

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

REPORT NUMBER 88 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD

November 1, 1999

To the Governing Council,
University of Toronto.

Your Board reports that it held a meeting on Monday, November 1, 1999, at 5:00 p.m. in the Miller Lash House, University of Toronto at Scarborough, at which the following were present:

Mr. Brian C. Burchell (In the Chair)
Ms Nancy L. Watson (Vice-Chair)
Professor Ian Orchard, Vice-Provost,
Students
Ms Susan Addario, Director,
Student Affairs
Dr. Robert Bennett
Mrs. Shari Fell
Ms Margaret Hancock
Mr. Vivek Krishnamurthy
Dr. Heather Lane
Ms Alicia Maund
Professor Ian R. McDonald
Mr. Jonathan Papoulidis
Ms Rosie Parnass

Mr. Kashif S. Pirzada
Ms Grace Subrata
Ms Sally Walker

Non-Voting Members:

Mr. Louis R. Charpentier, Secretary of the
Governing Council
Miss Janice Oliver, Assistant Vice-
President Facilities and Services

Secretariat:

Ms Margaret McKone

Regrets:

Professor Ethel Auster
The Honourable William G. Davis
Professor Bruce Kidd

Ms Mary Ann Pilskalnietis
Mr. Robert G. Spencer
Ms Wendy Talfourd-Jones

In Attendance:

Professor John Browne, Director, Residence Development
Mr. Jim Delaney, Manager, Liaison and Campus Life Services, Office of Student Affairs
Mr. Ivan Gottlieb, Manager, Administration and General Services
Ms Myra Lefkowitz, Community Safety Coordinator
Mr. James McGhee, Manager, University of Toronto Police Service at Scarborough
Mr. Lee McKergow, Manager, University of Toronto Police Service, St. George Campus
Ms Andrea Moffat, Chair, Council on Student Services, University of Toronto at Scarborough
Professor Tom Nowers, Associate Vice Principal, Student Affairs, University of Toronto at
Scarborough
Mr. Len Paris, Manager, University of Toronto Police Service at Mississauga

ITEMS 4 AND 5 CONTAIN RESOLUTIONS CONCURRING WITH ACADEMIC BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE GOVERNING COUNCIL.

ALL OTHER ITEMS ARE REPORTED FOR INFORMATION.

1. Welcome Remarks

The Chair noted his pleasure that the Board had the opportunity to meet at the University of Toronto at Scarborough, a vast and natural setting. He welcomed Professor Tom Nowers, Associate Vice Principal, Student Affairs, who was representing the College on behalf of its Acting Principal, Professor Joan Foley.

Professor Nowers welcomed members, noting that he was very pleased at the opportunity to showcase Scarborough campus lands and to meet members of the Board. By way of welcome, he drew attention to newly designed promotional literature, which had been tabled, and provided the following facts about the Scarborough campus:

- the campus enjoyed a healthy and buoyant enrolment of 5600 full- and part-time students, an amount greater than the total student enrolment at Trent University;
- just over 37% of the University's entire Arts and Science undergraduate students were registered at either of the Scarborough and Mississauga campuses;
- the campus comprised over 300 acres of land, including the valley in which this meeting was taking place;
- over 200 faculty and 150 staff members were employed by the campus;
- the campus's three-phase townhouse residence provided accommodation for a total of 536 students and it was hoped that this residence would be expanded in the near future;
- the campus had eleven tennis courts and it was hoped that varsity baseball would soon be offered in the valley; and
- as part of a transformation process, new signage had been ordered and would be in place shortly.

Professor Nowers referred to ongoing discussions between Ontario universities and the Government of Ontario concerning potential university growth and expansion. The Scarborough campus eagerly anticipated the outcome of these discussions as it believed it was in a position to make a meaningful contribution to enrolment expansion at the University of Toronto and that such expansion would have a positive impact on the Scarborough campus.

Professor Nowers described the importance of the venue for today's meeting – the Miller Lash House, which had been purchased by the Scarborough campus in 1913. The house was being actively restored, largely under the efforts of Ms Lynn Dellandrea. Following its purchase, the House had been used as a Principal's residence until 1976. One year ago, the House had been designated as a historical site and as such qualified for restoration funding. Also of assistance to the restoration work were monies raised from the rental of the House for weddings, receptions, conferences and meetings. Recently, the House had been one of the 600 successful projects, out of a total of 3500 applicants, under the Canadian Millennium Partnership Program. As such, it would be eligible for \$83,000 of matched funding for further restoration work. He extended his thanks to Ms Dellandrea for her very persistent and innovative efforts that had led to this matching funding.

