

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL
REPORT NUMBER 155 OF
THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD

January 26, 2010

To the Governing Council,
University of Toronto.

Your Board reports that it met on Tuesday, January 26, 2010 at 4:30 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, with the following members present:

Ms B. Elizabeth Vosburgh, In the Chair
Professor Jill Matus, Vice-Provost, Students
Ms Lucy Fromowitz, Assistant Vice-President,
Student Life
Ms Greta Chiu
Dr. Louise Cowin
Professor William Gough
Mr. Allan Grant
Ms Joeita Gupta
Mr. Adam Heller
Professor Bruce Kidd
Mr. Ben Liu
Mr. Chris McGrath
Mr. Olivier Sorin
Mr. John David Stewart
Dr. Sarita Verma

Non-Voting Assessors:

Mr. Jim Delaney, Director, Office of the Vice-Provost, Students
Mr. Tom Nowers, Dean of Student Affairs,
University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC)
Mr. Mark Overton, Dean of Student Affairs,
University of Toronto at Mississauga
(UTM)
Ms Elizabeth Sisam, Assistant Vice-President,
Campus and Facilities Planning

Secretariat:

Mr. Henry Mulhall (Secretary)

Regrets:

Ms Diana A.R. Alli
Ms Erin Fitzgerald
Ms Judith Goldring, Vice-Chair
Mr. Maciek Lipinski-Harten
Ms Kimberley Stemshorn

In Attendance:

Mr. Neil Dobbs, Deputy Secretary of the Governing Council
Mr. Anwar Kazimi, Committee Secretary, Office of the Governing Council
Ms Mae-Yu Tan, Assistant Secretary of the Governing Council

REPORT NUMBER 155 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – January 26, 2010

ITEM 3 CONTAINS A CONCURRENCE WITH A PROSPECTIVE RECOMMENDATION OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD FOR GOVERNING COUNCIL APPROVAL.
ALL OTHER ITEMS ARE REPORTED FOR INFORMATION.

1. Report of the Previous Meeting

Report Number 154 (November 3, 2009) was approved.

2. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting

In response to a question, Professor Matus advised that the update of the Code of Student Conduct was underway. A series of consultation sessions with groups and individuals across the University community had been planned and would begin very soon. The schedule of consultations was available from Mr. Jim Delaney, Director of the Office of the Vice-Provost, Students, who could also provide further information about the process.

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

3. University of Toronto at Mississauga Campus Construction of a Parking Deck

The Chair noted that the University Affairs Board considered capital projects such as parking facilities and student residences as part of its general responsibility for matters that directly concerned the quality of student and campus life. The Board's role was to advise Governing Council on their implications, and to concur with the recommendation of the Academic Board for their approval. She added that, since the proposed project was an ancillary operation that involved the balancing of expenses and revenues, the concurrence of the Business Board would also be sought before it proceeded to the Governing Council for final approval.

Details of the proposal are contained in the memorandum and accompanying documentation from the Vice-President and Principal of the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM) to the Board dated January 14, 2010. ¹ Ms Sisam outlined the key points contained in the documentation, including: the scope of the project, the reasons why it was needed, the various initiatives that had already been put in place to reduce the need for on-campus parking, the different alternative options that had been considered to increase on-campus parking capacity, the reasons why the proposed project had been considered the best option, and the means by which the project would be financed.

Among the matters that arose in discussion and questions were the following. A member questioned whether the proposal to add 252 parking spaces would be adequate to meet the future need for parking beyond the short term. Given that enrolment on the UTM campus was projected to increase further in the coming years, he recommended that serious consideration be given to expanding the scope of the project to include a third level on the parking deck. This would avoid the need to carry out the planning and approval process once again within a few years, and costs would be lower to complete one expanded project rather than two. Another member expressed his agreement that the incremental costs would likely be lower, and added that it might be beneficial to complete an expanded project at the present time when financing costs were relatively low, and there was a good possibility that they would increase in the short term.

