

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

REPORT NUMBER 91 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD

April 18, 2000

To the Governing Council,
University of Toronto.

Your Board reports that it held a meeting on Tuesday, April 18, 2000, at 5:00 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, at which the following were present:

Mr. Brian C. Burchell (In the Chair)
Ms Nancy L. Watson (Vice-Chair)
Professor J. Robert S. Prichard, President
Professor Ian Orchard, Vice-Provost,
Students
Ms Susan Addario, Director,
Student Affairs
Professor Ethel Auster
Dr. Robert Bennett
Dr. Shari Graham Fell
Mr. Ljupco Gjorgjinski
Ms Margaret Hancock
Mr. Vivek Krishnamurthy
Professor Ian R. McDonald

Ms Rosie Parnass
Ms Wendy Talfourd-Jones
Ms Sally Walker

Non-Voting Members:

Mr. Louis R. Charpentier, Secretary of the
Governing Council

Secretariat:

Ms Margaret McKone

Regrets:

The Honourable William G. Davis
Professor Bruce Kidd
Dr. Heather Lane
Ms Alicia Maund

Mr. Ahmed Rafi Mian
Ms Mary Ann Pilskalnietis
Mr. Kashif S. Pirzada
Mr. Robert G. Spencer

In Attendance:

Mr. Elan Ohayon, member, the Governing Council
Ms Karen Lewis, member-elect, the Governing Council, and Assistant Dean of
Administration, Faculty of Physical Education and Health
Dr. Jon S. Dellandrea, Vice-President and Chief Development Officer
Mr. Robert G. White, Chief Financial Officer
Ms Anita Benedict, Coordinator, First Nations House
Mr. W. G. Tad Brown, Finance and Development Counsel
Ms Mary Campbell, Manager, Health and Wellness Centre, University of Toronto at
Scarborough (UTS)
Mr. Jim Delaney, Manager, Liaison and Campus Life Services, Office of Student Affairs
Mr. Davis Elisha, Executive Assistant to the Director of Student Services
Ms Susan Girard, Chief Returning Officer, Governing Council Elections, and Assistant
Secretary of the Governing Council
Ms Jennifer Hamilton, Student Success Facilitator, Student Affairs, UTS
Ms Pearl Karimalis, Coordinator, Housing Services

In Attendance (cont'd):

Mr. Paul Kutasi, Vice-President, Students' Administrative Council
Mr. Jaan Laaniste, Director, Physical Education and Athletics, UTS
Mr. Don MacMillan, Director of Recruitment and Registrar, UTS
Dr. Sam Minsky, Coordinator, Counselling and Learning Skills
Mr. Liam Mitchell, UTS Student Member, COSS
Ms Evelyn Napier, Counsel, University of Toronto Faculty Association
Dr. David Neelands, Director, Toronto School of Theology
Mr. Tom Nowers, Associate Vice-Principal, Student Affairs, UTS
Ms Carmela Pagnello, Budget and Accounting Analyst, Financial Services, UTS
Mr. Kasi Rao, Director of the Office of the President and Director of Government Relations
Ms Yvonne Rodney, Associate Director, Career Centre
Ms Deborah Simon-Edwards, Executive Assistant to the Chief Financial Officer
Dr. Sara Taman, Physician in Chief, Health Services
Mr. Kevin Thomas, member, Students' Against Sweatshops
Mr. Paul Tsang, President, Graduate Students' Union
Mr. Gord van Dyk, Manager, Grounds, Parking and Waste Management, UTS
Mr. Glenn Walker, Chief Administrative Officer, University of Toronto at Mississauga
Ms Fran Wdowczyk, Manager, Student Housing and Residence Life, UTS
Ms Renata Zathureczky, Assistant to Associate Vice-Principal, Student Affairs, UTS

ITEM 7 IS RECOMMENDED TO THE GOVERNING COUNCIL FOR APPROVAL. ALL OTHER ITEMS ARE REPORTED FOR INFORMATION.

Chair's Remarks

The Chair welcomed to the Board Mr. Ljupco Gjorginski, a newly elected part-time undergraduate student governor, replacing Mr. Jonathan Papoulidis.

The Chair reported that there had been an error in one of the resolutions and supporting documents in the agenda packages that had been sent to members the previous week. Corrected versions of the documentation had been distributed by courier to members the previous day.

Vary the Agenda

The Chair noted that Mr. Jim Delaney, the author of the Student Societies: Financial Statements and Auditor's opinion had another commitment that would require him to leave the meeting early. With members' consent, this item was, therefore, moved forward on the agenda.