In conclusion, Professor Nowers noted that he looked forward to future meetings of the Board on the Scarborough campus.

2. Report of the Previous Meeting held on September 28, 1999

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

Report Number 87 of the University Affairs Board
(September 28, 1999).

3. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting

Item 1 – Chair’s Remarks – Organizational Chart for Student Affairs

The Chair recalled that, at the previous meeting a member had asked for clarification of the duties for the newly created position of Director, Student Affairs. At the Chair’s invitation, Professor Orchard referred members to tabled descriptions for the Office of Student Affairs and for the Office of Student Services, the latter of which comprised nine services including the Career Centre, the Counselling and Learning Skills Service, the Family Care Office, the Family Housing Office, First Nations House, the International Student Centre, off Campus Housing and Residence Information, the University Health Service, and the University Psychiatric Service. A copy of the description is attached hereto as Appendix “A”.

Item 3 – College of Electors: Medical Residents – Alumni Status

The Chair recalled that, at its previous meeting a member had raised a question concerning the alumni status of medical residents who were now being charged tuition fees. Dr. Jack Dimond, Secretary Emeritus of the Governing Council, had provided written advice, which members had received with their agenda packages.

4. Capital Project: Centre for Information Technology - Garage

The Chair noted that this item involved a capital project, which fell within the jurisdiction of the Planning and Budget Committee; however, the University Affairs Board also advised the Governing Council on the implications of capital projects within its areas of responsibility. In a memorandum to members, the Chair had suggested they contemplate the impact of the proposed garage on levels of service, fees and the University community. The Board had a special role to play on this issue in that it had been assigned responsibility in governance for the Parking Ancillary. The capital project would also have an impact on the Parking Ancillary’s budget, which the Board would be asked to approve in the Spring.

Miss Oliver introduced the proposal. The City of Toronto maintained a special parking by-law for the University of Toronto, St. George campus, which required that the University maintain an inventory of 2000 parking spaces, plus or minus a 5% variance. This variance recognized construction projects, which in some instances, temporarily used existing spaces. Two thirds of the University’s inventory of parking lots were currently above ground, with most situated on sites designated for future development. As development projects were undertaken, the Parking Ancillary looked at the overall level of parking on various locations around campus to determine the best plan. The new Centre for Information Technology (CIT) was to be constructed on the parking lot in the interior of the block bounded by College, St. George, Huron and Russell Streets. The elimination of this parking lot would result in the loss of 128 parking spaces. Additional projects that would have an impact on current parking lots included the prospective Centre for Cellular and Biomolecular Research, the residence expansion program, and the first phase of the Open Space Plan. In considering the effect of these projects on the overall parking inventory, the Parking Ancillary had reviewed its parking stock, which included underground parking garages located at: OISE/UT (250 parking spaces), the School

4. Capital Project: Centre for Information Technology – Garage (cont'd)

of Management (500 parking spaces), and the new Graduate/Second-Entry Residence (350 parking spaces). These represented a substantial number of parking spaces available on the northern half of the St. George campus; however, most of the displacement was to occur near the high density medical and engineering complexes on the southern part of campus. Consultants had advised that up to 350 parking spaces could be built under the CIT. Given that the location for the CIT was the largest development site able to accommodate a garage and given its proximity to other parking sites that would be lost, the Parking Ancillary had recommended that a 308 space parking garage be constructed beneath the CIT complex.

Miss Oliver noted that over the course of the last few years, the net proceeds from the Parking Ancillary had been transferred to the University's operating fund. Therefore, there was a limited capital fund for the garage. The construction of the CIT garage would deplete the reserve and necessitate borrowing the balance of the required capital. This would have an impact on future transfers from the Parking Ancillary to the operating fund.

Miss Oliver continued that it was an annual exercise for the Parking Ancillary to review its parking rates across the campus and those of its nearby competitors. This would be done later this year, following which, a recommendation for parking rates for 2000-2001 would be brought to the University Affairs Board for consideration. She emphasized that this exercise would be undertaken regardless of the construction of the proposed parking garage.

Financial implications. A member asked what the anticipated time frame was for payment of the estimated cost of \$10,280,000. As well, how long would this financing have an impact on the Parking Ancillary's contribution to the University's operating fund? Miss Oliver invited Mr. Ivan Gottlieb, Manager, Administration and General Services, to respond. Mr. Gottlieb noted that the model currently assumed a 25-year amortization; however, the University's Chief Financial Officer would be consulted as to the best possible interest rate and period for financing. A final decision would be made based on optimum conditions for interest rates. The Parking Ancillary's land rent transfer payments from the Ancillary to the Operating Fund would be affected for this period of time.

