

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL
REPORT NUMBER 161 OF
THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD

February 1, 2011

To the Governing Council,
University of Toronto.

Your Board reports that it met on Tuesday, February 1, 2011 at 4:30 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, with the following members present:

Ms B. Elizabeth Vosburgh, In the Chair
Mr. John Switzer, Vice-Chair
Professor David Naylor, President
Professor Jill Matus, Vice-Provost, Students
Ms Lucy Fromowitz, Assistant Vice-President,
Student Life
Ms Diana A.R. Alli
Dr. Louise Cowin
Mr. Andrew O.P. Drummond
Ms Joeita Gupta
Mr. Arman Hamidian
Professor Ira Jacobs
Mr. Chris McGrath
Ms Natalie Melton
Professor Elizabeth M. Smyth
Mrs. Rachel Trozzolo

Dr. Sarita Verma

Non-Voting Assessors:

Mr. Louis R. Charpentier, Secretary of the
Governing Council
Mr. Mark Overton, Dean of Student Affairs,
University of Toronto Mississauga (UTM)
Mr. Desmond Pouyat, Dean of Student Affairs,
University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC)
Ms Elizabeth Sisam, Assistant Vice-President,
Campus and Facilities Planning

Secretariat:

Mr. Henry Mulhall (Secretary)

Regrets:

Mr. Samuel Oduneye
Miss Meera Rai
Miss Melvin Sert
Miss Priatharsini Sivananthajothy
Ms Rita Tsang
Ms Neeharika Tummala

In Attendance:

Professor Franco Vaccarino, Vice-President and Principal, UTSC, and Member of the Governing Council
Mr. Andrew Arifuzzaman, Chief Strategy Officer, UTSC
Mr. John Aruldason, President, Scarborough Campus Students' Union (SCSU)
Ms Vickita Bhatt, President, University of Toronto Mississauga Students' Union (UTMSU)
Dr. Anthony Gray, Special Advisor to the President
Ms Joan Griffin, Office of the Vice-Provost, Students
Professor Rick Halpern, Dean and Vice-Principal (Academic), UTSC
Mr. Anwar Kazimi, Committee Secretary, Office of the Governing Council
Ms Kim McLean, Assistant Principal (Business and Administration) and Chief Administrative Officer,
UTSC

REPORT NUMBER 161 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – February 1, 2011

ITEM 3 CONTAINS A CONCURRENCE WITH A RECOMMENDATION OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD FOR GOVERNING COUNCIL APPROVAL.

ALL OTHER ITEMS ARE REPORTED FOR INFORMATION.

1. Report of the Previous Meeting

Report Number 160 (November 2, 2010) 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. Capital Project: Project Planning Report for the University of Toronto at Scarborough Sport and Recreation Centre

The Chair noted that the University Affairs Board considered capital projects such as athletic facilities 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.

Details of the proposal are contained in the memorandum and accompanying documentation from the Assistant Vice-President, Campus and Facilities Planning to the Board dated January 25, 2011.¹ Ms Sisam outlined the key points contained in the documentation, highlighting the very positive impact that the proposed facility would have on campus life and the student experience at the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC). The project was intended to rectify a serious deficiency of athletic and other space on this rapidly growing campus. It would also provide a much needed sport and recreation centre to the local Scarborough community. The facility would serve as the Aquatics Centre for the 2015 Pan Am Games, and through partnerships with the City of Toronto, as well as the Provincial and Federal Governments, a much more extensive sport and recreation centre would be realized on the UTSC campus than would have been possible otherwise. The University would contribute \$37.51 million (\$30 million through a UTSC student levy and \$7.51 million from UTSC/U of T Central) towards a project that would cost \$170.5 million (all figures in 2008 dollars). The University's involvement in these partnerships had, from the outset, been driven by the requirements and requests of UTSC students, and the resulting Project Planning Report clearly reflected student needs. The facility would be jointly owned and operated by the University and the City of Toronto, and the University's share of the ongoing operating costs was estimated to be approximately \$1.5 million per year. There would be student representation on the facility's management board, and student access and use would be protected.

