

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL
REPORT NUMBER 145 OF
THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD

January 29, 2008

To the Governing Council,
University of Toronto.

Your Board reports that it met on Tuesday, January 29, 2008 at 4:30 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, with the following members present:

Dr. Claude Davis, In the Chair
Ms B. Elizabeth Vosburgh, Vice-Chair
Professor David Naylor, President
Professor Jonathan Freedman, Vice-Provost,
Student Life
Ms Anne E. MacDonald,
Director, Ancillary Services
Professor Varouj Aivazian
Ms Diana A.R. Alli
Dr. Louise Cowin
Miss Saswati Deb
Dr. Shari Graham Fell
Ms Kaila Folinsbee
Professor William Gough
Mr. Richard Hydal
Professor Bruce Kidd
Mr. Chris McGrath
Mr. Alexandru Rascanu
Ms Rebecca Spagnolo
Ms Tian Tian

Ms Estefania Toledo
Mr. Jonathan Tsao

Non-Voting Assessors:

Mr. Louis R. Charpentier, Secretary of the
Governing Council
Mr. Jim Delaney, Director, Office of the Vice-
Provost, Students
Ms Lucy Fromowitz, Assistant Vice-President,
Student Life
Professor Angela Hildyard, Vice-President,
Human Resources and Equity
Mr. Tom Nowers, Dean of Student Affairs,
University of Toronto at Scarborough
Ms Elizabeth Sisam, Assistant Vice-President,
Campus and Facilities Planning

Secretariat:

Mr. Henry Mulhall

Regrets:

Mr. Arya Ghadimi
Mr. Robin Goodfellow
Mr. Tim Reid
Dr. Sarita Verma

In Attendance:

Ms Catherine Riggall, Vice-President, Business Affairs
Mr. Neil Dobbs, Deputy Secretary of the Governing Council
Mr. Thomas Felix, Co-chair, Committee on Responsible Investment at the University of Toronto
Dr. Anthony Gray, Special Advisor to the President
Ms Michal Hay, Vice-President, University Affairs, University of Toronto Students' Union
Mr. Matthew Lafond, Committee Secretary, Office of the Governing Council
Ms Nancy Smart, Chief Returning Officer for Governing Council Elections
Ms Mae-Yu Tan, Assistant Secretary of the Governing Council

REPORT NUMBER 145 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – January 29, 2008

ITEM 3 CONTAINS A RECOMMENDATION FOR GOVERNING COUNCIL APPROVAL.
ALL OTHER ITEMS ARE REPORTED FOR INFORMATION.

The Chair introduced and welcomed Ms Lucy Fromowitz who had assumed the position of Assistant Vice-President, Student Life at the beginning of January, and would serve as a non-voting assessor to the Board.

1. Report of the Previous Meeting

Report Number 144 (November 6, 2007) 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. *Policy on Social and Political Issues With Respect to University Investment*

The Chair noted that this Policy had been considered by the Board at its meeting on November 6, 2007, but had not received sufficient support for approval. At that time it had been agreed that a revised Policy should come back to the Board at the earliest date that the administration wished to do so. The Chair also clarified that the Board was being asked to consider for approval only the revised *Policy on Social and Political Issues With Respect to University Investment* (January 2008). The *Procedures for Responding to Social and Political Issues With Respect to University Investment* (January 2008) had been distributed for information only.

Ms Riggall reminded members that the Policy had first been approved by the Governing Council in 1978, then revised in 1994. In July, 2007, the Acting President had written on behalf of the President to the Chair of the Governing Council expressing a particular concern about the Policy. It placed members of the Governing Council who had been appointed members of an Investment Advisory Board in the unusual position of generating a recommendation to the President that could be accepted or declined. This was a reversal of the usual relationship where the Governing Council was responsible for setting policy and the administration was responsible for its implementation. Following a review, a revised Policy that did not restrict membership of an Advisory Committee to Governors had been brought to the University Affairs Board at its November 6, 2007 meeting.