Effect of parking garage on Heritage Site. A member asked if the heritage building located at 44 St. George Street would be affected by the proposed garage. Miss Oliver responded in the negative.

Parking By-law. In response to a query, Miss Oliver clarified that, prior to the development of the current special parking by-law for the St. George campus, the by-law had been for a minimum of 2000 spaces, with no upper limit. The current arrangement had been developed as part of the City's desire to minimize automobiles in the downtown core for environmental reasons. At that time a maximum number of spaces had, therefore, been introduced. The development of the proposed 308-space garage would place the University's parking inventory in the upper level of permissible spaces. This was being done for many reasons including increasing enrolment levels and the fact that many of the University's students who travelled to the St. George campus were not well served by public transportation.

Level of utilization of current underground parking lots. In response to a query, Mr. Gottlieb noted that during key periods in the fall and winter, the underground parking lots below the Joseph L. Rotman School of Management and OISE/UT sometimes operated at maximum capacity. At present, the demand was so great at the Rotman School of Management's parking lot that there was sometimes no cash parking available.

4. Capital Project: Centre for Information Technology – Garage (cont'd)

Impact of construction on available parking spaces. In response to questions, Miss Oliver noted that the construction of the Centre for Information Technology would result in the elimination of the largest parking lot in the south western portion of the campus, totaling 128 parking spaces. The proposed new parking garage would not be operational until September, 2001. The administration's plans for dealing with this temporary loss in available parking spots on this precinct included a freeze on the issuing of parking permits. The Parking Ancillary had contacted each of the 128 holders of parking permits on the current site to make alternative parking arrangements. Special arrangements had also been made for the immediate relocation of the handicapped parking spots.

Accessibility to Koffler Student Services Centre during construction. A member noted that there was a great deal of construction planned during the next two years in areas adjacent to the Koffler Student Services Centre, the location for *DISABILITY* Services for Students. She asked if appropriate arrangements had been made to ensure that this site remained accessible during construction. Miss Oliver noted that the member had raised a good point and she undertook to address the issue in consultation with Ms Helen Simson, Coordinator, *DISABILITY* Services for Students.

Traffic congestion. A member commented that there was already a great deal of traffic on St. George Street and Spadina Avenue. She expressed concern that the new underground parking garages to be located at Spadina and Harbord and on St. George Street below the new CIT would lead to even greater traffic congestion. Miss Oliver shared the member's concern. During construction of the proposed new garage and the CIT there would be a great deal of congestion. When completed, however, the new garage would be entered from Huron Street, which should alleviate some of the St. George Street congestion.

Lack of parking spaces on southern portion of the campus. A member expressed concern about the overall availability of parking spaces on campus, and in particular on the southern portion of the campus, including Hart House. The University's Open Space Plan called for the eventual removal of surface parking from King's College Circle and Hart House Circle. She noted that users of Hart House included elderly alumni who travelled to campus by car. With the elimination of surface parking spots, the nearest available parking would be on St. George Street, a fair distance from the House for elderly persons. While she supported the Open Space Plan and the move to underground parking garages, which would assist with snow removal on campus, she expressed reservations about the overall number of spaces on campus in relation to an increasing campus population. Miss Oliver agreed, noting that these concerns would be addressed as part of the planning process.

On the recommendation of the Assistant Vice-President, Facilities and Services,

YOUR BOARD CONCURS

With the recommendation of the Academic Board

THAT a parking garage be constructed beneath the Centre for Information Technology, for a cost of \$10,280,000 plus bridge financing, funded from the Parking ancillary's capital reserve and long-term borrowing.

The Chair noted that the motion had carried unanimously.

5. Expanding Residence Capacity at the University of Toronto

The Chair noted that this was a planning document for residence expansion at the University. As was the case with the previous proposal, this planning issue fell within the Planning and Budget Committee's areas of responsibility; the advice of this Board was being sought because residences were within its terms of reference. The Board was being asked to concur with both a general direction for residence development and the selection of particular sites for new residences. The general directions and priorities followed from the Board's approval last spring of *Student Housing: A Plan for the Next Phase*, which called for the construction of 2500 new residence spaces.

The Chair said that members should reflect on the adequacy of the targets given anticipated enrolment growth, on the kinds of residences being proposed (i.e. family, single or faculty) and the desirability of the selected sites with respect to their proximity to colleges, parking and campus services. This Board had a special role to play on this issue in that it had sole responsibility for the Residence Ancillary.