At the invitation of the Chair, Professor Vaccarino, Vice-President and Principal of UTSC, added that the proposed project was the response to nearly 25 years of student requests for enhanced athletic facilities. The UTSC campus had no aquatic facility, and campus space pressures had become acute during the previous decade when the student population had nearly doubled in size. The secondary effects of the project would include greater flexibility to free up space on campus for other student life activities, as well as an enhanced profile for UTSC in the local community. Mr. John Aruldason, President of the Scarborough Campus Students' Union (SCSU), noted that strong student support for the project had been demonstrated in 2010, when the largest ever turnout of students in a UTSC referendum had voted two to one in favour of the student levy to support the construction of the facility. Many UTSC students came

¹ <http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/AssetFactory.aspx?did=7454> and <http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/AssetFactory.aspx?did=7455>

REPORT NUMBER 161 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – February 1, 2011**3. Capital Project: Project Planning Report for the University of Toronto at Scarborough Sport and Recreation Centre (cont'd)**

from the eastern Greater Toronto Area, and wished to contribute to a project that would enhance both the campus and the local community for future generations of students and citizens.

Among the matters that arose in discussion and questions by members were the following.

In response to a question, it was clarified that the student levy referendum had stated that the levy rates would escalate once the facility had been constructed, the rationale being that it was fair that those students who would have use of the facility should pay more. Both the University and UTSC students had also agreed that their respective contributions to the project would increase based on inflation. In response to a further question, it was confirmed that the Provincial Government had provided a guarantee to cover construction cost overruns for the project. It was clarified that the facility would be constructed on both University and City of Toronto land, and would be jointly owned and operated by the two parties. Students had been consulted extensively regarding the programming that would be provided by the facility, as well as on the manner in which the centre would be managed. Both the SCSU and the Scarborough College Athletic Association (SCAA) would be represented on the body that would manage the facility. No negative effects on the programming provided to students were anticipated.

In response to a question, Ms Kim McLean, the Chief Administrative Officer at UTSC, provided further detail regarding the University's contribution to the funding for the project. The capital costs, including inflation, would be covered by the student levy and the UTSC/U of T Central contribution, as outlined in part (d) of the motion under consideration. The estimated annual operating costs of \$11-11.5 million per year would be covered by the various partners involved in the project, and discussions were currently underway to determine their respective annual contributions on a proportionate basis. The University's share was expected to be approximately \$1.5-1.7 million per year, and students would have approximately 17-20 percent of the overall use of the facility. The athletics fee currently paid by UTSC students would be allocated to the operating costs of the new centre once it was in use and the existing UTSC athletic facility had been decommissioned. Mr. Andrew Arifuzzaman, UTSC's Chief Strategy Officer, noted that the partnership agreement regarding the operation and operating costs of the facility was just one of a number of such agreements necessitated by the project. The University had entered an agreement in 2009 prior to participating in the bid for the Pan Am Games, and was currently in discussions regarding both a master agreement with the City of Toronto and an agreement for the construction of the facility with Infrastructure Ontario.

On the recommendation of the Vice-Provost, Students,

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

Subject to the availability of funding for the land remediation of the site,

- (a) THAT the Project Planning Report for the UTSC Sport and Recreation Centre, as accommodated in the Pan American Aquatics Centre, Field House and Canadian Sport Institute Ontario to be built at the University of Toronto at Scarborough, dated January 6, 2011, be approved in principle.

REPORT NUMBER 161 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – February 1, 2011

3. Capital Project: Project Planning Report for the University of Toronto at Scarborough Sport and Recreation Centre (cont'd)

- (b) THAT the site northeast of the corner of Military Trail and Morningside Avenue be assigned to the Pan American Aquatics Centre, Field House and Canadian Sport Institute Ontario Project.
- (c) THAT the total project cost for the UTSC portion be \$37.51 Million (2008 dollars) out of a total project cost of \$170.5 Million (2008 dollars) for all parts of the project.
- (d) THAT the funding costs for the UTSC portion of \$37.51 Million (2008 dollars) comprise:
 - \$30 Million acquired through a student levy and,
 - \$7.51 Million from UTSC/U of T Central.

4. Compulsory Non-Academic Incidental Fees

(a) Annual Report and Analysis: 2010-11

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.

(b) Student Society Proposals for Fee Increases Beginning Summer 2011

The Chair noted that the Board was responsible for the approval of requests for fee increases proposed by student societies as part of its responsibility for matters that concerned the quality of student and campus life. The Board's role was not to debate the merits of the individual fee requests, but rather to consider the processes, governed by policy, by which they had been brought forward for approval. If it was satisfied that these processes had been appropriate and thorough, and that any issues that had arisen had been dealt with satisfactorily, then the Board had a responsibility to approve the fees.