Since that time, the Policy had been further revised to address issues and concerns that had been raised by members of the University Affairs Board. In Ms Riggall's view, the Policy currently under consideration was an improved one, and she thanked members for their constructive input. Under the new Policy, membership of the Investment Advisory Committees would be approved by the Executive Committee on the recommendation of the President. Members would not be Governors, but would continue to be selected from the four major constituencies: students, staff, faculty and alumni. They would be selected in part for the relevant expertise they would bring to the Advisory Committee, as determined by the President and Executive Committee. The President would be responsible to screen potential members for possible conflicts of interest. He would also continue to make the final decision whether to accept or reject any recommendations made by an Advisory Committee, and he would report that decision to the Governing Council. The Policy remained a separate document from the Procedures that would guide its implementation. Ms Riggall emphasized that the Policy was not an investment policy; such a policy would come under the purview of the Business Board. Rather, it was a policy that dealt with social and political issues related to the University's investments. A preamble had been added to clarify how it was expected that such issues would arise. It stated that the University did not normally

REPORT NUMBER 145 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – January 29, 2008**3. Policy on Social and Political Issues With Respect to University Investment (cont'd)**

take positions on social and political issues, but that in situations where it had done so, it was reasonable that this could influence the investments that it held.

Following discussion of a procedural matter, the Chair invited Mr. Thomas Felix, Co-Chair of the Committee on Responsible Investment to address the Board. Mr. Felix stated that what was at stake in the consideration of this Policy was the rightful role of stakeholders in matters of social and environmental concern with respect to the University's investments, and the degree to which the input of those stakeholders should be taken into consideration. As Co-Chair of the Committee on Responsible Investment, he had received the input of the University's stakeholders, including staff and student unions, governors and alumni. The consensus of opinion was that the revised Policy was inadequate, and that other models for addressing social and environmental concerns should be considered. The Committee recommended that a permanent advisory body be established, rather than the *ad hoc* bodies proposed in the Policy. Such permanent bodies had been established at many universities in the United States and Canada, and there was evidence that increased diversity of representation and diffusion of authority promoted more effective decision making. It also had a positive influence on the relationship between trustees and stakeholders. A permanent body could focus on specific shareholder activities, such as proxy voting, that were not considered by the proposed Policy. The Committee on Responsible Investment appreciated having received information on the University's current proxy voting practises, but it recommended that such information be more widely disseminated to stakeholders. The Committee had assisted in drafting an alternate policy, and it recommended that the Board postpone consideration of the Policy on the table until this alternate policy had been reviewed. It wished to work constructively with the University's administration in establishing an effective structure for the consideration of the social and political aspects of investments.

The Chair invited Ms Michal Hay, Vice-President of the Students' Administrative Council (SAC) to address the Board. Ms Hay stated that she also wished to speak in her capacity as a member of the Committee on Responsible Investment. It was the Committee's view that the revised Policy was a step in the opposite direction to that taken by many institutional investors and international organizations in keeping with the United Nations Principles for Responsible Investment. Those Principles were contained in the alternate policy on responsible investment that had been distributed to members around the table. Regarding the Policy currently under consideration by the Board, the Committee wished to make the following points. It was a concern that the President retained the final decision regarding whether to accept or reject recommendations made by an Advisory Committee. While the University had diffused decision making authority for making investments through the establishment of the University of Toronto Asset Management Corporation (UTAM), it was not doing so under the proposed Policy in responding to concerns over the social and political aspects of those investments. Secondly, the process for dealing with petitions provided little opportunity for input from the broader University community. This was in contrast to a number of other universities which had well established consultative practises. Thirdly, the Committee was concerned that the membership of Advisory Committees would be established on the basis of relevant expertise rather than the goal of achieving representation of the diversity of the University community. This would limit the degree to which input would be received from stakeholders. The alternate policy that had been distributed proposed other models that would include the necessary technical expertise without excluding the majority of the University community. This could involve, for example, the establishment of a close working relationship with UTAM and the use of investment information services. The alternate policy was modeled on those currently in place at other universities and allowed for consultation with all stakeholders and the establishment of a representative mechanism. The alternate policy and its recommendations, unlike the Policy under consideration by the Board,