Professor Orchard introduced the plan, noting that it could be traced back to the 1988 Silcox report on student housing, which had established additional residences as a high priority for the University. Last year, the document titled *Student Housing: A Plan for the Next Phase* had been endorsed by the University Affairs Board. This too quantified the requirement for additional student housing at the University. As well, it called for a greater percentage of the University's students to be housed on campus. Increasing the percentage of students housed on campus from the current level of 17-18% to 25% would further enrich the culture of the University. During the summer, Professor John Browne, Director of Residence Development, had prepared the plan currently before the Board. Professor Orchard welcomed Professor Browne to the meeting.

Professor Browne outlined the main objectives of his plan. A copy of his handout is attached hereto as Appendix "B".

Discussion ensued on the following aspects of *Expanding Residence Capacity at the University of Toronto*.

Mixture of constituencies housed at each residence. A member noted that the percentage of places that would be offered to students in professional programs/faculties varied greatly across the constituent colleges and federated universities. This would lead to different types of communities within the different residences. Professor Browne agreed, noting that in some instances, a College's capacity to house students of professional faculties would depend on expansion of the residences. He noted that while he was engaged in discussions with the constituent colleges to encourage greater placement of these students, the University did not have the authority to hold similar conversations with the federated universities. He also noted that 60% of students in constituent colleges were first-year students, while only 40% students housed in the federated universities were first-year students. The mix of first-year students versus continuing students was also an important matter to consider in community building. He would be reviewing the mix of students in professional and arts and science programs as well as first-year and upper-year students.

Need for new student housing to be affordable. A member commended Professor Browne for his presentation. She noted that in discussion of the University's efforts concerning the homeless, the issue of affordable housing had been raised as an overarching concern. She urged that affordability be a priority as the administration proceeded with its plans for residence expansion. Professor Browne responded that he had addressed the issue of the cost of expansion within his plan. His recommendation had been that the Planning and Budget Office and the Chief Financial Officer should determine how the University could assist

5. Expanding Residence Capacity at the University of Toronto (cont'd)

divisions to mobilize the funds necessary for the residence expansion. Affordability of accommodation should be the key factor in determining the level of financial assistance which was to be made to the divisions. He added that the level of down-payment made towards each residence would have an impact on affordability. Where appropriate, the University would seek to integrate commercial activities with residences to assist with down-payments. Currently, residences fees ran from \$450 to just under \$500 per month. This range in cost could be a target for all new residences. As his plan noted, a 10% down-payment had a significant effect on the fee structure for residences and increased the financial viability of the operation. One model for fees for the Woodsworth College residence demonstrated that, if no down-payment were available and the monthly fee were fixed at \$600 (a \$5100 winter fee), the operation would not break even for over a decade, since not all family spaces would necessarily generate revenue. The Provost had created an advisory committee on housing, including representatives from the Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students, the Graduate Students' Union and the Students' Administrative Council, as well as Ms Ellen Giles, Director of Family Housing. He believed this group would be a good forum for further exploration of this issue.

Residences: space and style. A member noted that the cost of expansion in the plan assumed a minimum project cost of \$130 per gross square foot. She asked if this included common space (i.e. study space, storage space, meeting rooms, etc.). Professor Browne responded in the affirmative, noting that this estimate was based on recent residence projects built on campus including the recent residence at the University of Toronto at Mississauga. Another factor taken into consideration had been information contained in a publication of the American Association of Housing, which listed all residence projects built in the United States during the past year. He clarified that the types of space offered within residences would be decided upon locally, taking into account services offered (e.g. cafeterias offering meal plans). The estimated square footage per student represented a target. Over the next 3-4 weeks, he would be considering various alternatives in consultation with Ms Elizabeth Sisam, of the Planning and Budget Office.

The member noted that the administration had made estimates as to the number of students that could be housed on various sites. Did these estimates assume residence styles? Professor Browne responded in the negative. The estimates had been calculated based on the full volume of the envelope on each site in terms of gross square metres, discounted by 25%. Professor Browne had further discounted ground floors for entrances and passage ways. Additional discounts had been made for elevators and contingency plans. He believed his estimates to be conservative.

The member asked if there were plans to build food facilities on any of the proposed residence sites. She noted that there had been a substantial increase in students requiring meal plans at Victoria University and that the dining hall had not grown in proportion to the increasing demand. Professor Browne replied that he was unaware of any such plans. This would have to be a local decision based on existing facilities and the type of community contemplated for each site.

