

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO  
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL  
**REPORT NUMBER 117 OF**  
**THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD**

**October 28, 2003**

To the Governing Council,  
University of Toronto.

Your Board reports that it met on Tuesday, October 28, 2003, at 5:00 p.m. in the Giovanni Room, 89 Chestnut Street Residence, with the following members present:

Mr. Muhammad Basil Ahmad (in the Chair)	Ms. Parissa Safai
Dr. Robert M. Bennett, Vice-Chair	Dr. Thomas Simpson
Professor David Farrar, Vice Provost, Students	Ms. Rebecca Spagnolo
Ms. Catherine Riggall, Assistant Vice- President, Facilities and Services	Ms. Maggy Stepanian
Ms. Lisa Aldridge	
Mr. John Badowski	
Mr. Christopher M. Collins	
Mr. Mike Foderick	
Ms. Margaret Hancock	
Mr. Jason Hunter	
Professor Bruce Kidd	
Mr. Sean Mullin	
Dr. John P. Nestor	

**Non-voting Members:**

Mr. John Bisanti, Chief Capital Projects Officer  
Professor Ron Venter, Vice-Provost,  
Space and Facilities Planning

**Office of the Governing Council:**

Mrs. Beverley Stefureak, Secretary

**Regrets:**

Ms. Murphy Browne  
Dr. Shari Graham Fell  
Ms. Karen Lewis  
Professor Michael Marrus  
Dr. John Wedge

**In Attendance:**

Ms. Cristina Oke, Chief Returning Officer  
Mr. Jim Delaney, Assistant Director, Student Affairs  
Mr. Andrew Drummond, Secretary of the Elections Committee  
Mr. Davis Elisha, Executive Assistant to the Director of Student Services  
Mr. Ashley Morton, President, Students' Administrative Council

ALL ITEMS ARE REPORTED TO THE GOVERNING COUNCIL FOR INFORMATION.

### **1. Report of the Previous Meeting**

Report Number 116 of September 23, 2003 was approved.

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

There was no business arising from the report of the previous meeting.

### **3. Report on 2003 Elections**

The report on the 2003 elections had been circulated with the Agenda under cover of a memorandum from the Chief Returning Officer dated October 8, 2003. This report was for the information of members.

A member noted the very low voter turnout. The Chief Returning Officer agreed and indicated that she was looking for ways to increase turnout and would be happy for suggestions. She added that the data relating to the part-time undergraduate data were representative of what had happened several years ago. Candidates in that constituency had been acclaimed for the past several years and so no recent data on elections had been available.

### **4. Election Guidelines – 2004**

The Chair explained that Professor Michael Marrus, Chair of the Elections Committee, had been unable to attend the meeting today. The *Elections Guidelines 2004* had been developed after consultation with the University community, including a public meeting held on October 3. There were no major amendments to policy or procedures in the proposed revisions to the *Guidelines*, the vast majority of which were for clarity and updating of practice.

The Chair noted that members had received a copy of the proposed *Election Guidelines 2004*, together with a cover memorandum summarizing the most significant of the changes.

A member applauded the job done by the Elections Committee this year, but he hoped that within the next year the Committee would tackle the issue of constituency definition. He thought it was important, with the change in governance over the three campuses, that there be better balance in the student representation on the Governing Council. The current formula was out of date and revisions were long overdue. He further hoped that the timing of Governing Council elections would continue to coincide with elections to the Students' Administrative Council. This was mutually beneficial and might warrant formal recognition in the *Guidelines*.

Ms. Oke agreed that concurrent elections were beneficial to both processes. She was aware that SAC may be changing their electoral period this year and she noted that the *Guidelines* gave the Chief Returning Officer the flexibility to change the Governing Council schedule to coincide with SAC elections, if that were desirable. She assured the Board that every effort would be made to work with SAC toward the goal of effective and fair elections.

A member noted the reference to the possibility of a charge under the *Code of Student Conduct* for vexatious behaviour and asked what would be considered serious enough to bring about that result. Ms. Oke hoped that it would never be necessary to proceed with

#### 4. Election Guidelines – 2004 (cont'd)

action under the *Code*. However, the change had been recommended to signal to students that seriously intimidating or coercive behaviour during the elections, for example, would have consequences for them.

