

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

REPORT NUMBER 131 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD

November 15, 2005

To the Governing Council,
University of Toronto.

Your Board reports that it met on Tuesday, November 15, 2005 at 4:30 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, with the following members present:

Dr. Robert M. Bennett, In the Chair
Dr. Claude Davis, Vice-Chair
Professor David Naylor, President
Professor David Farrar, Deputy Provost
and Vice-Provost, Students
Mr. Husain Aboghodieh
Ms. Katherine Anne Boyd
Mr. Christopher M. Collins
Miss Coralie D'Souza
Mr. Brian Davis
Ms. Margaret Hancock
Dr. Joel A. Kirsh
Professor Ian R. McDonald
Mr. Chris McGrath
Dr. John P. Nestor
Mr. Sam Rahimi
Ms. Marvi Ricker
Ms. Rebecca Spagnolo
Mr. Mahadeo Sukhai

Non-Voting Assessors:

Ms. Susan Addario, Director, Student Affairs
Mr. Louis Charpentier, Secretary of the
Governing Council
Mr. Jim Delaney, Assistant Director, Student
Affairs
Mr. Tom Nowers, Assistant Principal,
Student Affairs, University of Toronto at
Scarborough
Mr. Mark Overton, Dean of Student Services,
University of Toronto at Mississauga
Mr. Ron Swail, Assistant Vice-President,
Facilities and Services
Ms. Marilyn Van Norman, Director,
Student Services

Secretariat:

Mr. Andrew Drummond, Secretary
Ms. Cristina Oke
Mr. Henry Mulhall

Regrets:

Ms. Anne E. Macdonald,
Director, Ancillary Services
Mr. Shaun Chen

Professor Larry Leith
Mr. Faraz Rahim Siddiqui
Dr. John Wedge

In Attendance:

The Honourable Mike Colle, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Government of Ontario
Mr. Ran Goel, Member of the Governing Council
Professor Michael Marrus, Member of the Governing Council and Chair, Elections Committee
Mr. Geoffrey Matus, Member of the Governing Council
Professor Ian Orchard, Member of the Governing Council and Vice-President and Principal,
University of Toronto at Mississauga
Ms. Elizabeth Vosburgh, Member of the Governing Council
Mr. Ari Kopolovic, past-member of the Governing Council
Professor Angela Hildyard, Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity
In Attendance (Cont'd)

REPORT NUMBER 131 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – November 15, 2005

Professor Anthony Chambers, Associate Vice-Provost, Students
Mr. Nouman Ashraf, Anti-Racism and Cultural Diversity Officer
Dr. Christopher G. Cunningham, Special Advisor to the President
Ms. Tina Doyle, Manager, AccessAbility Services, University of Toronto at Scarborough
Ms. Sara-Jane Finlay, Director, Faculty Renewal, Office of the Vice-President and Provost
Ms. Kaye Francis, Director, Family Care Office and Faculty Relocation Service
Dr. Anthony Gray, Chief Returning Officer
Ms. Connie Guberman, Special Advisor on Equity Issues and Status of Women Officer
Ms. Kate Lawton, Employment Equity and *Ontarians with Disabilities Act* Officer
Ms. Myra Lefkowitz, Manager, Health and Well Being Programs and Services
Ms. Elizabeth Martin, Manager, AccessAbility Resource Centre, University of Toronto at Mississauga
Ms. Janice Martin, Coordinator, Accessibility Services, St. George Campus
Ms. Rosie Parnass, Director, Organizational and Staff Development and Quality of Work Life Advisor
Ms. Caroline Rabbat, Community Safety Coordinator
Professor Aysan Sev'er, Special Advisor to the Principal on Equity Issues, University of Toronto at Scarborough
Ms. Paddy Stamp, Sexual Harassment Officer
Ms. Jude Tate, Coordinator, The Office of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer Resources and Programs

ITEMS 3 AND 4 CONTAIN RECOMMENDATIONS FOR GOVERNING COUNCIL APPROVAL.
ALL OTHER ITEMS ARE REPORTED FOR INFORMATION.

1. Report of the Previous Meeting

Report Number 130 (September 27, 2005) was approved.

2. Business Arising from the Report

There was no business arising from the Report of the previous meeting.

3. Elections Committee: Change to Terms of Reference

The Chair welcomed Professor Michael Marrus, Chair, Elections Committee, and Dr. Anthony Gray, Chief Returning Officer, to the meeting. Professor Marrus informed the Board that a change to the Elections Committee's terms of reference was proposed to allow the Committee to engage in broad consultation with the University community without requiring an annual open forum. He noted that attendance at the open forum had been steadily declining, with only one person attending in 2004 and three in 2005.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the proposed revised Terms of Reference for the Elections Committee, a copy of which is attached hereto Appendix "A", be approved.