1. Student Societies: Financial Statements 1998-1999 and Auditor's Opinion

Professor Orchard introduced the statements and auditor's opinion, noting that under the University's *Policy for Compulsory Non-Academic Incidental Fees*, each student society that received compulsory fee payments was required to submit financial statements audited by a public accountant, or obtain exemption from the University's Internal Auditor, as outlined in the provisions of the *Policy*. Students paid incidental fees as determined by their registration (full-time, part-time, undergraduate, graduate) or as members of a division. Though the University collected the fees on behalf of the individual societies, the University did not supervise the expenditure of the fees. Student societies were required to provide audited statements annually to the University and to their own boards. These statements were collected and reviewed by the Internal Audit Department and were summarized in the report as presented to this Board. If a student society did not submit an audited statement the next installment of its fees revenue would be withheld. This provided an incentive for student societies to submit timely statements.

1. Student Societies: Financial Statements 1998-1999 and Auditor's Opinion (cont'd)

Professor Orchard drew members' attention to issues concerning two student bodies: Architecture Students' Union and Erindale College Athletics and Recreations Association, which had been reported on in a memorandum from Mr. Delaney, a copy of which was appended to the documentation for this item. Professor Orchard emphasized that the matters were being taken seriously by the administration and he undertook to advise the Board of further developments.

2. Report of the Previous Meeting

Report Number 90 of the University Affairs Board (February 1, 2000) was approved.

3. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting

Item 2 – Election Guidelines for 2000 – Introduction on Web-based Voting

At the invitation of the Chair, Ms Talfourd-Jones, Chair, Elections Committee, reported on the implementation of the 2000 elections, which had for the first time combined web-based voting with the traditional ballot-box voting.

Ms Talfourd-Jones reported that the Governing Council election for undergraduate students had been held during the week of March 27. For the first time, web voting for the Governing Council elections had been available for undergraduate students. Web voting had opened at 7:00 a.m. on Monday, March 27 and had closed at 11:00 p.m. on Sunday, April 2, 2000.

Students had also had the option of voting at the jointly operated Governing Council and Students' Administrative Council (SAC) polling stations. Five polling stations run solely by the Governing Council had been open on Monday and Thursday evenings from 4:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m., mainly for the benefit of part-time students. Polls that had been run jointly with SAC had opened 10:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., with the five polls again staying open to 7:00 p.m. for Governing Council voters only.

In total, 2,345 students had voted, 836 of whom had voted on the web. One third of the full-time students who voted, had voted on the web, while one half of the part-time students had used the web.

Ms Talfourd-Jones continued that this year, slightly more full-time Arts and Science students had voted than last year, while slightly fewer professional faculties students had voted. The number of part-time students voting had been substantially lower than that of the previous year. 350 students had voted in 1998 when both seats had been contested. This year, with one seat at stake (the other had been acclaimed), 199 students had voted. The percentage of voters had remained low, with only 7% of the full-time students voting this year (7-8% last year) and 1.5% of the part-time students voting. In 1998, 2.5% of the part-time students had voted.

Ms Talfourd-Jones noted that the two-envelope method had been extremely time-consuming to check. However, it had been important. Two voters had voted at two different polling stations and 18 voters had used both the web and a polling station to vote. The paper ballots for these voters had been invalidated.

Ms Talfourd-Jones continued that she understood that Ms Girard, the Chief Returning Officer, had been pleased with the implementation of web voting. However, because students who had also wanted to vote in the SAC election had had to go to a polling

3. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting (cont'd)

Item 2 – Election Guidelines for 2000 – Introduction on Web-based Voting (cont'd)

station to vote, she did not have a good objective measure with respect to the number of web votes. Overall, 836 voters was a respectable number and one that would presumably increase if SAC moved to web voting next year as planned.

In response to a query, Ms Girard reported on the number of spoiled ballots, which she did not believe to be significant.

The Chair thanked Ms Talfourd-Jones, clarifying that this was an interim report. A full report would be brought to the Board at a later date.

4. Student Services: Operating Plans for 2000-2001

The Chair welcomed the guests from the University's three campuses who were in attendance for consideration of the student services operating plans.

a) University of Toronto at Mississauga Campus

The Chair welcomed Mr. Glenn Walker, Chief Administrative Officer, University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM), who was in attendance for this item.

Professor Orchard drew attention to his memorandum concerning operating plans for student services 2000-2001, dated April 16, 2000, which contained a description of the highlights for the University of Toronto at Mississauga. Appended to his memorandum was a synopsis of the various student services at UTM.

Professor Orchard addressed four highlights of the UTM student services operating plan.