The member commented that there was need for an overarching group to ensure that there was adequate space built within each residence for disabled students, interim and emergency housing. Professor Browne responded that he and Ms Sisam would be writing a set of guidelines that would include the University's expectations for student housing, including the examples cited by the member. These guidelines were expected to provide a framework for the individual users' committees. As well, users' committees were being provided with construction guidelines, developed by Miss Oliver's Office. He was also recommending to the Provost that each residence plan be part of the division's academic plan. These should demonstrate how the residence expansion would fit with the division's academic aspirations and would be available to the advisory committee on student housing. Finally, each residence plan would be brought to governance, including this Board, for final approval.

5. Expanding Residence Capacity at the University of Toronto (cont'd)

Potential source of funding for down-payments: U of T Campaign. A member commented on the remarkable success to date of the University's fundraising campaign. He suggested that some of the undesignated funds raised under the campaign be redirected from the academic area (e.g. endowed chairs) to housing projects. This would have an enormous effect on the University's ability to proceed with its residence expansion, while ensuring affordability. The member suggested that the Board discuss this matter further with Dr. Jon Dellandrea.

A member commented that as a student who had herself faced homelessness, she very much appreciated her colleague's consideration of this issue.

Faculty housing. A member noted that the plan occasionally referred to faculty housing. He asked about the status of this housing. Professor Browne responded that faculty housing was not within his portfolio. However, he had had conversations on the matter with Miss Oliver. This was both a short-term and long-term issue. While there would be a substantial increase in faculty recruitment during the next five years, the number of faculty at the University would then level off. The administration might, therefore, wish to consider family housing that could also accommodate faculty on an interim basis.

Need for student activity space in residences. A member lauded the inclusion in the plan of a recommendation for inclusion of student activity space in new residences. She noted that these types of spaces were being displaced elsewhere on campus because of development projects. Last year, when the committee to allocate student activity space had met, it had been able to accommodate only four of the 200 student clubs on campus. There was a possibility that additional student groups would be displaced as a result of the construction of the Centre for Information Technology. The member urged that as the guidelines for users' committees were developed, they emphasize that student activity space include not only divisionally-related activities, but also University-wide groups that drew membership from across the University. She added that ground floor locations would be very accessible for these purposes.

Professor Browne replied that he had had discussions with Professor Orchard as to which types of student activity space would be most appropriately accommodated in residences. He had also discussed this issue with Dr. Dimond for consideration in the development of the Bloor-Devonshire precinct.

Proposed sites for residences. A member expressed concern with respect to the traffic noise associated with those sites to be located on Spadina Avenue and Bloor Street. Professor Browne noted that both privacy and noise were among the top considerations in constructing new residences. The residence walls would be insulated and students would be given the choice as to which part of the residence in which they wished to live (e.g. facing a courtyard or facing the street). He, therefore, believed this issue could be dealt with by a combination of architecture and room allocation.

On the recommendation of the Vice-Provost, Students,

YOUR BOARD CONCURS

With the recommendation of the Academic Board

THAT the directions and priorities outlined in *Expanding Residence Capacity at the University of Toronto*, dated October 8, 1999, be endorsed; and

5. Expanding Residence Capacity at the University of Toronto (cont'd)

THAT sites 4, 5, 12, 21, and 26, subject to discussion with the City of Toronto, New College and University College, be approved, as primary sites for residence development. In the use of site 21, the development of a student residence will not take place without the simultaneous development of a new Varsity Stadium and a renovated Varsity Arena.

The Chair noted that the motion had passed unanimously.

6. Future Development of Varsity Stadium Site and Adjacent Sites on Devonshire and Bloor Street

The Chair drew attention to the memorandum from the President concerning the administration's plans for development for what would now be known as the Bloor-Devonshire precinct. He noted that members should take this opportunity to help shape the general direction this development would take in the coming months.

Professor Orchard noted that he was pleased to present the memorandum to the Board. The administration was seeking broad input on the project and he welcomed any comments members might have.

A member noted that the University had a wonderful opportunity to rethink its plans for the Bloor-Devonshire precinct. He applauded the choice of Dr. Dimond for the overall leadership and coordination of the project. He was optimistic that this project would address concerns raised previously regarding the need to incorporate student activity space in new residences.

The Chair asked if the development plans would be brought to fruition by the end of the academic year. Professor Orchard responded that this was the administration's objective.

7. Campus Police: Annual Reports

The Chair noted that the University Affairs Board was responsible for security on the University's three campuses. He was pleased that for the very first time, the Board was receiving the annual reports of the three Campus Police offices.

(a) St. George Campus

Professor Orchard welcomed Mr. Lee McKergow, Manager, Police Services on the St. George Campus.