REPORT NUMBER 131 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – November 15, 2005**4. Elections Guidelines 2006**

Professor Marrus introduced the proposed *Elections Guidelines 2006*, noting that several important changes had been made as part of the Elections Committee's annual discussion of the *Guidelines*, namely, that provision had been made to add sessional lecturers to the elections process; that the demerit system for campaign violations (rare though they were) had been revamped dramatically, and that greater discretion had been allowed to the Elections Committee in its role as overseer of the process. Professor Marrus acknowledged the significant contributions of members of the Elections Committee and especially of Dr. Anthony Gray, the Chief Returning Officer.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the proposed *Election Guidelines 2006*, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "B", be approved.

5. Report of the Equity Officers

The Chair welcomed the following individuals to the meeting room:

Professor Angela Hildyard, Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity, who would act as moderator for the discussion at the invitation of the Chair;
 Mr. Nouman Ashraf, Anti-Racism and Cultural Diversity Officer;
 Ms. Tina Doyle, Manager, AccessAbility Services, University of Toronto at Scarborough;
 Ms. Sara-Jane Finlay, Director, Faculty Renewal, Office of the Vice-President and Provost;
 Ms. Kaye Francis, Director, Family Care Office;
 Ms. Connie Guberman, Special Advisor on Equity Issues and Status of Women Officer;
 Ms. Kate Lawton, Employment Equity and *Ontarians with Disabilities Act* Officer;
 Ms. Myra Lefkowitz, Manager, Health and Well Being Programs and Services;
 Ms. Elizabeth Martin, Manager, AccessAbility Resource Centre, University of Toronto at Mississauga;
 Ms. Janice Martin, Coordinator, Accessibility Services, St. George Campus;
 Ms. Rosie Parnass, Director, Organizational and Staff Development and Quality of Work Life Advisor;
 Ms. Caroline Rabbat, Community Safety Coordinator;
 Professor Aysan Sev'er, Special Advisor to the Principal on Equity Issues, University of Toronto at Scarborough;
 Ms. Paddy Stamp, Sexual Harassment Officer;
 Ms. Jude Tate, Coordinator Office of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer Resources and Programs.

In addition, the Chair noted the presence of the Hon. Michael Colle, Ontario Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, who had graciously agreed to attend the meeting of the Board to hear about the University's efforts to enhance equity.

The Chair noted that the University Affairs Board was responsible for considering matters that concern the quality of life on campus, among them, equity issues. The report of the equity officers was a key element of accountability to governance on a major strategic concern for the institution. The standards of equity and accessibility applied equally to all. In the Chair's opinion, the University had consistently exceeded the minimum standards set for equity and had ensured continuing and growing support for equity as an institutional goal. He noted that the title of the Vice-President, Human Resources had been changed to Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity, in order to provide a single, senior officer of the University responsible for equity issues.

REPORT NUMBER 131 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – November 15, 2005**5. Report of the Equity Officers (cont'd.)**

Lastly, he informed the Board that he had requested that Professor Hildyard moderate the discussion that was to take place. The equity officers had determined that three major themes intersected their offices, and that a brief presentation would be given on each theme. The three themes were recruitment and retention, mental health, and cultural diversity/spiritual practice.

Professor Hildyard informed the Board that the University was blessed with an abundance of expertise in equity issues, and determined that the credit for institutional success in implementing equity initiatives lay with the individual officers and their staffs. She noted that the report of the Equity Infrastructure Review had been included in the agenda package, and that she, Professor Farrar, and Professor Edith Hillan, Vice-Provost, Academic, had been working diligently to implement the recommendations of that review. Her goal was to ensure that the University considered equity in a very broad way; to that end, she had established an advisory board, which was an expansive and representative group, to advance equity. In addition, she had appointed a Special Advisor on Equity Issues, Ms. Connie Guberman, to assist in the coordination and intersection of issues relating to equity. Equity, Professor Hildyard noted, was a firm commitment from the President, the Provost, and the entire administrative leadership of the University, and it was the University's goal to create an environment that proactively improved equity at the University. She invited Ms. Guberman to introduce the presentations.

Ms. Guberman began by noting that the University of Toronto was a great place to work, to study, and to learn. It was becoming more so through the University's equity commitments. The equity group continued to try to learn and adapt to ongoing change at the University, an effort strengthened by the fact that responsibility for equity was now firmly rooted in a Vice-President's responsibility. She believed that equity at the University of Toronto was unique in Canada for its depth and breadth and because responsibility for equity was now firmly rooted in a Vice-President's responsibility. As Special Advisor, she had observed how approximately 60 people were participating in the Equity Advisory Board, thus demonstrating the growing sense of collective responsibility for equity at the University. Equity at the University was defined broadly; indeed, it was considered far more broadly than the federal contractors requirements or the human rights code mandated. The University addressed the complexity of issues through a holistic approach, and looked at the intersection of the challenges faced by the various equity officers. The officers worked in concert to reflect the complexity of cases they faced. Although some of the work they did was reactive, the officers were constantly also working to initiate change proactively.