- The **UTM Student Service fee** for 2000-2001 had been set at \$148.00, an increase of \$4.00 over the 1999-2000 fee. The change resulted from the increased costs of operating the Inter-Campus Bus Service, which had grown significantly over recent years as the number of users had increased.
- The **Inter-Campus Bus Service** continued to experience an increase in passengers. Therefore, the above increase in the UTM Student Service Fee was recommended. The cost of a single fare for UTM students would increase by 35 cents, from \$1.40 to \$1.75. All other users, including staff, faculty and St. George students, would be required to pay \$3.50 (two tickets) for a single trip. There would be no increase in the transfer from the St. George Campus; it would continue at \$76,300 for one more year.
- The **Health Service** would continue its proactive wellness programs such as examination anxiety and stress management, eating disorders and nutrition counseling. The service operated twelve months of the year, with evening service during the winter session. There would be no fee increase in 2000-2001.
- The **Career Centre** provided a holistic, practical and dynamic approach to career management so that current students and recent graduates would know how to market themselves effectively to employers in order to secure meaningful work. There would be no fee increase in 2000-2001.

4. Student Services: Operating Plans for 2000-2001 (cont'd)

a) University of Toronto at Mississauga Campus (cont'd)

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the annual Operating Plans for the Student Services – University of Toronto at Mississauga, as summarized in Professor Orchard's memorandum dated April 16, 2000, and the annual Operating Budgets, as summarized on the attached Schedule C to Professor Orchard's memorandum, be approved; and

THAT beginning in the 2000-2001 Winter Session, the Health Service fee remain at \$35.00, and the Student Services fee be increased from \$144.00 to \$148.00.

b) St. George Campus

At the invitation of the Chair, Ms Addario introduced those members of the St. George Campus who were in attendance for this item.

Professor Orchard drew attention to his memorandum concerning operating plans for student services 2000-2001, dated April 16, 2000, which contained a description of the highlights for the St. George Campus. Appended to his memorandum were the following documents: Office of Student Affairs - Annual Report and Operating Plan, 2000-2001, Student Services - Operating Plans 2000-2001, and Student Services – Budgets and Student Service Fees, 2000-2001.

Professor Orchard provided the following highlights of the operating plans.

- As part of the reorganization of the Office of the Vice-Provost, Students, the Director of Student Services, Ms Marilyn Van Norman, who had formerly reported to the Assistant Vice-President, Student Affairs, and the Director of the Office of Student Affairs, Ms Susan Addario, a new position, now both reported directly to Professor Orchard. This change of administrative responsibility was reflected in the plans and budgets, which separated the budgets of the two areas.
- The operating plans had been prepared with input from the service managers, student users of the services, various advisory bodies, and the Council on Student Services (COSS).
- COSS had recommended approval of the operating plans and budget for the Office of Student Affairs for 2000-2001 (12 in favour, 3 opposed) and the operating plans and budget for the Division of Student Services for 2000-2001 (15 in favour, none opposed).

In conclusion, Professor Orchard noted that the information concerning the plans and aspirations of the various services was well documented in the agenda materials distributed. He was very proud of the continued level of outstanding services offered.

In response to a member's question, Professor Orchard clarified that divisional income reported for the Health Service included direct OHIP billings by the physicians.

4. Student Services: Operating Plans for 2000-2001 (cont'd)

b) St. George Campus (cont'd)

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the annual Operating Plans for the Office of Student Affairs and the Division of Student Services – St. George Campus, as summarized in Professor Orchard's memorandum dated April 16, 2000, and the annual Operating Budgets as summarized on Schedules A1 and A2, attached to Professor Orchard's memorandum, be approved; and

THAT beginning in the 2000-2001 Winter Session, the St. George Campus Student Services fee be decreased from \$145.98 to \$145.30 for full-time students.

Note: In accordance with the approval given in June 1997, unless this provision had been made, the Student Services fee would have decreased from \$145.98 to \$143.86 effective the 2000-2001 Winter Session.

(c) University of Toronto at Scarborough

At the invitation of the Chair, Mr. Tom Nowers, Associate Vice-Principal, Student Affairs, introduced representatives from the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTS).

Professor Orchard drew attention to his memorandum concerning operating plans for student services 2000-2001, dated April 16, 2000, which contained a description of the highlights for UTS. Appended to his memorandum was a copy of the UTS student services operating plans for 2000-2001.

Professor Orchard addressed two highlights of the UTS student services operating plan.

- A modest **operating reserve** (or contingency) of \$860 was proposed for 2000-2001 to accommodate enrolment fluctuations and variances in new labour costs associated with the recent collective agreement with the United Steelworkers of America. Any unspent reserves in this line would be added to the 1999-2000 carry forward reserve of \$6,450 and would be used to abate future fee increases or be converted to a capital reserve – as students wished.
- The proposed 2000-2001 Student Services Budget and related operating plans called for a **fee increase** of \$4.38 or 3.5% for a total of \$129.18. This had been approved unanimously at the meeting of the Council on Student Services of the University of Toronto at Scarborough on March 16, 2000. The budgets and operating plans of both the Health and Wellness Department and the Department of Physical Education and Athletics had been also approved with similar unanimity on February 23, 2000.