Professor Matus provided the context for the two requests for fee increases proposed by the Arts and Science Students' Union (ASSU) and the University of Toronto Mississauga Students' Union (UTMSU). The requests had come forward for consideration earlier in the year than usual, in order to allow collection of the fees during the upcoming summer term, if approved. Professor Matus noted that all requests for fee increases had to be supported by constitutional and fair processes within student societies. Her office thoroughly assessed all requests for fee increases, and she outlined the expectations that governed the assessment process. The administration relied considerably on the assurances of the officers of student societies that proper procedures had been followed. If a complaint was brought to the attention of the administration, the student society was normally asked to respond to the allegations. In rare instances where the society's response was not satisfactory, further inquiry was made to investigate the complaint.

Professor Matus reported that a concern had been raised about the process used to establish a summer part-time UPass levy as part of the UTMSU fee. In order to allow appropriate assessment of

REPORT NUMBER 161 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – February 1, 2011**4. Compulsory Non-Academic Incidental Fees (cont'd)****(b) Student Society Proposals for Fee Increases Beginning Summer 2011 (cont'd)**

the concern, the administration had decided to withdraw that recommendation from consideration by the Board.² The recommendation could possibly be reintroduced at the following Board meeting if it was determined to be appropriate. In response to a question, Professor Matus provided assurance that her office would carry out its investigation expeditiously in order to minimize any negative consequences for students. She noted that no other complaints had been received by the administration with respect to any of the other fee requests.

On the recommendation of the Vice-Provost, Students,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT, beginning in the Summer 2011, the society portion of the Arts and Science Students' Union (ASSU) fee be increased by \$2.00 per session, for all full-time undergraduate Arts and Science students on the St. George Campus. If approved, the total ASSU fee will be \$9.50 per session.

THAT, beginning in the Fall 2011 session, the University of Toronto Mississauga Students' Union (UTMSU) fee be increased by \$16.18/session in the U-Pass portion of the fee. If approved the total UTMSU fee will be increased to \$98.27, charged to all full-time fall/winter University of Toronto Mississauga students.

THAT, beginning in the Summer 2011 session, a University of Toronto Mississauga Students' Union (UTMSU) full-time fee be established at \$86.50/session for a Summer U-Pass fee. If approved, the total UTMSU fee will be increased to \$117.34 charged to all full-time University of Toronto Mississauga undergraduate students.

5. Student Experience: Information Session

Professor Matus provided a presentation to the Board on the student experience, specifically on the theme of 'student engagement'. The presentation offered a snapshot of activities that fostered student engagement across the University's three campuses. Using examples, it illustrated the broad range of opportunities that were available to students, the levels of participation that were occurring, as well as the positive impact that these programs were having on the experiences of both undergraduate and graduate students. The presentation focused on the following topics: orientation and transition, partnerships, first-year experience programs, peer mentorship programs, First Nations initiatives, international experiences, as well as the arts and culture. The highlights of the comprehensive presentation are outlined in the slides attached hereto as [Attachment "A"](#). Professor Matus concluded by playing the winning video submitted in a student video competition sponsored by the Office of the Vice-Provost, Students.

² The following paragraph of the motion, as it had appeared on the agenda, was withdrawn:

THAT, beginning in the Summer 2011 session, a University of Toronto Mississauga Students' Union (UTMSU) part-time fee be established at \$86.50/session, entirely for Summer U-Pass service. If approved the UTMSU summer fee will be charged to all part-time undergraduate University of Toronto Mississauga students.

REPORT NUMBER 161 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – February 1, 2011**6. Report of the Senior Assessor**

At the invitation of the Chair, Mr. Robert Cook, the University's Chief Information Officer, updated the Board on plans regarding improvements to student e-communications systems. By way of introduction, Professor Matus noted that some initial consultations had occurred on this topic with student unions and students at large. However, three town halls, one on each of the University's campuses, were planned for the near future. These would provide students with the opportunity to ask questions, as well as express their views, enthusiasms and concerns about the proposals that were being put forward.

Mr. Cook reported that an evaluation of student e-communications, involving consultations with students and staff over the course of the previous year, had reached a consensus that the existing UTOEMail system was inadequate. An alternative strategy was being proposed that would see the adoption of Microsoft's Live@edu service as the University's student e-communications system. A contract had not yet been finalized with Microsoft, and a threat and security assessment was still being carried out. Outsourcing of the service was being proposed because it provided a cost-effective solution to the University's needs, and responded to the concerns that had been raised during the consultation process. Live@edu would provide a one hundred fold increase in a student's email storage quota, a modern user interface, and a comprehensive suite of services such as calendaring and instant messaging. The "utoronto.ca" identity would be retained in email addresses, and students would have the ability to opt out of the service by redirecting their email to a service provider of their choice. The service would be free of advertising, the University would retain ownership of all data, and the service would be subject to the laws of Ontario and Canada. In response to privacy and security concerns that had been raised, no data mining would be allowed, authentication would be carried out by the University, and all data would be encrypted during transmission between the University and Microsoft. Mr. Cook stated that risks could never be completely eliminated, but that risk mitigation strategies were being developed, and the new email service was expected to be safer than what currently existed. Though a contract had not yet been finalized with Microsoft, a preliminary implementation plan was being developed. Pilots would be carried out during the spring and summer of 2011, to be followed by implementation of the service for new students in the fall of 2011, and for all other students over the course of the 2011-12 academic year.

