

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

REPORT NUMBER 125 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD

January 18, 2005

To the Governing Council,
University of Toronto.

Your Board reports that it met on Tuesday, January 18, 2005 at 4:30 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, with the following members present:

Dr. Robert M. Bennett, In the Chair
Mr. Ari D. Kopolovic, Vice-Chair
Professor David Farrar, Deputy Provost
and Vice-Provost, Students
Ms Anne E. MacDonald,
Director, Ancillary Services
Ms Mubarka Alam
Mr. Christopher M. Collins
Dr. Claude S. Davis
Ms Margaret Hancock
Ms Shaila R. Kibria
Professor Bruce Kidd
Dr. Joel A. Kirsh
Mr. Chris McGrath
Dr. John P. Nestor
Ms Teresa Pun
Mr. Tarek Saghir
Ms Rebecca Spagnolo

Ms Maggy Stepanian
Ms Preet Viridi

Non-Voting Assessors:

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

Secretariat:

Mr. Neil Dobbs
Mr. Andrew Drummond

Regrets:

Ms Katherine Anne Boyd
Mr. Shaun Chen

Dr. John Wedge

In Attendance:

Ms Oriel Varga, member, the Governing Council
Professor Angela Hildyard, Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity
Ms Murphy Browne, President, Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students
Ms Aisling Burke, Student Life Coordinator (Orientation and Transition Programs), Student Affairs
Ms Arij Al-Chawaf, Vice-President, External, Graduate Students' Union
Mr. Jim Delaney, Assistant Director, Student Affairs
Ms Anne Lewis, Manager, Student Accounts
Mr. Sam Rahimi, Vice-President, External, Students' Administrative Council
Ms Myra Lefkowitz, Manager, Health and Well-Being Programs and Services
Mr. Virata Thaivasiganomy, Chair of the Board, Scarborough Campus Students' Union

REPORT NUMBER 125 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – January 18, 2005

ITEMS 4 AND 5 ARE RECOMMENDED TO THE GOVERNING COUNCIL FOR APPROVAL. ALL OTHER ITEMS ARE REPORTED FOR INFORMATION

1. Report of the Previous Meeting

Report Number 124 (November 9, 2004) was approved.

2. Business Arising from the Report

The Chair noted that two items arising from consideration of the Elections Guidelines (item #2 of Report 124) had been taken under advisement by Mr. Paul Holmes, Chief Returning Officer. Mr. Holmes had responded to the two questioners directly. The first question, which had queried the level of voter participation at the three campuses, was not possible to answer because the voting system was designed not to track identifying characteristics of voters. The second question concerned the discrepancy between the number of part-time students eligible to vote in the Governing Council elections in 2004 and the substantially larger membership of the Association of Part-Time Undergraduate Students (APUS). Mr. Holmes had noted that membership in the Association was defined by paying fees in APUS, which were assessed by term. Part-time students registered in one session, but not necessarily in both terms, were eligible to vote and listed on voters' lists based on a snapshot in time.

3. Compulsory Non-Academic Incidental Fees

(a) Annual Report on Fees, 2003-04

Professor Farrar introduced the annual report on fees, noting that it was a routine report to governance for information. A member asked if students registering in a College for the first time were commonly made aware of the significant discrepancies in fees depending on the College. Professor Farrar responded that although the information was publicly available, such information was not collated and advertised to students. He noted, in addition, that there were many elements of College life of which students were likely unaware when they first joined.

(b) Request for Fee Increase – Students' Administrative Council

(c) Request for Fee Increase – Scarborough Campus Students' Union

At the suggestion of a member, and with the agreement of the Chair and the Board, the two above-noted items were discussed together.

Professor Farrar introduced the requests for fee increases, noting that the Board had heard on six previous occasions the administration's views on the implementation of fee collection for student body membership in the Canadian Federation of Students (CFS) and the Canadian Federation of Students – Ontario (CFS-O). In light of the Board approval of collection of the fee on behalf of the Association of Part-Time Undergraduate Students (APUS), the administration was recommending approval of collection of fees on behalf of the Students' Administrative Council (SAC) and the Scarborough Campus Students' Union. He noted, in particular, that the administration considered that the process to join CFS was a single referendum, and stressed the potential inequity if the Board did not extend its approval to other parties to the referendum.