Ms Sisam responded that a third level could be added to the proposed parking deck, but that, given the topography, the second deck could also eventually be extended horizontally over a greater proportion of the existing surface parking lot should the need arise. It had been decided that it was preferable to

¹ <http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/AssetFactory.aspx?did=6695>

REPORT NUMBER 155 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – January 26, 2010**3. University of Toronto at Mississauga Campus Construction of a Parking Deck (cont'd)**

construct a facility that was currently affordable for the parking ancillary, and to expand it incrementally in future if necessary. Without increasing parking rates beyond the 3% annual increases that had already been planned, the parking ancillary would be able to pay off the project within a reasonable 10-year period. Were the ancillary to build parking capacity beyond what was currently needed, current users would then be paying for future parking costs. Mr. Overton added that there had been extensive discussion of the capacity that was needed during the planning and approval process at UTM. There had been a concern that the construction of excess capacity could be a disincentive to the various initiatives to reduce the need for personal vehicles and parking on the campus. There had been a consensus that the proposed project struck the most appropriate balance, and that future expansion would be evaluated as needs evolved. He added that the surface parking over which the proposed deck was to be built would have to be taken out of service for the duration of the construction period (the summer months), and that it was unlikely that UTM could continue to carry on its essential operations were the project expanded and further existing parking was also taken out of service for that period.

Mr. McGrath, speaking in his capacity as a student affairs professional at UTM, noted that reasonably accessible and affordable public transit or parking was one of the key needs to facilitate a positive student experience on that campus. In response to a question regarding whether parking rates needed to be raised further, he added that UTM was overwhelmingly a commuter campus, and that its students, staff and faculty were accustomed to the significantly lower parking costs that were the norm in Mississauga and its surrounding communities compared to downtown Toronto. The planned 3% annual increases in parking rates were only one of a number of increased costs that would have to be borne by students. He reiterated that building parking capacity to meet potential long term needs would place an unreasonable financial burden on current users. It would also curtail the parking ancillary's ability to be nimble in meeting capacity needs that could fluctuate unpredictably over time. The proposed project sought to strike a balance among current needs, what was affordable, and the ability to meet future capacity if needed, and had the strong support of the UTM community.

A member acknowledged the current need for increased parking capacity at UTM, but recommended that, in future, efforts be continued to develop more sustainable transportation options such as public transit and carpooling. She also questioned why the current need for parking had not been foreseen given the enrolment growth that had occurred, and the number of parking spaces that had been lost as a result of the two major building projects currently underway on the UTM campus. Mr. Overton responded that UTM had experienced both planned and unexpected growth in recent years. Examples of the latter included the opportunistic development of the medical academy and the instructional centre. In response to the member's further question, he clarified that the proposed parking deck would significantly increase the availability of accessible parking spots. The topography of the site would allow access at grade from the upper level of the deck to the adjacent building, whereas the existing surface parking was below grade. He added that another advantage of the proposal was that it would continue to concentrate the footprint of the campus' parking facilities, and to further the trend to locate parking and traffic outside the ring road while making the inner campus more walkable.

There followed further discussion regarding whether potentially lower incremental costs justified expanding the scope of the proposed project to avoid having to do so at a higher cost in the near future. Ms Sisam responded that the savings would consist mainly of consulting fees, and would not be considerable. The cost per parking space of approximately \$25,000 in the proposed 252 space project would remain roughly the same were the project expanded by 500 spaces as recommended by the member.

REPORT NUMBER 155 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – January 26, 2010

3. University of Toronto at Mississauga Campus Construction of a Parking Deck (cont'd)

The Chair reminded the Board that its role was to consider the implications of the project for the quality of student and campus life, and that the Business Board had responsibility to consider its financial aspects. A member added that the Board's role was not to micromanage the detailed business of a UTM ancillary operation, but rather to ensure that the project had undergone the appropriate planning and approval processes, and that it upheld and advanced the University's mission. He was satisfied with respect to both these matters. The Business Board would examine the financial aspects of the proposal, and its report would be provided to the Governing Council when the project was considered for final approval. As a member of the UTSC community, he noted that the University's east and west campuses were both highly dynamic, and that, in these circumstances, an incremental approach to projects had often proven useful.

On the recommendation of the Vice-Provost, Students,

**YOUR BOARD CONCURRED WITH THE PROSPECTIVE
RECOMMENDATION OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD**

THAT the proposed construction of a single-level parking deck, on the site of an existing surface parking lot and with a capacity of approximately 250 spaces, be approved at a total cost not to exceed \$6.5 million with funding to be provided by a loan to be repaid by the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM) Parking ancillary over a period of ten (10) years, beginning in fiscal 2010/11.

4. Compulsory Non-Academic Incidental Fees: Annual Report and Analysis: 2009-2010

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 for information on the full set of fees charged across the University's three campuses. Professor Matus added that the Report was an inventory both of the compulsory non-academic incidental fees approved by the Board and collected by the University as well as similar fees charged by the Federated Universities. The format of the Report was unchanged from that of the previous year.