REPORT NUMBER 145 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – January 29, 2008**3. *Policy on Social and Political Issues With Respect to University Investment* (cont'd)**

represented the will of the University community. The Committee asked that the Board take this alternate policy and its recommendations into consideration before it approved the proposed revised Policy.

Ms Riggall commented that the alternate policy that had been distributed referred in a number of places to the Business Board, and it appeared on first reading that it was a matter for consideration by that body rather than the University Affairs Board. The two policies were not mutually exclusive; that is, were the Administration to bring the alternate policy forward in some form, it could be considered by the Business Board. However, the two documents also dealt with different issues. The proposed Policy before the Board concerned petitions to divest from existing investments; the alternate policy to which the speaker referred suggested that the University consider environmental, social, political and governance issues in the process of making new investments.

A member asked whether any body had been established to draft the Policy, and whether there had been a process in place to receive feedback from the University community. Ms Riggall responded that the Policy had been amended by taking into consideration and addressing the concerns raised at the University Affairs Board meeting of November 6, 2007. The original revisions had been prepared by a group of senior University administrators.

The President stated that the proposed Policy had arisen as a result of an existing policy oddity in which an advisory board of Governors was asked to make a recommendation to the President who could accept or reject that recommendation. This reversed the usual relationship between governance and administration. In addition, limiting membership on advisory boards to Governors could place an excessive burden of work on Governors. The proposed Policy sought to engage experts beyond Governors in providing advice on social and political issues. It was not intended to be an attempt by the President to seize authority; on the contrary the President was unlikely to relish the responsibility to make the final decision on such issues. As Vice-President Riggall had stated, two related but distinct issues were under discussion. The first dealt with petitions for divestment and the need to have a mechanism in place to deal with them appropriately. The proposed Advisory Committee would be responsive to governance in its composition which would include representation for the various constituencies. The second issue under discussion was a proposal to develop an investment policy, an issue that had been debated in the past and was alive again. Constructive ideas were being advanced, including that of involving UTAM in the process. The President was prepared to commit to further discussion about how to formulate these ideas into a proposal that could go to governance for consideration. It would perhaps be useful to have an offline session involving interested stakeholders, representatives from UTAM, and members of the Business Board and University Affairs Board in order to frame a proposal. The proposal being considered for approval by the Board was a narrow one that sought to overcome deficiencies in the existing Policy, and it included revisions that addressed concerns raised by the Board at its previous meeting. It was not incompatible with the ideas being advanced about a possible investment policy, and there did not seem to be a considerable difference of interests among the various parties that had participated in the discussion.

The Chair reiterated the President's statement that the Board could both consider for approval the motion on the table, as well as, at a later date, engage in an offline discussion of the ideas being proposed for an investment policy. The two actions were not mutually exclusive.

A member stated that he had been one of three members of the Board who had raised concerns about the Policy at the previous meeting, and that he was now completely satisfied that his concerns had been met. The Policy as revised had eliminated the problem in which the President could potentially ignore the

REPORT NUMBER 145 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – January 29, 2008**3. Policy on Social and Political Issues With Respect to University Investment (cont'd)**

recommendations of Governors. It provided safeguards in that the Executive Committee approved the membership of the Advisory Committee, and it also reviewed any revisions of the Procedures that accompanied the Policy. Professor Freedman added that he had received communications from the two other members who had raised concerns at the previous meeting, that they also supported the revised Policy.

A member recommended that, in order to overcome some of the confusion that had arisen, the name of the Policy be amended to replace the word Investment with Divestment. Ms Riggall was pleased to accept this amendment.