REPORT NUMBER 125 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – January 18, 2005**3. Compulsory Non-Academic Incidental Fees (Cont'd)****(b) Request for Fee Increase – Students' Administrative Council****(c) Request for Fee Increase – Scarborough Campus Students' Union (Cont'd)**

A member asked for clarification of why the Board had voted in June 2004 to approve the fee collection on behalf of APUS. Professor Farrar responded that the Board had chosen to overlook certain concerns about the referendum and had directed the administration to collect the fee. Given that decision, the administration had concluded that to consider them once again would be inappropriate and unfair to the remaining parties to the referendum.

The Chair invited Mr. Sam Rahimi, Vice-President, External, of the Students' Administrative Council (SAC) to speak. Mr. Rahimi informed the Board that he was SAC's representative on the CFS Executive, and that he felt that authorization of the fee collection was important to approve. He noted that voter turnout in the referendum was twice that of a normal SAC election, and requested that the Board not interfere with the will of students by voting down the recommendation.

The Chair invited Mr. Virata Thaivasiganomy, Chair of the Board of the Scarborough Campus Students' Union (SCSU) to speak. Mr. Thaivasiganomy thanked the administration for its positive recommendation and noted that the matter had been extensively debated within the SCSU. He urged the Board to support the resolution before members and requested that the will of students be upheld.

The Chair invited Ms Arij Al-Chawaf, Vice-President, Internal, of the Graduate Students' Union (GSU), to speak. Ms Al-Chawaf informed the Board that she was pleased to add the GSU's endorsement of the recommendation, and urged the Board to vote in favour of the collection of fees for CFS membership.

The Chair invited Ms Murphy Browne, President, APUS, and former Board member, to speak. She urged members to support the democratic will of the students, and noted the especially strong support among part-time students for CFS membership in the referendum.

A member stated her support for the motion based on the strong recommendation from all four recognized student groups.

A member expressed his opposition to the motions. He recalled that in June 2004, when the Board had approved the APUS fee increase, the administration had maintained that there were not three referenda but only one, which had been tainted by irregularities. In response, the CFS supporters had argued that because the APUS referendum had passed by a significantly greater margin, and had fewer complaints than the SAC referendum, it should be considered separately. By voting to approve the APUS levy, the Board had implicitly agreed with the CFS's position that there were three separate referenda with their own intricacies. Therefore, the Board should not now accept the argument that it should approve the other requests for fee increases on the basis of support by a single referendum. He stated his view that the Board made an error in June, 2004 by approving the request from APUS, and he urged the Board not to compound the error by committing another one.

Another member spoke against the motion, and stated that, in her opinion, there had been three referenda and the results had to be treated separately. She felt additional consideration should be given to the irregularities raised in the referendum process and that she felt there was insufficient information for the Board to make an informed decision.

REPORT NUMBER 125 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – January 18, 2005**3. Compulsory Non-Academic Incidental Fees (Cont'd)****(b) Request for Fee Increase – Students' Administrative Council****(c) Request for Fee Increase – Scarborough Campus Students' Union (Cont'd)**

Another member noted his discomfort with the proposal before members because he thought that the choice was either to overlook existing policy on referenda or to overlook the results of a referendum. He asked if there were any reason to believe that irregularities with the referendum process were greater in the SAC or SCSU portions than the APUS portion. Professor Farrar replied that that might have been the case, but he did not think it appropriate to revisit the question of the propriety of the referendum because the Board had (in June, 2004) concluded that any irregularities were insufficient to warrant refusal to collect the fee.

A member said that, in his opinion, there were three referenda, but that he still urged passage of the motion. Another member noted that members should respect the decision of the Board in June and vote in favour of the motions and uphold their fiduciary duty to the institution.

There was a brief discussion in which it was clarified that membership in the Board had altered significantly since June, 2004.