4. Student Services: Operating Plans for 2000-2001 (cont'd)

(c) University of Toronto at Scarborough (cont'd)

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the annual Operating Plans for the Student Services – University of Toronto at Scarborough, as summarized in Professor Orchard's memorandum dated April 16, 2000, and the annual Operating Budgets, as summarized on the attached Schedule B to Professor Orchard's memorandum, be approved; and

THAT beginning in the 2000-2001 Winter Session, the Student Services fee be increased from \$124.80 to \$129.18, the Health and Wellness fee remain at \$47.00, and the Athletics and Physical Education fee be increased from \$141.80 to \$144.33.

5. Service Ancillaries: Operating Plans for 2000-2001

The Chair noted that the operating plans for service ancillaries came to the Board through the Service Ancillaries Review Group (SARG), which annually included three of the Board's members. This year they were Mr. Vivek Krishnamurthy, Dr. Heather Lane, and Ms Sally Walker. On behalf of the Board, the Chair thanked these members for their willingness to serve in the review of the plans.

Professor Orchard welcomed Mr. Robert G. White, Chief Financial Officer, and SARG Chair. He noted that each year the Board was asked to approve operating plans for service ancillaries, which described the services and programs to be offered, within the financial parameters set by the University's operating budget and financial policies set by the Business Board. The plans included each ancillary's annual operating budget and described changes to programs and levels of service, categories of users, accessibility, and compulsory or optional fees. Draft plans for each ancillary had been reviewed by the Controller's Office, whose report had been considered by SARG and accepted by the President and Vice-Presidents. As had been indicated by the Chair, three members of the University Affairs Board had served as members of SARG and had participated in the review of the plans. Members had been provided with an executive summary of the various service ancillary operating plans as well as a bound copy of the service ancillary management reports.

Professor Orchard drew specific attention to the operating plan for Hart House, which recommended that student fees be reduced by 1.5% in 2000-2001, with increases commencing in 2001-2002. The Hart House operating plan and budget had also been considered by COSS, which had recommended its approval.

Professor Orchard continued that a motion had been made at COSS that the 2000-2001 fee for Hart House remain at \$119.66 and that revenue surplus to the budget (i.e. the difference between the 1999-2000 Hart House full-time student fee of \$119.66 and the proposed 2000-2001 operating budget fee of \$117.95) be externally restricted to an "accessibility" account, to fund construction of the Hart House elevator. The proposal had been tabled to the next meeting of COSS because of time constraints. Professor Orchard would report on its disposition at the next meeting of the University Affairs Board.

5. Service Ancillaries: Operating Plans for 2000-2001 (cont'd)

Discussion ensued on the operating plans for service ancillaries. Among the substantive matters that arose were the following.

(a) Graduate House. Several members and Mr. Paul Tsang, President, Graduate Students' Union, expressed concern that a 3% increase in the fee for the new graduate residence was being proposed in the absence of appropriate dialogue with users. Specifically, concerns were expressed that unanticipated delays, cost overruns, and premature hiring of staff, along with the \$18.4 million mortgage taken out by the School of Graduate Studies, had unfairly necessitated the proposed increase.

Professor Orchard, Ms Addario, and Board members who had served on COSS, clarified that the proposed increase was in line with those being recommended for other campus residences and were not a consequence of cost overruns for the project. As well, student representatives sat on the Graduate House Governing Body, comprising 18 members, which had been created by the School of Graduate Studies Council. This group had met four times in 1999-2000 and had, among other things, provided advice with respect to the proposed fee increase.

(b) Parking Services: St. George Campus. A member expressed concern that the parking permit rates for the St. George Campus, which were already high, were proposed to increase by 10% in each of the next two years. This was all the more frustrating given the absence of available parking for permit holders on the weekends. Miss Oliver responded that parking rates were, pursuant to a previous decision of the University Affairs Board, to be comparable to market rates in the surrounding area, including those located in government buildings and hospitals, which were on average 27% above University of Toronto parking rates. The proposed increase of 20% over the next two years was, therefore, in accordance with this policy. She explained that the St. George Campus Parking 2000-2001 budget and long-range plan had included the net bottom line effect of replacing low cost surface parking spaces with two parking garages: the Harbord Street garage and the Centre for Information Technology garage. The CIT garage had originally been estimated at a capital cost of \$10.3 million with external financing in the amount of \$8 million. These estimates had been revised to approximately \$13.1 million and \$10.9 million, respectively. The additional capital costs had resulted in approximately \$100,000 in annual external financing costs. The overall impact of all these changes was a significant reduction in the annual land rent contribution to the operating fund. A total of \$1.6 million was expected to be transferred to the operating budget in 2000-2001. In response to the member's concern regarding the availability of parking spaces on the weekend, Miss Oliver urged the member to contact the parking ancillary directly.

The member continued that parking permits were issued primarily to faculty and staff, many of whom were dependent upon their automobiles for transportation to the University. The proposed increase could be viewed as a tax on staff salaries.

Several members spoke in support of the need for increased usage of public transportation, with adequate parking being made available for persons with disabilities.