On the recommendation of the Vice-President, Business Affairs,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the revised *Policy on Social and Political Issues With Respect to University Divestment*, a copy of which is attached hereto as [“Appendix A”](#), be approved, replacing the existing Policy as passed on December 14, 1994.

The Chair recommended that Professor Freedman take responsibility to ensure that communications occurred between the University administration and interested parties who wished to discuss the possibility of developing a policy on investment. Professor Freedman stated that he would be pleased to do so, and Ms Riggall added that as a starting point she would be happy to meet with members of the Committee on Responsible investment.

4. Student Experience: Report on the Canadian Graduate and Professional Student Survey (CGPSS)

The Chair noted that this item would allow the Board the opportunity to discuss both the CGPSS survey as well as the broader topic of the enhancement of the student experience, one of the key priority objectives of the University’s current academic plan. He introduced Professor Susan Pfeiffer, Dean of the School of Graduate Studies who provided a PowerPoint presentation on the results of the 2007 Survey. Professor Pfeiffer initially reviewed the very diverse suite of approximately 150 graduate programs offered at the University. These consisted of 74 doctoral stream programs (Ph.D., M.A., M.Sc., M.A.Sc.), as well as 47 professional graduate programs that offered 33 degrees (professional master’s degrees). In addition there were collaborative, combined and joint, and diploma programs. A very substantial proportion of registered graduate students had responded to the 2007 CGPSS: a total of 5182, which represented 43% of the total pool. This compared favorably to a response rate of 41% when the survey was previously conducted in 2005. The respondents were also demographically representative of the graduate student body in terms of the proportions of doctoral stream and professional students.

The key finding of the survey was that most graduate students were pleased with their academic programs and experience, with 88% indicating that their overall experience was excellent to good. This was a stronger positive result than had been received when similar surveys were administered in 2002 and 2005. More than 50% of respondents in 2007 reported that they had no education-related debt, while approximately 75% reported satisfaction with their “student life” experience.

Professor Pfeiffer then reviewed some examples of the types of significant results derived from the survey. Responses to questions concerning the faculty-student relationship showed an upwardly positive

REPORT NUMBER 145 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – January 29, 2008**4. Student Experience: Report on the Canadian Graduate and Professional Student Survey (CGPSS) (cont'd)**

trend from 2005 to 2007. Similarly, all categories of graduate students had responded more positively in 2007 than in 2002 or 2005 to questions regarding the relationship of program content to their research and professional goals. More than 80% had responded positively in each category (doctoral, research master's, and professional master's). The same trends could be observed in the responses to questions regarding opportunities to engage in interdisciplinary work. Students in a doctoral advising relationship had been administered 11 specific questions regarding their progress towards completing their dissertation. More than 80% of the 3722 students in this category had responded positively, a higher proportion than in 2005. More than half (50.2%) of respondents had reported that they had no education-related debt. Those reporting debt were mainly students in professional master's programs.

Of particular significance were four general assessment questions that asked students to provide an overall rating of their academic experience, their graduate program, their student life experience, and their overall experience. Positive responses were received from over 85% of students in the various categories on three of these questions. With respect to their student life experience, positive responses averaged over 75%. Students in research master's programs displayed the highest levels of satisfaction. Responses to these same four questions had improved from 2005 to 2007, and had improved more markedly at the University of Toronto than at Canadian peer institutions that had administered the survey.

The information received from the CGPSS had been used to inform aspects of the 2007 Performance Indicators Report. In addition, the results had been provided in a variety of comparative formats to groups of graduate students, to individual academic departments, and to faculties. The overall goal arising from the survey was to enhance the sense of community among the graduate student body. To this end, renovations had been carried out to a new space in the Graduate House known as the Grad Room. In response to the less than satisfactory CGPSS results concerning the availability of information on financial support, each doctoral program's commitment to student funding had recently been provided on the web site of the School of Graduate Studies. Finally, it was gratifying that the number of graduate students with valid email address, who could consequently be administered the CGPSS, had increased from 82% in 2005 to 94% in 2007.