Ms. Finlay summarized the changes in the status of people studying and working at the University over the previous decades. Women now outnumbered men in both undergraduate and graduate studies; 1,800 students reported having some form of disability; half were in a visible minority. In 1960, only 11% of faculty members were women, but that proportion was now well over 30%, and could be expected to continue to grow. Members could anticipate that, over the next ten years, there would be more women and more visible minorities among students, faculty and staff. In that context, Ms. Parnass would summarize some of the issues facing the equity officers by summarizing two composite cases based on real cases brought before members of the equity officers' group.

Ms. Parnass cited the example of 'Mary', a single parent PhD student who was attempting to discern whether she should complete her doctoral studies. In the early stages of the degree, she had encountered difficulties, in particular with the funding formula that disadvantaged her and had almost driven her out of graduate study altogether. At the time, she had contacted both the Status of Women Office as well as the Family Care Office, as well as communicating with her Department, informing administrators that the situation could jeopardize her ability to complete her program of study. At that time, the Department had

REPORT NUMBER 131 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – November 15, 2005**5. Report of the Equity Officers (cont'd.)**

amended its policy on funding so that unintended negative consequences would not force her to abandon her funding, and, hence, her study.

'Mary' had found it difficult to maintain her progress in her PhD studies: child care was a recurring and increasing issue for her, so she discussed the issue with both the Family Care Office and the Family Resource Centre. She was directed to some family-friendly University events, and the situation improved, but she continued to feel a lack of sympathy from her Department. Finally, she completed her degree and proceeded to hold a post-doctoral fellowship in the United States. While there, she searched for permanent academic employment, and received an offer from the University of Toronto as well as from another University. The University of Toronto's offer included immigration assistance for her new partner, as well as career connections services to help him find employment. The Family Care Office and the Faculty Relocation Service were also contacted to assist her in relocating back to Toronto and assisting her with her return, and she accepted the University of Toronto's offer, in part because of the support she received.

'Ling' was employed at the University of Toronto as a data entry clerk, a position which underemployed her skills (learned in her country of origin), though she was comfortable in her work environment. Difficulties stemming from culture and language seemed to limit her options within the institution, but she was taking evening language courses to improve her English. 'Ling' had two aging in-laws requiring home care, and, since she was married to their eldest son, cultural expectations of her family responsibility for care were strong. Her home responsibilities seemed to conflict with her desire to advance her career, and over time, she was missing more and more time at work. Her supervisor suggested that she contact the Family Care Office for assistance with the ongoing issues of elder care, and the Quality of Work Life Advisor to offer assistance on other matters. 'Ling' also accessed staff development programming as well as career counseling services. As a result of the efforts of numerous elements of the University's infrastructure, 'Ling' was retained as an employee. In this case, it was likely she would not have stayed as an employee without the assistance.

Other campus services, not normally considered 'equity' services, could assist too, such as Hart House or the Athletic Centre, in offering services that would increase accessibility to the University community.

Ms. Guberman then invited Ms. Janice Martin to make a presentation on the impact of mental health issues on equity concerns. Ms. Martin noted that a growing number of faculty, staff and students were reporting mental health issues, and, indeed, between 30% and 40% of disability claims related to mental illness. Many mental illnesses saw their onset in people between the ages of 18 and 25, which corresponds to the years many attend university. This factor is of critical importance to the University's equity efforts, and Accessibility Services at the St. George campus had seen its use increase by 25%. Parallel services at the Scarborough and Mississauga campuses reported more students with depression, anxiety and schizophrenia than ever before. Services would occasionally see students diagnosed with multiple mental illnesses. Although a majority of cases were addressed efficaciously to enable clients to do well in both academic and workplace situations, a question for equity offices would be how to act during incidents of possible crisis and address the safety of the community while still attempting to serve the community member in question.

'Andrew', diagnosed with a learning disability, had been seeing a learning services strategist to allow him to complete his studies successfully. He had informed the strategist that he was also seeing a psychiatrist. The tutor assigned to him had been receiving, increasingly, unwanted contact from 'Andrew', who was then assigned to meet with the manager. The manager advised 'Andrew' that

REPORT NUMBER 131 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – November 15, 2005**5. Report of the Equity Officers (cont'd.)**

the service wanted to help, but that contact would need to be much more regulated. He seemed to be suffering from disorganized thinking, and was asked to meet with a psychiatrist, who diagnosed him with personality disorder and chronic depression. After a series of events displaying highly emotional behaviour and continued inappropriate contact with the tutor, who reported being harassed and stalked, the Campus Police were contacted and the Code of Student Conduct provisions were used; in that context, a safety plan was put in place for his tutor also. 'Andrew' was provided with assistance throughout the difficult period, eventually finished his degree, and the file was closed.