A member advocated that the revenues generated from the parking ancillary be used for pressing student projects, including the installation of an elevator at Hart House and the creation of a multi-faith facility. Professor Orchard took the member's suggestion under advisement.

5. Service Ancillaries: Operating Plans for 2000-2001 (cont'd)

(c) **Food and Beverage Services.** In response to a member's concerns regarding the cost, quality and nutritional content of cafeteria food on campus, Miss Oliver outlined the process for securing and renewing food services contracts on campus, which included community input. Members with specific concerns were encouraged to contact the manager of the relevant food services ancillary.

Members urged that in considering new food services contracts, the administration consider smaller enterprises as well as services that would offer multi-cultural food.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the service ancillary operating plans for 2000-2001, including the service ancillary operating budgets, as summarized in Schedule II, the service ancillary capital budgets as summarized in Schedule V, and the rates and fees in Schedule VI be approved.

6. Interim Appropriations Approval for the Faculty of Physical Education and Health: Co-curricular Programs

Professor Orchard noted that the Council on Student Services had declined to recommend the proposed 2000-2001 operating plan and budget for the Faculty of Physical Education and Health: Co-curricular Programs on the basis of a requested increase in student fees of 5% over last year's fee approval. The senior management team for the Co-curricular Programs would convene the Budget Committee of the Council on Athletics and Recreation to consider budget options in light of this decision. A revised operating plan and budget would be presented at the May meeting of the University Affairs Board.

Professor Orchard continued that, normally the budget was approved prior to the start of the fiscal year. However, the budget would not be brought to the University Affairs Board until May 23, 2000 and therefore the Faculty required spending authority to continue operating after May 1, 2000 and until the budget for 2000-2001 was approved. Two months' expenditure (approximately \$1.8 million) was recommended to enable the University Affairs Board to approve or not approve the proposed operating plan and budget at its May meeting. The Business Board had customarily approved two months' expenditure when interim operation budget appropriations were required.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the Faculty of Physical Education and Health be authorized to expend up to \$1,800,000 for the normal operation of the Faculty of Physical Education and Health: Co-Curricular Programs for the period May 1, 2000 to June 30, 2000.

7. University of Toronto Trademark Licensing Policy

The Chair welcomed Dr. Jon Dellandrea, Vice-President and Chief Development Officer, and Mr. Tad Brown, Finance and Development Counsel, who were in attendance to answer questions on the Policy.

The Chair continued that he had granted speaking privileges on this item to Mr. Kevin Thomas, member of Students Against Sweatshops, and Ms Evelyn Napier, Counsel for the University of Toronto Faculty Association. He would recognize these speakers after the proposal had been introduced and questions for clarification had been addressed.

(a) Introduction

Professor Orchard noted that the formulation of the proposed *Trademark Licensing Policy* before the Board followed a long period of extensive consultation with the University's faculty, staff and students. As part of the process, the Forum on Licensing had also been organized by the Clarkson Centre for Business Ethics on January 31, 2000, at which international experts had provided advice. Participants in the Forum had included representatives of the Fair Labour Association, the Union of Needletrades, Industrial, and Textile Employees (UNITE), the Retail Council of Canada, the Consulate General of India and the Maquila Solidarity Network. Dr. Dellandrea had briefed the University Affairs Board at its January 11 meeting on the development process. Also, Dr. Dellandrea had issued an invitation to Board members to attend a briefing session on the proposed *Policy* held the previous Wednesday. Members who had been able to attend had found the session to be informative. Professor Orchard continued that members had received copies of both the proposed *Trademark Licensing Policy* (the *Policy*), which was before members for consideration, and the *Code of Conduct for Trademark Licensees* (the *Code*), which was before members for information. This was unusual practice because the *Code* was an administrative policy. However, the Board had received both documents as an illustration of the high priority placed by the University on enacting the proposed *Policy*. He believed that the University's thinking on the matter was very advanced and had been informed in large part by the broad consultations undertaken.

(b) Questions for Clarification

A member asked what mechanisms were in place to monitor the implementation of the *Code*. Dr. Dellandrea responded that the *Code* set out certain expectations of licensees and the kind of compliance reports that would be required. While the *Policy* itself should not require modification on a regular basis, the *Code* was very much a living document and would be modified accordingly when best practices in monitoring were identified. The member asked if there would be further student involvement in the application of the *Code*. In response, Dr. Dellandrea drew members' attention to section 9 of the *Policy*, which provided for an annual report to the University Affairs Board on the operation of and issues connected with the trademark licensing program, including copies of the licensee compliance reports and the disposition of complaints received. The University community, including faculty, staff and students, would thereafter have an opportunity to provide the responsible University office with comments on the annual report and advice on compliance, monitoring and new developments in the licensing area.