A member asked whether the data from the CGPSS would be supplemented with qualitative feedback from graduate students, which would provide context for the numerical results and would capture information regarding issues that had not been raised by the survey. Professor Pfeiffer responded that the CGPSS also collected narrative commentary in addition to the numerical data that had been included in the Report. Further, individual graduate departments were expected to carry out self studies that included a qualitative component.

A member noted that, for graduate students, the academic experience and student life experiences were closely tied, and the member asked what specific questions were included in the CGPSS to try to distinguish the two. Professor Pfeiffer responded that the survey included specific questions on such student life issues as the University's provision of parking services, daycare facilities, housing, and food services. In addition, it provided clear indications that the graduate student life experience was very tightly linked to social activities at the departmental rather than university-wide level.

A member noted that the percentage of graduate students with more than \$40,000 in education-related debt at the time of graduation had almost doubled from 2002 to 2007. She asked whether information was available regarding average family incomes and other possible factors that prevented students from

REPORT NUMBER 145 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – January 29, 2008**4. Student Experience: Report on the Canadian Graduate and Professional Student Survey (CGPSS) (cont'd)**

proceeding to graduate studies. Professor Pfeiffer responded that such information was available in the Report on Student Financial Aid. Regarding graduate student debt, it was perhaps helpful to bear in mind the significant diversity of graduate student programs, some of which represented the credential required for professional specializations in such fields as dentistry. There were similarities between some of these professional master's programs and some of the second-entry health sector programs in terms of the career aspirations of the students.

A member noted that the percentage of students who reported having no debt from their undergraduate studies on the CGPSS seemed considerably higher than the overall percentage for students at the time they graduated from the University's undergraduate programs. Professor Pfeiffer clarified that the question asked about current levels of undergraduate debt rather than the amount at the time of graduation, and noted that many graduate students did not proceed directly to graduate studies. Professor Freedman added that there could be a variety of factors underlying these data. For instance, it could be that students with less undergraduate debt were more likely to go on to graduate studies. It could also be that students from families with higher incomes were less likely to acquire undergraduate debt. The member added that these data raised intriguing questions, and he recommended that further analysis be carried out to try to determine what relationships existed between rates of undergraduate indebtedness and the likelihood that students would subsequently pursue graduate studies.

A member noted that the CGPSS data embedded a variety of aspirations and expectations, and suggested that there might be value in attempting to track graduate students after graduation to receive their feedback at various intervals on some of the issues raised by the CGPSS. Professor Pfeiffer responded that less research of this type was being conducted at the graduate rather than the undergraduate level. She was aware of one research institute in Oregon that conducted such studies. They were challenging and expensive to carry out, but could provide very useful information.

A member asked whether there was any evidence that student satisfaction was higher in faculties with higher levels of financial resources, and if so, whether such data should be used to influence University-wide decisions regarding the allocation of resources. Professor Pfeiffer responded that the CGPSS was a summary statistical report, and that the data had not been analyzed in this regard. Her own subjective impression from the data was that no such correlation existed.

In response to a question, it was clarified that the CGPSS did not define "education-related debt"; nor did it include any questions regarding levels of non-education-related debt. Students in professional master's programs had access to the same sort of favourable arrangements with banks as did students in second-entry programs. In response to a further question, it was clarified that, though the 2007 data had not been disaggregated by campus, it would be possible to do so for those students who had specified their campus of registration.¹

A member asked if it was possible to compare the University's CGPSS data with that for other universities in the Greater Toronto Area. Professor Pfeiffer responded that this was possible through data access agreements, and she added that the G13 group of Canadian research intensive universities also had a highly developed database that allowed such comparisons. Finally, a member noted that there was an important relationship between graduate student satisfaction and the undergraduate student experience, given that most teaching assistants were graduate students.