Mr. McKergow noted that, following twenty years of service on the St. George campus, Mr. Len Paris, former Community Safety Coordinator, had been appointed Manager of Police Services at the University of Toronto at Mississauga. It had been a challenge to replace Mr. Paris; however, Mr. McKergow was pleased to introduce the newly appointed Community Safety Coordinator, Ms Myra Lefkowitz. Ms Lefkowitz held a bachelor of arts from York University and a Master of Social Work from the University of Toronto. Her previous position had been Coordinator, Victim Witness Assistance Program in the Ministry of the Attorney General, where she had gained extensive experience in counselling and advocacy for victims and directed a variety of educational and outreach initiatives. She also had much experience in counselling students, homeless persons, and sexual assault survivors.

7. Campus Police: Annual Reports (cont'd)

(a) St. George Campus (cont'd)

Mr. McKergow continued that he believed his annual report to be self-explanatory. With regard to personnel, two women police officers had left his office during the past year; however two women had since been hired. He was extremely pleased that for the first time his office had hired a member of the Sikh community as well as a member of the Vietnamese community. With regard to the statistics within his annual report, there had been no increase in the number of cases dealt with during the past year. Assaults had decreased by 29%, while threats/harassment had increased by 50%. He attributed these changes to a greater awareness within the University community that led members to come forward for assistance at earlier stages. Early intervention by the Campus Police lessened the chances of assaults at a later stage. While mischief to personal property had decreased by 47%, and break and enter occurrences had decreased by 48%, theft of personal property had risen by 43%. This was largely due to the University being targeted by professional wallet thieves.

(b) University of Toronto at Mississauga

Professor Orchard welcomed Mr. Len Paris in his new capacity as Manager, Police Services at the University of Toronto at Mississauga.

Mr. Paris noted that like the St. George Campus, the statistics for the Mississauga campus were similar to those in previous years. He referred to page 11 of his annual report which provided a five-year analysis of criminal statistics. In 1998 there had been 163 crime-related occurrences on the Mississauga campus, and approximately 100 non-criminal occurrences (e.g. fire calls and medical emergencies). There was a fairly low crime rate at the Mississauga campus, which he attributed to the remote location within a low-crime area. Mr. Paris noted that there was a large percentage of students living on campus, many of whom worked in partnership with the Campus Police (e.g. residence dons). These partnerships with the community were part of the reason for the low crime rate.

Discussion ensued on the following aspects of the annual report.

In response to a query, Mr. Paris noted that "suspicious circumstances" was a catch-all category. He did not have an explanation for the increase in occurrences within this category.

A member noted that there appeared to be a disparity in the way occurrences were reported across the three campuses. He suggested that more uniform reporting would assist in assessing the Police Services on the three campuses. Mr. Paris responded that presently there were three different software programs for reporting on the three campuses. It was hoped that within the next year, the suburban campuses would utilize a system recently purchased by the St. George campus. Statistics would consequently be more uniformly categorized.

A member noted that there were two instances of hate crimes reported for 1998. This appeared to be a new offence for the Mississauga campus. Mr. Paris noted that the first instance involved homophobic graffiti on a student's locker. The second offence had involved e-mail containing racial comments directed at University students. The software package Mr. Paris had referred to earlier would help the three Campuses track these types of occurrence.

A member asked if Mr. Paris was aware of the reason for the decrease in domestic dispute case from fourteen in 1995 to six in 1998. Mr. Paris responded that he did not but suggested that perhaps the decline was due to a heightened awareness of this issue within society. The member commented on the nature of the Mississauga community, which was very close-knit. She wondered if the Campus Police believed that this style of community led to an unwillingness or

7. Campus Police: Annual Reports (cont'd)

(b) University of Toronto at Mississauga (cont'd)

reluctance of community members to report fellow members for crimes such as domestic disputes. Mr. Paris agreed that it was possible that reporting rates were lower in communities where members knew each other well. However, he also believed there was a role for the community to play.

(c) University of Toronto at Scarborough

Professor Orchard welcomed Mr. James McGhee, Manager, Police Services at the University of Toronto at Scarborough.

Mr. McGhee noted that the Scarborough and Mississauga campuses were comparable in size and policing methods were similar at the two campuses. He drew attention to pages 4-6 of his annual report, which outlined approximately 24 campus safety programs operated or organized by the University Police Service at Scarborough. These programs had played a valuable role in decreasing the number of offences on the campus. Mr. McGhee drew specific attention to the WALKsafer Service, which had been set up on the recommendation of a Advisory Committee on Campus Safety and Security, formed in 1991. The Committee's membership included staff, faculty and students. In 1998, the WALKsafer Service had provided escorts to 442 students. Mr. McGhee noted that pages 7-8 of his annual report provided a statistical overview of cases. The total monetary amount of criminal activity on campus relating to property in 1998 was \$103,390 as compared to \$80,704 in 1997. He attributed the \$22,000 increase to auto thefts on campus (six in 1998). In 1998, the University Police Service at Scarborough investigated and submitted 490 General Occurrence Reports on or in relation to the campus.