The President emphasized that the University Affairs Board was considered the principal forum for community input into the application of the *Code*. Community discussion and input would appropriately take place at the Board meeting at which the annual report was received for information.

7. University of Toronto Trademark Licensing Policy (cont'd)

(b) Questions for Clarification (cont'd)

A member drew attention to the final paragraph of the *Code*, which stated:

The University reserves the right to announced examination of the practices, activities and work sites of its licensees and their contractors.

The member questioned whether it would be more appropriate for the University to reserve the right to **un**announced examination, as was practice in other codes with similar objectives. Recognizing that the *Code* was before members for information only and did not require the Board's endorsement, the President sought advice from Mr. Brown on discussions that had taken place and whether it would be appropriate to remove the term "announced" from the clause. Mr. Brown responded that inclusion of the word "announced" would not preclude the University from conducting unannounced examinations. The administration had not pursued the incorporation of a specific reference to the right to unannounced examination because of potential legal concerns expressed by administrators at other institutions. The *Code* anticipated that the University would develop external monitoring mechanism that might well include unannounced visits. The President continued that in light of the information provided, he anticipated that he would remove the word "announced" from the *Code*.

(c) Addresses by Non-Members

Mr. Kevin Thomas, Students Against Sweatshops (SAS). Mr. Thomas noted that he had been a participant in the task force that had developed the proposed *Policy*. During the lengthy consultation process, SAS had seen eye to eye with the administration on the majority of the proposed *Policy*; however, there had also been times of intense conflict over particular clauses. Mr. Thomas was happy to report that the *Policy* and *Code*, including the clause on wages (which had previously been in dispute) substantially met with the approval of SAS. He, therefore, urged members of the University Affairs Board to recommend the *Policy* to the Governing Council for final approval.

Mr. Thomas conveyed to the Board the excitement that had been generated by the creation of the *Policy* and *Code*. The University of Toronto was the first university in Canada to bring forward a policy to address the issues of "sweatshops". Other Canadian institutions were awaiting the University of Toronto's adoption of a policy. Also monitoring the University's initiative were unions, high schools, political parties, businesses, manufacturers and retailers. The process developed by the University would serve as a guideline for other organizations within Canada. The University was providing intellectual and ethical leadership in an area of need. With regard to student involvement in the development process, Mr. Thomas was pleased to report that Dr. Dellandrea had brought together a very good task force, comprising faculty, staff and students. Through the long hours of drafting, meeting and re-drafting the *Policy* and *Code*, members had gained a great deal of expertise in the issues. They had established communication with many leading experts in this field, with students and faculty at many other universities, with groups involved in the national task force on these issues, and most importantly, with non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and workers. These consultations had been crucial to the determination of how the *Code* would be monitored effectively.

In conclusion, Mr. Thomas commended the *Policy* to members of the Board as an initiative that would be a source of pride to the University and one which would be of benefit to workers.

7. University of Toronto Trademark Licensing Policy (cont'd)

(c) **Addresses by Non-Members** (cont'd)

The President noted that he regularly received a great deal of communications from members of the community on a wide variety of topics. Memoranda on this matter from Mr. Thomas ranked among the best he had received during his presidency. He commended Mr. Thomas on his advocacy in seeking a workable policy in this area and on his skill in constructing and articulating his arguments.

Ms Evelyn Napier, University of Toronto Faculty Association (UTFA). Speaking on behalf of Professor Bill Graham, President of UTFA, Ms Napier noted that the Association was very pleased to see that the proposed *Policy* squarely addressed the issue of how licensees and contractors operate their workplaces, and clearly set out a code of workplace and related standards that licensees must meet.

Ms Napier explained that, in order to become a licensee, compliance with the applicable laws in the country of manufacture, including environmental laws, was required. This was strengthened by the statement that where the *Code* and the laws of the applicable country differed or conflicted, the higher standard would prevail. The section on employment standards compliance addressed areas of concern such as health and safety, child labor, working hours, forced labour and non-discrimination, among others. The *Code* explicitly affirmed the right of employees to associate freely and bargain collectively, and not be subjected to harassment, intimidation or retaliation for exercising those rights. The *Policy* also stated that employees were to be treated with dignity and respect and not be subjected to any physical, sexual, psychological or verbal harassment or abuse. The ethical principles identified for compliance unambiguously stated that licensees and their contractors shall commit to conduct their business according to standards of "honesty, integrity, trustworthiness and respect for the unique intrinsic value of each human being". That the *Code* identified these as "minimum" standards further spoke to the University's continuing commitment to these principles. As Canada's leading university the University of Toronto could point with justifiable pride to these standards and requirements. In UTFA's view, they exemplified leadership in its best sense: in the *Policy* the University of Toronto not only showed the way, but also led the way by publicly stating its commitment to a vision of what it was to be a fair, ethical, responsible and committed employer.

