

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL
REPORT NUMBER 105 OF
THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD

February 26, 2002

To the Governing Council,
University of Toronto.

Your Board reports that it met on Tuesday, February 26, 2002 at 5:00 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, with the following members present:

Dr. John P. Nestor (In the Chair)
Professor Ian Orchard, Vice-Provost,
Students
Miss Janice Oliver, Vice-President,
Operations and Services
Mr. Muhammad Basil Ahmad
Ms. Aisling Burke
Mr. Jacob Glick
Ms. Margaret Hancock
Mr. Vivek Krishnamurthy
Professor Ian R. McDonald
Ms. Gail Paech
Ms. Parissa Safai
Ms. Wendy Swinton
Dr. John Wedge
Ms. Geeta Yadav

Non-voting Members:

Ms. Susan Addario, Director of Student
Affairs
Mr. Louis R. Charpentier, Secretary of the
Governing Council
Ms. Marilyn Van Norman, Director of
Student Services
Professor Ron Venter, Vice-Provost, Space
and Facilities Planning

Office of the Governing Council:

Ms. Susan Girard
Mrs. Beverley Stefureak, Secretary

Regrets:

Dr. Shari Graham Fell
Dr. Robert M. Bennett
Professor Marion Bogo
Professor Bruce Kidd
Ms. Karen Lewis
Mr. Paul McCann
Mr. Kashif Pirzada

In Attendance:

Mr. Sam d'Angelo, St. George Police Services
Ms. Sheila Brown, Controller and Director of Financial Services
Mr. Jim Delaney, Assistant Director, Student Affairs
Mr. Jorge Sousa, President, Graduate Students' Union

ITEM 3 IS RECOMMENDED TO THE GOVERNING COUNCIL FOR APPROVAL.

ALL OTHER ITEMS ARE REPORTED FOR INFORMATION.

The Chair welcomed Mr. Vivek Krishnamurthy to his first meeting following his appointment to complete the term of Mr. Fayez Quereshy. The Chair also congratulated Mr. Krishnamurthy on having been recently awarded a 2002 Rhodes Scholarship. Members of the Board applauded.

The Chair noted a correction to the Agenda: Item 4, not 5, would be considered *in camera*.

1. Report of the Previous Meeting

Report Number 104 of January 22, 2002 was approved.

2. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting

The Chair noted that Report Number 104 had reported on the Board's consideration of the operating plan and operating budget of the proposed Varsity Centre for Field and Ice Sports. The Referendum Conduct Committee had been struck and it was being chaired by Professor Ian Orchard.

Invited to comment, Professor Orchard provided an update on the work of the Referendum Conduct Committee, whose members were Mr. Selwyn Pieters (appointed by the student government leaders), himself (appointed by the President), and Ms. Vinitha Gengatharan (appointed by Professor Orchard and Mr. Pieters) as the third. The Committee was meeting regularly and had agreed on the referendum question. The rules and regulations for the referendum, which he hoped could be approved this week, would include the dates of the voting period, the appointment and regulation of official "yes" and "no" committees, the material to be mailed to voters, the extent of public advertising and the funding that could be expended on such advertising or other solicitation.

The Chair recognized Mr. Sousa, who had asked to address the Board. Mr. Sousa recalled that he had spoken strongly against the referendum at the last meeting of the Board and reiterated the conviction of the Graduate Students' Union leadership that negotiations relating to this project had been conducted in bad faith. He noted that the campaign period had not begun but, in his view, there was a "yes" coalition already distributing material on the Web and in flyers. Additionally, in his opinion, comments by President Birgencau could be interpreted as promotion of the project. The group opposed to the project had been hoping to conduct an honorable campaign and were awaiting guidelines for that campaign.

A member asked if the regulations would include a mechanism to deal with complaints and sanctions for breaches of the rules. Professor Orchard confirmed that they would and that the regulations would be posted to the Web once the Committee had agreed on them.

A member asked about the role of the Department of Public Affairs during the referendum campaign. Professor Orchard said that the intention was to provide equivalent access to the University's media for both the "yes" and "no" committees.

3. Policy on Policing

The Chair noted that the University Affairs Board was responsible for policy on campus security. Following a review of the St. George Police Services in 2000, the Board had requested that the administration develop a policy on policing.

3. Policy on Policing (cont'd)

Miss Oliver introduced the proposal by recalling that in 2000 a review had been undertaken of the St. George Campus Police Services by a committee comprised of Professor Kent Roach, Ms. Susan Addario, Professor Rosemary Gartner, and Mr. Josh Koziembrocki. Recommendations made by that Committee had informed the search for a new Manager and the creation of a Campus Police Community Advisory Board. The Committee's report had been tabled in November 2000. The Board at that time had recognized its responsibility in the absence of a policy and had asked the administration to draft one.