A member asked for clarification that charges would only occur if the behaviour was one of those prohibited in the *Code*. Ms. Oke confirmed that that was the case and reiterated that, hopefully, there would never be need to use the *Code* in relation to Governing Council elections.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the *Election Guidelines 2004* be approved.

#### 5. Annual Report on Decisions of Hearing Officers, *Code of Student Conduct*

The Chair indicated that this was an annual accountability report for monitoring a policy that was within the Board's responsibilities. Members had had the opportunity to review the report under cover of Professor Goel's memorandum of October 20. Both Professor Goel and Mr. Holmes, the Judicial Affairs Officer, were unable to be at the meeting today. If members had any questions about the report, they were requested to contact either Professor Goel or Mr. Holmes, or to inform the Secretary who would undertake to provide a response from one or the other of them.

Noting that the number of cases had reduced to very few, a member asked why that might be. Professor Farrar replied that he had noticed the same and had spoken with Professor Goel. The view was that this could be partly the result of revisions to the *Code* in 2001-02. It was now better written and no longer used frivolously.

#### 6. Recognized Campus Groups: Report #1

The Chair said that, under the *Policy on Recognition of Campus Groups*, twice a year the University Affairs Board received a report on recognized campus groups at the University of Toronto. The report from Mr. Delaney under cover of Professor Farrar's memorandum circulated with the Agenda provided detailed information on the *Policy* and a comprehensive list of the campus groups. This was a report for information.

A member queried why there had been such a significant proliferation in campus groups. Professor Farrar replied that it may be related to a more engaged student population and he invited Mr. Delaney to provide additional comments.

Mr. Delaney noted that there was now some harmonization in the way applications were handled among the three student governments and this may have had an effect. Also, there was evidence of increased emphasis on civic engagement among students in high schools. In response to a question about the duration of the groups, Mr. Delaney indicated that, while there were no good data on this, there were indications that the number of groups renewing their status this year had jumped markedly. To further questions, he noted that there were some common bases for new groups. Many had somewhat narrow interests. Finally, the phenomenon of increased clubs or groups appeared, as well, to be evident in residences and at the college level.

## **7. Senior Assessor's Report**

Professor Farrar's Report #2 had been circulated with the Agenda. He was invited to add comments and reviewed briefly several of the items. SAC and the University had co-hosted an event with a controversial speaker the evening before. It had been planned carefully and had been successful. In his view, both SAC and the Campus Police had done a wonderful job in handling the event. He thought it would be worthwhile to develop protocols to assist in the planning and handling, and hopefully reduce the cost, of events of this nature.

Professor Farrar said he was in the process of developing with the student governments an on-line survey on service, fees and other issues related to student life. SAC and the GSU had expressed strong interest in cooperating. He was looking forward to hearing from them soon.

Professor Farrar spoke about the development of a student portal and the Report of the OSAP Reform Working Group. He commented on the very successful Ontario Universities Fair in late September and on the Repository of Student Information (ROSI) system. In closing, he informed members of the upcoming "Breaking Down Barriers 2003" conference on November 1 which would be co-sponsored by the GSU and SAC on behalf of students and by the Offices of the Vice-President, Government and Institutional Relations and Vice-Provost, Students on behalf of the administration. One hundred and fifty participants had already signed up and he looked forward to what promised to be a very successful conference.

A member commented on the enormous success of Discovery Day, an event that was well managed and that had elicited positive comments from parents and students alike.

## **8. Other Reports**

There were no other reports.

## **9. Report #34 of the Elections Committee – October 17, 2003**

Members had received Report #34 of the Elections Committee in their agenda package. This was for information.

## **10. Next Meeting – Wednesday, November 26, 2003**

The Chair reminded members that the next meeting of the Board was scheduled for Wednesday, November 26, 2003 at 5:00 pm.

## **11. Other Business**

There was no other business.

The meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

---

Secretary

---

Chair

November 10, 2003