(d) **Discussion**

A member applauded the involvement of students, and in particular, the organization Students Against Sweatshops, in the development of the *Policy*. He took comfort that he would now be able to wear apparel bearing the University name with pride. He also commended the University for bringing forward a very good policy for consideration. He thanked Dr. Dellandrea for his characterization of the *Code* as a living document, and was pleased that it would be modified where needed. In conclusion, the member indicated his support of the *Policy*.

A member noted that he was happy to see the *Policy* coming to governance for approval. He hoped that a working group, which included students, could be established to make a contribution to the ongoing implementation of the *Code*. He too would now wear University apparel with pride.

Another member commented on the *Code's* provision noting that a report on the trademark licensing program be submitted to the University Affairs Board annually. He wondered if there would be student participation in the monitoring of the program. The President responded that he would review the suggestion in consultation with Dr. Dellandrea and

7. University of Toronto Trademark Licensing Policy (cont'd)

(d) Discussion (cont'd)

Mr. Brown. If the *Policy* was approved, the University's next step would be to roll out the conditions for compliance and monitoring and to communicate with its licensees. Mr. Tad Brown would oversee the implementation process.

A member of the Governing Council indicated that he was pleased that a representative of Students Against Sweatshops had been permitted to address the Board. He commended the activism of members of SAS in bringing attention to the issue and expressed his opinion on the importance of such activism. He too was grateful that the *Code* was considered a living document and he advocated a task force, including representatives of the Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students, the Graduate Students' Union, the Students' Administrative Council and SAS, to oversee its implementation.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the *University of Toronto Trademark Licensing Policy*, dated April 12, 2000, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "A", be approved.

The President recorded his gratitude to Dr. Dellandrea and Mr. Brown for their leadership on this matter.

8. Reports of the Administrative Assessors

Professor Orchard reported on the following matters.

(a) Student Services - Open House

A new student services office had been opened the previous day in the athletic centre at Harbord and Spadina. The office would house the student crisis response coordinator, the student health outreach program, the Walksafer Services, and a student drop-in centre.

(b) Task Force on Graduate Student Financial Support

Professor Orchard reported that the Task Force was close to submitting its final report. A second open forum was planned for the following week at which feedback on a consultation draft would be sought from faculty, staff and students. Professor Orchard indicated that a great deal of information had been accumulated based on 1998-99 data. A total of approximately \$73 million (including \$4.2 million for OISE/UT) in support was distributed to graduate students. The \$69 million (excluding OISE/UT) was spread over the four divisions of the School of Graduate Studies as follows: Divisions I and II received \$11.3 million and \$10 million respectively, while Divisions III and IV received \$20.3 million and \$27.4 million. The difference in funding available for Divisions III and IV was due in large part to a larger base of external funding. This difference would become more pronounced with the introduction of the Ontario Graduate Scholarship for Science and Technology (OGSST) awards. The average master's student funding was \$11,300 per year and funding for doctoral students was \$14,100 per year.

8. Reports of the Administrative Assessors (cont'd)

(b) Task Force on Graduate Student Financial Support (cont'd)

Professor Orchard said that the Task Force was recommending a guaranteed minimum package of support composed of \$12,000 plus tuition (approximate value \$17,000), for one year for master's students and for four years for doctoral students. This package would make the University competitive with peer US institutions. He noted that some departments would want to set a higher amount in order to maintain competitiveness. The next question was how much additional funding would be required to provide the \$17,000 package. Based on the 1998-99 data, the shortfall at the doctoral level was \$4.3 million for OISE/UT, \$1.2 million for Medicine and \$6 million for the remaining doctoral students. At the master's level, the shortfall was \$9.6 million, for a total of \$21 million. This year, 1999-2000, additional funding of \$3 million was available from OSOTF and another \$2.6 million from the inauguration of the OGSST.

Professor Orchard said that a number of master's degrees were terminal degrees and they were not designed to lead to doctoral degrees. It would be important to define doctoral stream programs. The Task Force had also looked at the possibility of support for students in the "post-4" years, those who needed longer than four years to complete their doctoral degrees. The current cohort had experienced rising tuition and it was recommended that those in years 5, 6 and 7 receive an as-of-right completion grant of \$2500 a year. It was also recommended that this "post-4" program support be reviewed after four years.

Professor Orchard continued that the Task Force suggested that a major fundraising campaign with a goal of \$200 million for graduate student support was achievable. MIT had recently announced a similar campaign for graduate student fellowships. The overwhelming success of the OSOTF campaign had vastly improved the funding available for student support and led the Task Force to suppose another campaign could be successful. Echoing the recommendations in Professor Munroe-Blum's report on innovation and university research, which called for increased support for training graduate student, University advocacy should be increased to maximize externally supported awards. Internally, the Task Force suggested that funds raised under OSOTF be transferred more efficiently, that Connaught Fund support be re-examined, and that sources of matching funding be found.