A member expressed his support for the proposal, and asked why the University had selected the services offered by Microsoft rather than those provided by Google. Mr. Cook noted that both were largely free services, though there would be costs for some features such as the opt-out provision. In the end, the University had decided that the likelihood of finalizing an acceptable contract with Microsoft had been greater, and that the Live@edu service would best meet its security and privacy needs.

Professor Matus reported on a number of matters.

(a) "Join U of T" Admissions Portal

A new "Join U of T" recruitment and admissions portal had been developed. The intention was to begin engaging students and building their sense of community during the application process, and if they were accepted, while they were considering whether to attend the University. The portal was a personalized and interactive social network experience which offered live stream chats and question and answer sessions, and was linked to Facebook. It would have the added benefit of reducing print mailings to prospective students. Within two weeks of its launch, the portal had received 20,000 unique visits. Focus group sessions were being conducted with high school students to gauge their reaction to the portal, and the results would be incorporated into future programming. The portal was part of a broad-based attempt to personalize the admissions experience, and to build engagement and community even in advance of the orientation process.

REPORT NUMBER 161 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – February 1, 2011**6. Report of the Senior Assessor (cont'd)****(b) Code of Student Conduct Consultations**

During 2010, the Office of the Vice-Provost, Students had initiated an extensive series of consultations on the *Code of Student Conduct* in order to ascertain what areas of the document needed updating. A much better understanding of how the *Code* was perceived on campus had been acquired through these consultations with student unions, college societies, principals of colleges and divisional leaders, residence and student affairs personnel, and various other organizations. A common theme had been that the *Code* was difficult to understand both conceptually and procedurally. A wide array of conceptions and misconceptions about its function and processes had been obtained. In response, the Office of the Vice-Provost, Students would be drafting a 'question and answer' companion document that would address the various questions around the *Code* that had arisen during the consultations. A working draft would be circulated for further feedback among the groups which had been involved in the consultation process. It was intended that the companion document, framed in terms of rights and responsibilities, would be a helpful and explanatory perspective on the *Code* for students, faculty, staff, and administrators. Professor Matus would provide further updates on this matter at subsequent meetings of the Board.

(c) Review of the Noah Meltz Program

A Review Committee established by the University Registrar had held a number of productive meetings. Its membership included faculty and college registrars, a part-time undergraduate student, the Executive Director of the Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students (APUS), and the Director of Student Aid. The Manager of Financial Aid and a Financial Aid Counsellor were serving as assessors to the Committee. Professor Matus would report back to the Board in greater detail once she had received the recommendations of the Review Committee.

(d) University of Toronto ODA (*Ontarians with Disabilities Act, 2001*) Report 2010-11

Professor Matus provided the Board with a summary of the highlights of the annual ODA Report.³ There had been a steady increase in the number of students, faculty and staff who had availed themselves of the services offered by the Accessibility Services offices on all three campuses. As legislated by the provincial government in the *Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA)*, the University had introduced the Customer Service Standard in 2010. The University had worked with the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities and the Council of Ontario Universities towards introducing the Information and Communication Standard, the Transportation Standard, and the Employment Standard in 2011. The Built Environment Standard was expected to be introduced in 2012. The University's Advisory Committee constituted for the implementation of the legislated standards had expressed its general satisfaction at the progress made to date. Across the province, the University was seen as a leader in the implementation of the legislated standards. Professor Matus commended Ms Andrea Carter, the Employment Equity AODA Officer, for her leadership role in this initiative.

³ See: <http://www.hrandequity.utoronto.ca/Assets/reports/oda/1011.pdf?method=1>

REPORT NUMBER 161 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – February 1, 2011

7. Date of the Next Meeting

The Chair informed members that the next regular meeting of the Board was scheduled for Tuesday, March 15, 2011 at 4:30 p.m.

8. Other Business

There was no other business.

The meeting adjourned at 6:15 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

February 17, 2011