¹ Professor Pfeiffer subsequently confirmed that the sample sizes were too small to yield meaningful results.

REPORT NUMBER 145 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – January 29, 2008**5. Compulsory Non-Academic Incidental Fees: Annual Report and Analysis: 2007-2008**

The Chair noted that the University Affairs Board was responsible for the approval of non-academic incidental fees. In order to provide context for this approval process, the administration provided an annual report on the full set of fees charged across the University's three campuses. Professor Freedman stated that this extensive report was submitted officially to governance through the University Affairs Board, and that it was intended to provide useful information to members as they considered recommendations for the approval of fees at upcoming meetings.

A member noted the large variation in fees charged at the various colleges and asked if further information was available that would break down the amounts charged. Professor Freedman responded that the various colleges had flexibility in setting their fees, and these consequently varied both in the types of fees charged and in the total amounts. Mr. Delaney added that information was provided beginning on page 13 of the Report that broke down the various college fees into their component parts.

6. Recognized Campus Groups, 2007-08: Report #1

Professor Freedman noted that this Report was also officially submitted for information to governance each year through the University Affairs Board. It provided detailed information regarding the tremendous variety and number of organizations that were officially recognized by the University across its three campuses.

A member asked if the number of such groups had increased or decreased in 2007-08. Mr. Delaney responded that the number on the St. George campus was roughly the same as in the previous year, while that at the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC) had increased slightly. There had been a somewhat more significant increase at the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM), in part as a result of the collaborative development of a new recognition process by the Student Life Programs Office on the St. George Campus and the UTM Office of Student Affairs. A member asked why academic unions were officially recognized at UTM but not on the St. George campus. Mr. McGrath responded that academic societies had recently been introduced at UTM as part of an agreement between the University of Toronto at Mississauga Student Union (UTMSU) and the Office of the Academic Dean. During their transition from being student clubs to academic societies, they were temporarily retaining their status as officially recognized groups in order to allow them, in the interim, to continue to provide programming and initiatives to enhance student life. This accounted for the one-year increase in the total number of recognized groups at UTM referred to previously by Mr. Delaney.

Mr. Nowers noted that there had been a remarkable increase in the number of recognized campus groups at UTSC in the previous ten years, from 34 in 1998 to 135 in 2007-08. This had occurred despite the fact that the percentage of commuter students on the campus had increased during that same period. The increase was evidence of a tremendously vibrant student life that needed to be carefully stewarded. To that end, efforts were being made to try to control the costs to students of their student experience, and it was hoped that this would be reflected in the operating plans for the UTSC Student Services being developed for the upcoming year.

A member asked if studies had ever been conducted comparing the total number of groups and the space they required in order to function effectively. Mr. Delaney responded that from time to time there had been efforts to measure the desire of groups for space, and his recollection was that the number of groups who wanted offices was considerably lower than the total number of groups. The Chair asked if data were available on the total membership of all the recognized groups. Mr. Delaney replied that membership data were provided by each group, but that these numbers were not verified.

REPORT NUMBER 145 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – January 29, 2008**7. Election Guidelines 2008: Joint Statement on Campaigning in Residences**

The Chair reported that the University Affairs Board had approved the *Election Guidelines 2008* at its meeting on November 6, 2007. At that time, it had been stated that once a joint statement on campaigning in residences for Governing Council elections had been prepared by the Deans of the University's residences, the statement would be considered by the Elections Committee and appended to the Election Guidelines. This had occurred, and the *Statement* was being provided to the Board for its information.