The Chair stressed that the Board's decision should be guided by the need to perform its fiduciary duty to the University of Toronto and to ensure that members' roles as trustees were upheld. The Chair referred to current litigation involving the student society at another university, and he said that the administration and the Chair had advised the representatives of the student organizations of their responsibility to have clear contractual agreements with the Canadian Federation of Students and the Canadian Federation of Students – Ontario dealing with opting out at a future date if their constituencies were to ask for such a change.

On the recommendation of the Deputy Provost and Vice-Provost, Students,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT beginning in the summer 2005 session, the Students' Administrative Council fee be increased by \$6.27 per session for membership in the Canadian Federation of Students and the Canadian Federation of Students - Ontario, charged to all full-time undergraduate students on the St. George Campus and at the University of Toronto at Mississauga, so that the SAC fee on the St. George Campus would increase from \$19.48 to \$25.75 per session in summer 2005 and from \$99.19 to \$105.46 per session in fall 2005 and winter 2006; and the SAC fee on the Mississauga Campus would increase from \$17.23 to \$23.50 per session in summer 2005 and from \$96.94 to \$103.21 per session in fall 2005 and winter 2006.

REPORT NUMBER 125 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – January 18, 2005

3. Compulsory Non-Academic Incidental Fees (Cont'd)

(b) Request for Fee Increase – Students' Administrative Council

(c) Request for Fee Increase – Scarborough Campus Students' Union (Cont'd)

On the recommendation of the Deputy Provost and Vice-Provost, Students,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT beginning in the summer 2005 session, the Scarborough Campus Students' Union fee for full-time students be increased by \$6.27 per session for membership in the Canadian Federation of Students and the Canadian Federation of Students - Ontario, charged to all full-time undergraduate students at the University of Toronto at Scarborough, so that the SCSU fee for full-time students would increase from \$138.77 per session to \$145.04 per session.

Professor Farrar stated, in response to a comment made during the debate, that he did not believe the actions of the Board or of the administration had interfered with the will of students, and he reasserted his belief that the actions of administration and of the Board had been consistent with well-established policy.

He then stated for the record his thanks to Mr. Jim Delaney, who had worked extensively on the file and who deserved the Board's thanks for his hard work. The Chair concurred with Professor Farrar and joined him in thanking Mr. Delaney.

4. Policy on Crisis Preparedness and Response

The Chair welcomed Professor Angela Hildyard, Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity, to the meeting. Professor Hildyard said that the University had no overall crisis-preparedness Policy and even lacked formally approved definitions of what constituted a crisis. The Policy before members was the result of extensive work in the Office of the Deputy Provost and Vice-Provost, Students as well as in her own office. She was especially grateful for the work of Ms Susan Addario, Director, Student Affairs, and Ms Myra Lefkowitz, Manager, Health and Well-Being Programs and Services, both of whom were present.

The proposed Policy set out the authority to act in a crisis, outlined the team nature of responses, and mandated the development of local plans in various divisions throughout the University and its campuses. Although the University had a manual to respond to crises, there existed no clear policy authority to govern crisis preparedness and response. In light of recent crises (such as the SARS outbreak and the electrical blackout of 2003), it was important to implement such a Policy.

Professor Hildyard then provided a brief presentation to the Board outlining structures of crisis management under the proposed Policy. Because of her responsibility for health and safety matters, the President had appointed the Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity as the Crisis Manager. Led by the Manager, a Crisis Management Team consisting of the Vice-Presidents, Vice-Provosts, relevant Deans and/or Principals, the Office of Public Affairs, and Legal Counsel, would be on call to respond to

REPORT NUMBER 125 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – January 18, 2005**4. Policy on Crisis Preparedness and Response (Cont'd)**

crises as they arose. A Response Team, bringing together the Director of Student Affairs and the Director of Campus Police, as well as individuals with the requisite specialized skills to handle the particular crisis, would be formed. Below the response team, three further teams would be created: a critical incident response team, specialized emergency teams, and a pool of internal and external expertise to assist those affected by the crisis.

Professor Hildyard's Office was continuing to consult across the University and to finalize a response procedure manual, following which the implementation would be rolled out.

During discussion, it was clarified that the Vice-Presidents and Principals of the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM) and the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC) would act as local crisis managers and follow the Policy with parallel structures to those envisioned for the St. George campus. Ms Addario further clarified that the proposed Policy would apply to all campuses, and the rollout of the Policy would include training for development of crisis management frameworks for those divisions requiring updates to their plans.