A member commented on the substantial variation in the levels of fees charged by different divisions, and asked what factors accounted for this variation. Mr. Delaney responded that the fee levels often reflected local needs and priorities, including for example, fees for special projects and facilities enhancements. One purpose of the composite Report was to demonstrate the variety of different activities that occurred in the various divisions of the University.

5. Report of the Senior Assessor

University Response to the Earthquake in Haiti

Professor Matus briefed the Board on the response of the University community to the devastating earthquake that had occurred in Haiti two weeks previously. That same week the President had released a statement in which he had extended sympathies to those suffering from the disaster. The Office of the Vice-Provost, Students, in conjunction with faculty and students, had organized "A Public Observance in Solidarity with the People of Haiti" held at Hart House on January 21, 2010. The President had opened the event in which students, faculty, and administrators had shared personal experiences of Haiti and Haitian culture. Similar events had taken place or were being planned at the UTM and UTSC campuses.

REPORT NUMBER 155 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – January 26, 2010**5. Report of the Senior Assessor (cont'd)**

A number of opportunities to assist Haiti and its people had already emerged from the University community, and continued efforts would be made to develop means by which the University could assist in rebuilding efforts.

H1N1 Pandemic Debriefing

Professor Matus also provided a debriefing on the University's response to the H1N1 pandemic. The pandemic was ongoing, but thus far the planning to mitigate its impact on the University community had proven to be effective. A Crisis and Pandemic Planning Group had been established in the spring of 2009 under the leadership of the Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity. Various subcommittees had taken responsibility for such matters as academic continuity; students, residence, food and housing; vaccinations and liaison with public health; and business continuity planning. Professor Matus had chaired the Students, Residence and Housing group, and had been impressed with the degree of cooperation she had experienced across the University's three campuses. Among the initiatives undertaken had been communications to students by means of email and the portal, information packages for residence dons, and the installation of hand sanitizers at food centres and residences. When vaccines had become available, H1N1 clinics had been offered first to high risk individuals and then to all students.

Planning for the pandemic had also sought to ensure academic continuity of programs in order that all students would have the opportunity to complete all of their courses. Teaching staff had been informed that they were to make reasonable accommodations for students who were unable to attend classes or to complete academic requirements due to suspected or actual H1N1 illnesses. Such requirements could include make up examinations or re-weighting of assignments. Further, as it was expected that individuals suffering from flu-like symptoms might be told by public health authorities or by their physicians not to visit a physician's office, the University had decided that it would not require a medical certificate for absences due to suspected H1N1. In lieu of a medical certificate or doctor's note, a process had been put in place through the student registrarial system (ROSI) whereby students had been directed to make a declaration of illness. The declaration had included a statement that the student was aware that the declaration was for the purposes of academic accommodation, but that nevertheless, she or he was still responsible for completing the requirements of the course. It had also contained a statement that the student understood that making a false declaration would constitute academic misconduct.

The system by which students could make a declaration of illness had been in place by the first day of classes in September 2009, and absences had been centrally monitored for the duration of the fall term. It was significant to note that the rate of absence declarations for students had very closely followed illness trends in the general population. At the peak, the total number of student declarations represented 0.55% of the total population of students. In contrast to prior concerns expressed by many faculty and students that the system could be abused, it was clear that the University's students had acted very responsibly.

Student Experience Report and Performance Indicators

Professor Matus noted that ordinarily the Board received a report on the student experience at its January meeting. The report outlined the results of either the undergraduate NSSE (National Survey on Student Engagement) or graduate CGPSS (Canadian Graduate and Professional Student Survey) surveys which usually occurred in alternate years. This year, however, no survey results were available to be reported, as the next CGPSS survey was to be conducted in the spring of 2010, and the NSSE survey would follow in 2011. However, Professor Matus did direct members' attention to the University's recently released

REPORT NUMBER 155 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – January 26, 2010

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

*Performance Indicators for Governance, 2009 – A Summary*² which included a number of measures (pp. 17-34) related to student recruitment and the student experience.

6. Date of the Next Meeting

The Chair informed members that the next regular meeting of the Board was scheduled for Tuesday, March 16, 2010 at 4:30 p.m.

7. Other Business

There was no other business.

On a motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

The Board moved *in camera*.

In Camera Session

8. Governing Council Elections - Chief Returning Officer: Appointment

On a motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT Mr. Anwar Kazimi be appointed Chief Returning Officer, effective immediately and continuing until his successor is appointed.

On a motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

The Board returned to open session.

The meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

January 29, 2010

² Available at: <http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/AssetFactory.aspx?did=6633>