In response to a member's query, Mr. McGhee noted that most of the incidents of hate crime on the Scarborough campus pertained to graffiti. As a result, the UofT Police at Scarborough, in partnership with the Council of Student Services, had initiated an Anti-Graffiti Programme. The initiative had been very successful to date.

A member commented on the level of training required of the personnel in Police services on all three campuses. This spoke well of the programs run by the three Police Services and of the calibre of Police staff.

Mr. McGhee responded to several questions for clarification on his annual report.

8. Annual Report for 1998-99 on Decisions of Hearing Officers appointed under the Code of Student Conduct

The Chair noted that the University Affairs Board was responsible for policy concerning non-academic discipline. Accordingly, it received an annual report on the *Code of Student Conduct*.

Professor Orchard noted that he would be happy to answer questions that members might have on the annual report, which indicated that the number of cases referred for resolution under the *Code* continued to be low.

In response to a question, Ms Addario clarified that formal hearings were not held for all offences. Upon completion of the report of the Investigating Officer, a student could choose to accept the findings and waive his/her right to a hearing. In such instances, the recommendations of the hearing officer were implemented.

9. Recognized Campus Groups: Preliminary Report

Professor Orchard noted that in accordance with the *Policy on Recognition of Campus Groups*, he had prepared for the Board's information a list of campus groups that had been given recognition until September 30, 1999. A total of 128 campus groups had met the requirements for and been granted recognition by the Office of Student Affairs. In response to a member's question, Mr. Delaney provided a description for one of the recognized campus groups. Professor Orchard referred members to the World Wide Web for further information on the campus groups <<http://www.campuslife.utoronto.ca/recognizedgroups>>.

10. Report Number 18 of the Elections Committee – Procedures for Full-time Arts and Science Undergraduate Student By-Elections

The Chair noted that this report was for the Board's information. He noted a change in the balloting procedure for an upcoming by-election. This was consistent with the Election Guidelines and, therefore, no action was required by the Board. He also noted the Committee's deliberations with respect to web-based voting. When a proposal had been finalized, it would be brought to this Board, and to the Governing Council, for final approval.

11. Capital Project: Users' Committees – Terms of Reference

The Board received for information the terms of reference for the following users' committees.

- (a) Student Residence Expansion at New College
- (b) Student Residence Expansion at the University of Toronto at Mississauga
- (c) New Student Residence at the University of Toronto at Scarborough
- (d) University Centre at the University of Toronto at Scarborough

The Chair noted that the terms of reference were for the Board's information and comment. The final reports of the various users' committee would be brought to governance for final approval, at which time the University Affairs Board would offer its advice to the Governing Council.

The Chair observed that the various reporting deadlines for the users' committees were in February and March, 2000. This presented an ambitious timetable for governance given that *Expanding Residence Capacity at the University* stated that for the proposed new spaces to be available by September 2001, construction must begin in late winter, 2000.

Professor Orchard noted that *Expanding Residence Capacity at the University* predated the establishment of the various users' committees. The Provost would discuss with the Secretary of the Governing Council whether there was a mechanism for speeding up the process for approval of the users' committee reports, once finalized. He assured the Board that undue haste would not be entertained merely to meet the deadline. Funding for the buildings and use of space would be first priorities for the University, rather than an opening date.

12. Report of the Administrative Assessors

Professor Orchard reported on the following matters.

Smart Card. The committee to review the smart card (T card) had not met over the summer because of student schedules; however, it had met twice since October. The task force would seek to survey students in the coming term, using the Hitachi Survey Group, located at the University of Toronto at Mississauga. The survey, which would be undertaken by telephone

12. Report of the Administrative Assessors (cont'd)

would determine whether students believed the smart card served them better than the previous student card. Students who had only experienced the smart card as well as those who had used both the smart card and the previous student card would be surveyed. In addition, the administration would survey facilities where the smart card might be used for access to the facility (e.g. Hart House, student services, athletics and recreation, and the Library).

Council on Student Services (COSS). COSS had held a two-hour orientation the previous Friday afternoon for new and continuing members. Professor Orchard believed the orientation to have been very successful. The first regular meeting of COSS would take place the following week.