A member suggested that the Policy stipulate that pre-established teams would be activated in response to a crisis. Professor Farrar responded that that would not necessarily be the case because different teams would be required to handle different kinds of crises.

On the recommendation of the Deputy Provost and Vice-Provost, Students,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the proposed Policy on Crisis Preparedness and Response, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix 'A', be approved.

5. College of Electors: Constitution – Revisions

The Chair welcomed Mr. Louis R. Charpentier, Secretary of the Governing Council, to the meeting. Mr. Charpentier, presenting the recommendation on behalf of the Chair of the Governing Council, said that the proposed revisions to the Constitution of the College of Electors arose from a report commissioned by the Executive Committee in late 2003 and received in late 2004. The Executive Committee had endorsed an implementation strategy for changes to the operation of the College of Electors, including recommendations to change the method of election and re-election of the Chancellor to provide for greater clarity. The major changes in the proposal before members were that consent would be required from nominees to the position of Chancellor, the 'Expanded Executive' Committee would formally be called a 'Search Committee' and act as one in a manner parallel to those formed for other searches at the University, and the re-election process would include a review process which, respectful of the incumbent, would be initiated well in advance of the re-election.

In addition, Mr. Charpentier noted, many changes had been included to update language related, for example to offices and officials, and to remove references to obsolete technology.

REPORT NUMBER 125 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – January 18, 2005

5. College of Electors: Constitution – Revisions (Cont'd)

During discussion, a member asked if all of the recommendations of the Review Committee were going to be implemented. Mr. Charpentier noted that many of the recommendations did not require amendment to the College's Constitution and could be undertaken under the leadership of the Chair of the College, while a single recommendation to alter the composition of the College would be deferred to provide an opportunity to observe the effect of other changes.

On the recommendation of the Chair of the Governing Council,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the revised Constitution of the College of Electors, a copy of which is included in Appendix "B" hereto, be approved.

6. Hart House Board of Stewards: Constitution - Minor Revisions

Professor Farrar and Ms Hancock introduced the proposed minor changes to the Hart House Board of Stewards Constitution. There was no discussion.

On the recommendation of the Deputy Provost and Vice-Provost, Students,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the proposed revisions to the Constitution of the Hart House Board of Stewards, as described in Professor Farrar's memorandum of December 14, 2004, be approved.

7. Senior Assessor's Report

Professor Farrar referred to his written report, which dealt primarily with the University's response to the recent tsunami disaster in South and Southeast Asia. In response to a member's question as to the impact of the disaster at the University, Professor Farrar responded that the University had immediately tried to locate any members of the University community directly involved with the tsunami, and to his knowledge there had not been any. Sadly however, two members of the University of Toronto community had lost immediate family members.

8. Recognized Campus Groups, 2004-05 - Report #1

Professor Farrar noted that the report on Recognized Campus Groups was a routine biannual report, and stated that Mr. Jim Delaney was present to answer any questions about it. The Chair referred to a member's question (asked prior to the meeting) about why a group had been denied recognition. That question had been answered. The group that had been denied recognition was a sorority, and its denial was for two reasons. First, a decision of the *Caput* of the University in 1960 had stated that fraternities and sororities were not eligible to be recognized campus groups. In addition, current policy did not allow groups to deny membership to members of the student community. The sorority denied membership to men, and was therefore ineligible.

REPORT NUMBER 125 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – January 18, 2005

8. Recognized Campus Groups, 2004-05 - Report #1 (Cont'd)

A member noted that many of the groups were graduate student organizations, and asked whether, on the basis of the inability to deny students membership, they could be 'taken over' by undergraduate students. Mr. Delaney responded that that was unlikely to happen but was theoretically possible.

9. Date of Next Meeting

The Chair informed members that a meeting on the reserve date of February 22, 2005 would be required so that the Board could hear a report from the Deputy Provost and Vice-Provost, Students on the results of the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE).

10. Other Business

There was no other business

The meeting adjourned at 5:25 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

January 26, 2005

32889