Surveys of Canadian universities had revealed that where policies existed the focus was on campus security and not on community policing. The administration had returned to a review of the mandate of Police Services, together with their objectives and a determination of what had worked well and what had not. The outcome of the review had also served as a basis for the policy development.

Miss Oliver noted that the policy, unusually, included a section on implementation. This had been done in order to illustrate how the police services would meet their objectives. The policy statement and the implementation plans had been reviewed by the St. George Campus Police Community Advisory Board, the University of Toronto at Mississauga Police Services and the University of Toronto at Scarborough Police Services and had been endorsed by all.

In response to a question, Ms. Oliver indicated that reporting would continue from each of the three separate police services and that the policy would be amended to reflect, under "Implementation", the plural rather than the singular of "departments".

On the recommendation of the Vice-President, Operations and Services,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the *University of Toronto Police Policy*, as revised, dated February 27, 2002, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "A" be approved.

4. Hart House

Ms. Hancock withdrew for this item.

The Chair noted that the University Affairs Board was responsible for student and campus services and for the appointment of Warden of Hart House. Following the normal practice at the end of a director's term, the Provost had appointed a Committee to review the work of Hart House during the term of the current Warden and to make recommendations regarding the reappointment of the current Warden. The Chair continued, saying that the Board would commence its discussion of the Report *in camera* but he would also provide an opportunity to continue the discussion in open session if members wished, following item 4.2. Ms. Hancock's response to the Report would be placed on the Agenda for the meeting of March 26, to provide the opportunity for members to discuss with Ms. Hancock recommendations in the Report and her administrative response.

ON MOTION DULY MOVED AND SECONDED, THE MEETING MOVED *IN CAMERA*.

4. Hart House (cont'd)

4.1. Report of the Provost's Review Committee

The Report was introduced by Professor Ian Orchard and was received positively.

4.2. Appointment of Warden

On the recommendation of the Vice-Provost, Students,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT Ms. Margaret Hancock be reappointed as Warden of Hart House for a five-year term from July 1, 2002 to June 30, 2007.

ON MOTION DULY MOVED AND SECONDED, THE MEETING RETURNED TO OPEN SESSION.

Ms. Hancock rejoined the meeting. The Chair announced the outcome of the Board's *in camera* discussions and the Board congratulated Ms. Hancock with applause.

As he had noted earlier, Ms. Hancock would be providing the administrative response to the report at the next meeting of the Board. Members had no questions at this time.

5. Report of the Assessors

Professor Orchard began his report with an expression of delight at the re-appointment of Ms. Hancock.

He informed the Board that the third annual Report on Student Financial Support had been presented to the Administration and to the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs, and had been well received. Members of the Board would be informed of the url for accessing the Report on the Web.

The Report showed that the distribution of needs-based funding to students had increased twenty-fold from \$1.5 million in 1990-91 to \$30 million in 2000-01. Most of the increase had occurred since 1997-98 and had coincided with the new policy on student financial support that had been approved by governance for implementation with the 1998 entering class, implementation of the government directive that 30% of increased tuition fees must be invested in needs-based funding, and the tremendous success of the Ontario Student Opportunity Trust Fund (OSOTF).

The Report had further revealed that the proportion of first-entry students who had convocated with no Ontario Student Assistance Program (OSAP) debt had remained steady at about 56%, as had the average debt-load (\$14,000 to \$15,000) of those who had graduated with OSAP debt. Any data on high debt-load had been and would continue to be monitored closely.

The Report concluded that the University of Toronto, despite increased tuition fees, had remained accessible to first-entry students from low-income and non-traditional backgrounds. Careful monitoring of this had indicated no marked fluctuation. This had led the administration to conclude that the financial aid program was achieving its objective of maintaining the University of Toronto as a viable choice for all students, regardless of background.

5. Report of the Assessors (cont'd)

Professor Orchard turned to graduate student financial support. The Task Force on Graduate Student Financial Support had made the bold recommendation that funding packages of \$17,600+ a year should be awarded to doctoral stream students. Great progress had been made toward achieving that goal. Last summer, Arts and Science (assisted with external funding) had been able to offer five-year packages of \$20,600 to all Sciences students and \$17,600 to Humanities and Social Sciences students. Each year the Provost had made one-time-only allocations and the University budget now had a \$13 million line for graduate student funding. The minimum objective of the Task Force had now been achieved in many divisions. Funding for graduate students in the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education at the University of Toronto (OISE/UT) had doubled in the last few years. It was hoped their shortfall in funding would be addressed by September 2003. Overall, this has been a very successful response to what seemed unattainable goals several years ago. Professor Orchard applauded the leadership of the Provost, the Deans and Chairs and the work being done throughout the community in support of these goals. He closed by noting that the University of Toronto currently distributed \$102 million annually in graduate student funding.

Members asked if data had been available on private debt or on the debt-load of second-entry students. To the former, Professor Orchard responded that, though the data were available, average debt outside OSAP had been about \$250. With respect to second entry, data were provided in the report on bank loans.