Family Housing. Professor Browne had requested Professor Orchard's assistance with regard to family housing. Professor Orchard had put together an advisory group which included students and Housing Service staff in its membership. The advisory group would seek to answer some of the questions posed by Professor Browne in *Expanding Residence Capacity at the University of Toronto*. This committee would begin to meet in the next couple of weeks.

Student Activity Space. The administration believed the provision of space for student activities to be essential, not only in residences but also in all new buildings on campus. Professor Orchard had asked Ms Susan Addario to establish a committee that would make recommendations to the advisory group on housing as well as to others at the University on what types of space were most appropriate for various buildings. Professor Orchard recalled that a recommendation of the Task Force on Student Activity Space had called for the assignment of space for student activities in all new buildings on campus. This recommendation had been accepted by the President and the University community. As a result, the administration had established a space allocation committee, whose membership was predominately students. This group would inform the University community on the appropriate types of space required within new buildings.

Special Needs in Residences. Ms Addario had formed an advisory group to look at special needs required within new residences. The report of this group would be presented to Professor Brown's advisory group on housing.

Miss Oliver reported on the following matters.

The **Erindale Student Residence** had successfully opened in September.

The **Erindale Student Centre** had also opened; however, there were some design issues that had to be rectified. The administration was working with the contractor on this matter.

The construction of the **Graduate/Second-Entry Residence** continued to experience delay. The delays were in large part due to a shortage of windows and difficulties in securing drywallers, who were in high demand because of a building boom within the City of Toronto. The administration was optimistic that the first four floors would be completed and ready for occupancy by December 15. Miss Oliver noted that there continued to be difficulty in the provision of supplies and staffing. The administration would continue to engage the contractor on these issues.

A member urged that the administration accommodate those students who were unable to relocate to the new residence on December 15 due to examinations and/or travel arrangements. Miss Oliver and Professor Orchard offered assurance that the administration would assist students with the move.

12. Report of the Administrative Assessors (cont'd)

A member asked if the contractor would have to pay a financial penalty for the delay in completing the residence. Miss Oliver responded that the University's agreement with the contractor did not contain a penalty clause for delay in completion. The administration was pursuing its various options given the circumstances.

Professor Orchard elaborated on initiatives undertaken to accommodate those students being housed in downtown hotels until the completion of the residence. A 24-hour study space had been set up for the students. A shuttle bus ran between the hotels and campus and the students were provided with complimentary TTC passes. The various colleges had provided a great deal of support and staff from Student Affairs and Student Services had worked with the students to build communities within the hotels. Mr. Delaney, working with dons located at the hotels, had put a real emphasis on academic success. Professor Orchard commended the efforts of the staff and students.

13. Date of Next Meeting

The Chair reminded members of the next meeting to be held on Tuesday, January 11, 2000 at 5:00 p.m.

14. Other Business

(a) Non-Voting Assessor to the Board

The Chair noted that Ms Marilyn Van Norman, Director, Student Services, had been appointed to the Board as a non-voting assessor.

THE BOARD MOVED INTO CLOSED SESSION.

15. Striking Committee: Membership for 1999-2000

The Chair remarked that the duty of the Striking Committee was to recommend new members to fill the seats for co-opted, or non-elected, members on the Board as they arose throughout or at the end of every year. The Committee comprised members of the Governing Council representing each of the estates. As Chair, he would represent the alumni, and as Vice-Chair, Ms Watson would represent the students. Professor McDonald, as the only Governing Council member on the Board from the teaching staff, had agreed to serve on the Striking Committee. Dr. Shari Graham Fell and Dr. Alex Waugh had volunteered to serve on the Committee as representatives of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council appointees and administrative staff, respectively.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

The following membership for the University Affairs Board Striking Committee for 1999-2000:

Mr. Brian Burchell	Alumnus (Chair)
Dr. Shari Graham Fell	Government Appointee
Professor Ian McDonald	Teaching Staff
Ms Nancy Watson	Student
Dr. Alex Waugh	Administrative Staff.

16. Service Ancillaries Review Group: Appointment of University Affairs Board Members

The Chair recalled that in an earlier mailing the Committee Secretary had sought volunteers from the Board to serve on the Service Ancillaries Review Group (SARG). Three members had volunteered to serve for the coming year.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT Mr. Vivek Krishanmurthy, Dr. Heather Lane, and Ms Sally Walker be appointed to the Service Ancillaries Review Group for 1999-2000.

The Chair thanked these members for volunteering to represent the Board's interests in this area.

THE BOARD RETURNED TO OPEN SESSION.

The meeting adjourned at 7:15 p.m.

Secretary

December 6, 1999

Chair