A member noted that the *Statement* did not refer or apply to either UTM or UTSC, which collectively accounted for approximately one third of the University's housing capacity. He was concerned that the relevant administrators on these campuses had not been consulted in the formulation of the *Statement*, and he stated that this would make its implementation problematic. Ms Smart responded that this had been an unfortunate oversight. The *Statement* had been developed in response to recent problems involving campaigning in residences, all of which had occurred on the St. George campus, and it addressed those problems where they had occurred. The member added that it was likely that there had been few problems at UTM or UTSC because well-developed policies were already in place. He recommended that, in drafting future iterations of the *Statement*, internal best practises at UTM and UTSC be taken into consideration. He also suggested that the current *Statement* be amended to clarify that it applied only to certain colleges on the St. George campus and was not applicable university wide. The Chair indicated that this would be a matter for consideration and action by the Elections Committee.

A member noted that a number of colleges, such as Trinity and St. Hilda's, were not included in the *Statement*, and asked if it applied to them as well. Ms Smart responded that not all the colleges had adopted the *Statement*, but that contact information had been provided for the non-participating colleges so that enquiries could be made regarding their practises with respect to campaigning in residences. A member asked for clarification that the *Statement* applied only to Governing Council elections, and not to other student elections; Ms Smart confirmed that this was the case. A member noted that the *Statement* made no reference to potential conflicts of interest involved in campaigning in residences, for instance if a candidate had a relationship with or was endorsed by a residence administrator or don. Ms Smart replied that the *Statement* was not intended to address such issues. If an allegation of conflict of interest arose, it would be investigated through the appeals process conducted by the Elections Committee.

8. Report of the Senior Assessor

Professor Freedman reported that the Council on Student Services (COSS) had held its first meeting the previous evening. It had been a spirited but agreeable meeting, and he was hopeful that future meetings would be conducted in a similar manner. He introduced and welcomed Ms Lucy Fromowitz, who had assumed the position of Assistant Vice-President, Student Life at the beginning of January. This was a large portfolio with important responsibilities for student affairs and the student experience, and she brought to it strong qualifications from her previous positions at Centennial College and York University.

Professor Freedman summarized the highlights of the *Accessibility of Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA): University of Toronto Accessibility Plan, 2007-08*. This was the fifth year that the University had developed such a plan, under the administrative responsibility of the Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity. Over the course of the previous year, training sessions

REPORT NUMBER 145 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – January 29, 2008

had been instituted at Hart House to assist staff in planning accessible events. In addition, a discussion forum had been established for students and recent alumni with disabilities to share

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

experiences regarding entering the workforce. The inaugural Accessibility Awards had been presented in April to honour members of the University community who were committed to making the University a welcoming and barrier-free environment. In addition, UTM had recently opened Oscar Peterson Hall, a student residence that incorporated a wide range of barrier-free living options for students with disabilities. The Plan for the upcoming year would focus on three key areas of activity: the built environment, best practises in pedagogy and student life, and mental health issues. A key goal was to ensure that programs and services would become part of the overall fabric of the institution. Professor Freedman wished to note that accessibility to buildings on the University's three campuses continued to improve as priorities were identified and funding became available. These ranged from smaller projects such as individual washroom renovations, to more substantial renovations such as that recently carried out at 215 Huron Street. It was a challenge to bring some of the University's older buildings up to current standards, but significant progress was being made in this regard. All of the University's newly constructed buildings incorporated high levels of accessibility. Consequently, the UTM and UTSC campuses, where large numbers of new buildings had been completed in recent years, had higher levels of accessibility than the St. George campus with its high concentration of historic buildings. Finally, Professor Freedman noted that an alumnus of the University, the Honourable David Onley, had been appointed the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario in July of 2007. Having lived with polio and post-polio syndrome for most of his life, he was a champion of disability issues, and his appointment could be seen as a representative of the Province's commitment to improved accessibility.

9. Date of the Next Meeting

The Chair informed members that the next regular meeting of the Board was scheduled for Tuesday, March 25, 2008 at 4:30 p.m.

10. Other Business

There was no other business.

The meeting adjourned at 6:30 p.m.

 Secretary

 Chair

February 7, 2008