In response to a further question, Professor Orchard indicated that the Ontario Universities Application Centre (OUAC) surveyed, on behalf of universities, high school students to secure data on their perception of universities, how financial aid had factored in choice of institution and background of students with respect to parental income, demographics, ethno-cultural background and educational background of parents. Tracking the data through the period of increasing tuition had indicated that tuition had not affected the applicant pool. The COU/OUAC conclusion had been the same as that which had emerged from the University of Toronto data. He concluded by saying that the data collection would continue and results would be carefully monitored.

Ms. Oliver reported that the residence projects at the University of Toronto at Scarborough, the University of Toronto at Mississauga and the New College Residence had gone to tender. Efforts were underway to effect cost savings in those, as well as in the childcare project which had not yet gone to tender. She hoped to move forward soon to the selection of an architect for the University of Toronto at Scarborough Student Centre. Finally, there had been no announcement as yet from the Ontario Municipal Board regarding Woodsworth Residence.

6. Date of Next Meeting

The Chair reminded members that the next regular meeting of the Board was scheduled for Tuesday, March 26 at 5:00 p.m.

The meeting adjourned at 5:55 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

(18864)

APPENDIX "A"

TO: University Affairs Board
FROM: Janice Oliver
FOR: Meeting of February 26, 2002
AGENDA ITEM: 3

ITEM IDENTIFICATION:

Proposed Policy on Policing

SPONSOR:

Janice Oliver
Assistant Vice-President
Operations & Services
Call 978-4322 for further information

JURISDICTIONAL INFORMATION:

Terms of Reference of the University Affairs Board indicate that: Policy concerning campus security is the responsibility of the Board. The terms of reference further state that new policies will normally require the approval of the Governing Council.

HIGHLIGHTS:

- In 2000 a review was undertaken of the St. George Campus Police Services.
- Both the review and the administrative response were tabled at the University Affairs Board. In the ensuing discussion the University Affairs Board asked the administration to develop a policy on policing.
- In preparing the policy, a search was made of policies at other Canadian universities and a review was undertaken of the mandate and operating procedures of the Police Services.
- The proposed policy has been reviewed and approved by the St. George Campus Police Community Advisory Board. Input and concurrence were received from the administration at Scarborough and Erindale.

ACTION SOUGHT:

THAT the University of Toronto Policy on Policing be recommended to Governing Council for approval.

University of Toronto Police Policy

Preamble

The University of Toronto is committed to maintaining an environment where faculty, staff, students and visitors can pursue their business peacefully and without fear for their safety and security.

Mandate

The University of Toronto Police Services* supports the academic mission by creating a safe, secure and equitable environment for all members of the community. Police Services works in a receptive and genuine partnership with the University community in providing a reliable 24 hour response to emergencies and violations of rules, including the criminal code, and in promoting crime prevention, security and safety awareness, and community service and referrals.

Objectives

The objectives of the University of Toronto Police Services are:

- to protect persons and property by developing programs that promote safety and security and by broadly communicating these programs to the community;
- to prevent crime, maintain the peace, resolve conflicts and promote good order;
- to deliver non-discriminatory, inclusive programs to the diverse University of Toronto community;
- to be accountable to the University of Toronto community;
- to respond to emergencies and provide assistance to faculty, students and staff;
- to ensure University policies and regulations are followed;
- to enforce the criminal code and selected provincial and municipal statutes as necessary.

Values

The University of Toronto Police Services is accountable to its community and is guided by the following principles and values:

- respect for the dignity, privacy, worth and diversity of all persons;
- fair and impartial treatment of all individuals;
- equality of access and protection of civil rights and liberties;
- reliability, competence, accountability, teamwork and open communication;
- an approach to campus policing that welcomes and encourages community involvement and promotes safety and security as a responsibility of all members of the community.

Implementation

To implement this policy:

- within the resources provided, University of Toronto Police Services will strive to deploy adequate complement at all times;
- University of Toronto Police Services will follow a pro-active community based policing approach, working in close partnership with the community in the development and execution of its programs. This includes the establishment of appropriate community advisory boards and committees with broad representation from the community to provide advice/input and accountability on police programs;
- University of Toronto Police Services will follow a stringent recruitment process and hire only constables who have exhibited high standards of achievement in their academic and previous work histories; the candidates must meet both University standards and the standards established by the Police Services Board for obtaining and retaining the Special Constable status;
- University of Toronto Police Services will provide an ongoing training program to ensure that skills and knowledge are pertinent, relevant and convey the principles and values of the Police Services as well as the policies & codes governing all members of the University community;
- discipline & promotional processes will be informed by the principles and values of the Services and the Human Resources policies and practices of the University;
- University of Toronto Police Services will stay current in law enforcement methods, techniques and procedures as appropriate for Universities;
- University of Toronto Police Services will issue public annual reports.

* includes the Campus Police Services at the St. George, UofT at Mississauga and UofT at Scarborough campuses.