A member who had had responsibility in the past year for administering three scholarships that had been set up in tribute to past lives spoke to the importance of the initiative. Professor Orchard expressed his gratitude to the member for his leadership in this area.

(c) Student Family Housing

In response to member's inquiry regarding the need of family student housing, Professor Orchard recalled that the administration had put forward a plan for increased student housing, which had included family housing. This was a priority for Professor John Browne, Director of Residence Development, and the task force on student housing. Users' committees would be established for various residence projects and would consider sites, space plans, overall cost and sources of funding for the projects. The reports of the users' committees would be brought for approval to governance, through the Planning and Budget Committee. The advice of the University Affairs Board would also be sought with respect to residence style, fees, and the quality of student life.

8. Reports of the Administrative Assessors (cont'd)

Ms Addario reported on the following ongoing initiatives within her portfolio.

(d) Working Group on a Multi-Faith Issues

Ms Addario noted that the working group had been busy the past year working to consolidate and improve the space that had been made available in New College. The Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget, had provided the Planning and Budget Committee with a draft terms of reference and membership for a Users' Committee for a New Centre for Inter-Faith Study and Worship.

A development committee, comprising members of the working group on multi-faith issues as well as other members of the University community, had also been established. Work of the group had included a visit to York University to view the Scott Centre for Religious Observance. The committee was actively working to develop a fund-raising strategy.

(e) Student Club Space

Ms Addario reported that the building located at 21 Sussex Avenue (corner of Huron Street and Sussex Avenue) was being vacated to house student activities and clubs. *The Varsity* newspaper and Afropan, the University's steel band group, would be among those groups relocated to 21 Sussex Avenue. Once the building had been vacated of its current occupants, the committee to allocate student activity space would invite and consider applications from the student groups that had applied for space during the previous year. The plan was to offer a 24-hour study space, a student lounge and as many club offices as possible.

A member cautioned that 21 Sussex Avenue was not accessible to persons in wheelchairs. He added that there was a movement on campus to ensure adequate club, study and worship spaces. Members would hear more of this initiative in the coming months.

Professor Orchard responded that it was a high priority for the administration to build access ramps to the building, which did contain an elevator.

A member echoed his colleagues concerns with accessibility issues. He questioned why *the Varsity* newspaper was being relocated from its current location and he expressed concern that 21 Sussex was not currently accessible. Further, he noted that the Director of DisAbility Services for Students had resigned recently, citing her frustration with accessibility issues.

The President responded that the building which currently housed *the Varsity* newspaper was being incorporated into the new building which would house the Centre for Information Technology (CIT). The space was to be fully renovated to house activities associated with the CIT and, therefore, it would not be possible for *the Varsity* newspaper to remain in its current location. He added that he believed staff of *the Varsity* were in agreement with the proposed new location.

Professor Orchard responded to the member's concerns regarding accessibility. He drew attention to the terms of reference for the Review of DisAbility Services for Students, the review of which would seek to address some of the issues raised.

8. Reports of the Administrative Assessors (cont'd)

(e) Student Club Space (cont'd)

The member recalled that he had previously requested that the University Affairs Board discuss the issue of accessibility on campus. He also asked when the necessary renovations would be made to 21 Sussex Avenue to make it accessible. Professor Orchard responded that the Board received annually reports of the various equity offices for information, usually in the fall. This was the appropriate time for receipt of information and discussion of the accessibility issues. In response to the timing of renovations to 21 Sussex Avenue, Professor Orchard undertook to advise the Board at its next meeting.

A member advocated continued funding for student groups in support of orientation events to ensure they received exposure at the beginning of the academic year. Professor Orchard responded that he and the Provost would be discussing this issue with the Students' Administrative Council. Professor Orchard commented that he had provided SAC with funding for last year's orientation.

(f) Review of DisAbility Services for Students

Ms Addario drew members' attention to the terms of reference for the review of the DisAbility Service for Students that was appended to the annual report and operating plan for the Office of Student Affairs. She reported that she and the Vice-Provost, Students were actively seeking to relocate the DisAbility Service for Students to a location that was more accessible to students.

A member expressed concern that *the Varsity* newspaper was being relocated from its current location and that 21 Sussex was currently not accessible.

(g) Translation of Student Services Literature

A member commented that many of the University's students had parents whose native tongue was not English. He asked if the University produced information concerning the various student services in languages other than English. Ms Addario responded that she was not aware of any such initiative within the Student Services area.

(h) Committee to Review the St. George Campus Police

Miss Oliver noted that the Vice-President, Administration and Human Resources had appointed a committee to review the St. George Campus Police. Its terms of reference had been placed on the table. She invited Board members to provide their input to the Committee.

9. Date of the Next Meeting

The Chair reminded members of the Board's next meeting scheduled for Tuesday, May 23, 2000 at 5:00 p.m.

The meeting adjourned at 7:15 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

May 14, 2000