time student category. Removing the 600 or 700 who were visiting students, there was still a considerable cohort of 1000 students who were excluded from eligibility to participate in Governing Council elections. He hoped the Committee could reconsider and bring forward a conclusive recommendation.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the motion be referred back to the Elections Committee.

**11. Trademark Licensing Policy: Annual Report**

The Chair introduced Mr. Tad Brown, Finance and Development Counsel, and Mr. Kyle Winters, Associate Director of Marketing and Licensing Programs.

A member asked if it was still possible for University of Toronto branded merchandise to be manufactured under conditions that were unacceptable in this Policy. Mr. Brown responded that it was possible but unlikely. During the term of transition, existing contracts had to be honoured. These had now all expired and new tenders had been issued under the terms of the Policy and the Code. Sixty licensees had agreed to the Code. Monitoring and verification is ongoing and he had no indication that any violations to the Policy had occurred.

**12. Recognized Campus Groups: Annual Report**

Professor Orchard introduced the second annual report for the information of the Board. A member asked what was the consequence of recognition for a campus group. Mr. Delaney was invited to respond. He indicated that recognition provided the group with better access to facilities on campus, for example room bookings. In addition, it gave the group status and corporate history.

The member asked what checking was done before a group was recognized. Mr. Delaney said that it was important to assure that democratic principles of membership were in place. Also, Student Affairs monitored the organization of meetings and the accountability of officers. However, the academic community in which these groups emerged placed great value on freedom of participation and freedom of expression. Therefore, the reason or beliefs underlying the group were not scrutinized.

**13. Report of the Administrative Assessors**

Professor Orchard reported that, in light of the Government announcement that there would be full average funding for increased enrolment, a working group on enrolment expansion was meeting regularly using the University framework for enrolment expansion as its guide. The two suburban campuses each were expected to grow by 50%. Sub-groups were studying and would be recommending on the impact of such growth on student residences, student aid, and student services.

Continuing, Professor Orchard said that changes to the part-time incidental fees were being considered. Currently, part-time students paid 30% of the full-time fee regardless of the number of courses taken. This had long been recognized as inequitable. The administration had not proceeded with changes recommended in a report presented to the University Affairs Board in 1999. Continued consultation had taken place and recommendations would come forward in the autumn for a more equitable schedule of fees.

Professor Orchard reported that priorities for 2001-02 had been set by the Provost's Office since the last Board meeting. The Vice-Provost, Students would be expected to focus on five priorities, the first of which was student financial aid. This would be reported to the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs annually, but would be monitored constantly with respect to impact of higher tuition fees on accessibility. Approximately \$87 million, needs and merit based, would be distributed this year.

A second priority would be the continued implementation of the graduate student support defined in the task report last year. An advisory group had been meeting every two to three weeks and progress in achieving the objectives of the task force had been much faster than expected. Some areas required more work, notably OISE/UT.

Student recruitment would be a high priority for Professor Orchard's portfolio. In particular, there would be a challenge to maintaining and enhancing intake quality in light of the rapid enrolment expansion and the need to concurrently understand a dramatically changed high school curriculum before standards and requirements were established to admit students from the double cohort. A primary objective in student recruitment would be to increase geographic diversity and outreach. In that regard, he spoke to another priority, namely that he hoped international student exchanges would be increased.

Finally, Professor Orchard noted that the Board had approved the operating plans for Student Services, Student Affairs and Hart House and supporting these offices in meeting their objectives was a priority for his office.

A member asked for specifics on the part-time incidental fee proposal related to students taking overload. Professor Orchard said that several models were under study, but that none had yet been discussed with student groups. Essentially, all models were neutral to full-time students and proposed a more fair redistribution of costs among part-time students.

A member hoped that, with a distribution of approximately \$87 million in student aid, good financial aid counseling was provided to students. Professor Orchard responded that \$450,000 had been distributed to academic divisions for this purpose and that the Registrar ran seminars on where to direct students for assistance. He offered to expand on this information in future reports on student financial aid.

**13. Report of the Administrative Assessors (cont'd)**

Ms. Addario had nothing to report, but invited members to join the University of Toronto's large contingent in the Annual Pride Day which was scheduled for Sunday, June 24, congregating at 1:30 p.m. at Bloor and Church streets.

Miss Oliver reported that work was proceeding on four residences, scheduled for 2003 opening. She also indicated that construction of a reading room and more carrel space in the Gerstein library was underway. Finally, she informed the Board that an irrigation system, originally omitted when the City of Toronto and the University redid St. George Street, was being installed. This was also taking place on the back campus to improve the playing fields.

**13. Other Business**

There was no other business.

The Chair thanked the retiring members of the Board for their support throughout the year. He informed the Board that Mr. Vivek Krishnamurthy had been recognized by the Department of Political Science at its annual Undergraduate Awards reception as the winner of the Canadian Institute of International Affairs Book Prize. He also acknowledged the hard work and support of the assessors to the Board, noting in particular that Professor Paul Gooch would be leaving the Board and his current position for his appointment as President of Victoria University on July 1.

Echoing the Chair of the Governing Council, Mr. Burchell paid special tribute to Ms. Wendy Talfourd-Jones for her long list of contributions to the University and particularly to the University Affairs Board and the Elections Committee. On behalf of the University Affairs Board and in recognition of her contributions as Chair of the Elections Committee for the past two years, he presented her with an engraved gavel.

Professor Orchard said that this would be the last meeting for the current Chair and said it was his pleasure to thank Brian Burchell for the tremendous contributions he had made to the University Affairs Board over his eleven years on the Governing Council and, especially, during his tenure as Chair of the Board. His diligence and hard work was exemplary and he thought the Board had received great benefit from Mr. Burchell's knowledge of governance and attention to detail. On behalf of the University, and in recognition of his three years as Chair of the Board, he presented Mr. Burchell with an engraved chair.

The meeting adjourned at 7:40 p.m.

---

Secretary

---

Chair

June 14, 2001