'Carmen' was a full-time staff member and a part-time student who was suicidal. She had sent inappropriate email communications of a sexual nature to colleagues, and reported seeing aliens. The Campus Police and the Community Safety Office were contacted, as well as Carmen's union representatives, to inform her of her rights. Carmen was given a leave of absence and access to psychiatric services. Eventually, she was referred to mental health practitioners off campus, and her successful treatment has allowed her to reintegrate into the workplace. In this case, the rights of all concerned were respected while ensuring the safety of both 'Carmen' and her colleagues. With appropriate accommodation and support, a positive outcome was assured.

In these two cases, 11 services were used in conjunction with the employee and six with the student. Because of the complexity of the issues facing the individuals involved, each required an enormous amount of time, sensitivity, and understanding to reach a successful outcome.

A member asked how the Code of Student Conduct 'stood up' with regards to such cases. Professor Farrar responded that it was used in only a small number of cases. Ms. Addario added that the focus of the Code was on behaviour, and the investigative procedures used would often point to issues that needed to be addressed.

A member asked if students identified with a psychiatric illness had the ability to use the Accessibility Services to assist them in preparing for academic appeals that they might be going through. Ms. Martin responded that a disability officer would sit down with a student, review any pertinent information and prepare a report to fill in any gaps and support the process in whatever ways were appropriate. The member then asked if it was reasonable to require mandatory consultation. Ms. Martin responded that ultimately, it was up to the student to ask for support, and that her office did not keep data on appeals cases of students who used the services.

A member asked to what degree a student could ask for help relating to family care. Ms. Parnass responded that a student could go to the Family Care Office or numerous other offices, each of which would be able to point the student in the right direction even if he/she was in the 'wrong' office to deal with a case.

A member noted that the presentations provided evidence of why the University of Toronto was considered among the top 100 employers in Canada. She then noted that no additional funding was provided to extracurricular activities such as Hart House or the Athletic Centre despite their frequent assistance to individuals.

Ms. Guberman then invited Ms. Stamp to speak about issues of cultural diversity and spiritual practice. Ms. Stamp stated that all the cases demonstrated how the equity officers interacted, in some cases, to 'stay out' of a case, while in others, to work with different elements of the equity infrastructure to achieve the desired result. The first case was of a referral. An employee had approached the

REPORT NUMBER 131 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – November 15, 2005**5. Report of the Equity Officers (cont'd.)**

Sexual Harassment Officer complaining of harassment based on religion. She had complained that a co-worker had taunted her with offers of food and drinks during a fast period required by her faith. She was referred to the Anti-Racism Officer instead. Each office was a 'portal', so knowledge of one office would raise the overall profile of all the offices as well as enabling access to the equity infrastructure in place at the University. In this case, the emphasis was on education and the long-term improvements that could be effected by intervention.

The second case raised by Ms. Stamp was that of a female international student who held paid employment on campus (currently, by law, the only place she was allowed to be employed in Canada). She was a lesbian and a devout religious practitioner. A co-worker took the view that her sexual orientation was contrary to the proper practice of her faith and consistently communicated his disapproval of her orientation. As a result, her work life became miserable, and she approached the Sexual Harassment Office, despite the fact that the criticism was as much of her faith as of her sexual orientation. She was unaware of the Anti-Racism Office, but was given choices whether she wanted to proceed with the Sexual Harassment Office, the Anti-Racism Office, or both. In addition, the matter could go forward as a work grievance, given that the supervisor had provided an inadequate response. After meeting with both officers, the individual wanted her supervisor's response to the issue addressed, and a joint meeting with the supervisor occurred to explain the situation better. The officer made sure to speak about the interaction of the individual's faith and sexual orientation. In this case, education on a proactive basis was deemed appropriate, and the LGBTQ Office assumed the lead role.

The Chair then opened the floor for discussion.

A member noted that none of the *Maclean's Magazine* rankings of Universities ranked accessibility as an issue. He asked if there was any way of measuring the proactivity of equity efforts at Universities. Ms. Stamp responded that, in her opinion, and perhaps paradoxically, a rising number of complaints would be an indicator of the confidence held by the community in the mechanisms available to respond to issues.

Another member noted that it appeared that not many students appeared to be on the advisory group and asked what students could do to be more involved. Professor Hildyard responded by indicating that further involvement was always welcome and that a number of working groups could benefit from students' expertise.

A member asked how the University of Toronto compared to other universities with regards to equity efforts. Professor Hildyard responded that the University of Toronto had a greater range of equity offices than any other institution in Canada, to the best of her knowledge. Some institutions had chosen to provide for a single Human Rights Office, but the University of Toronto had chosen not to do so, because of the sheer range of expertise and commitment that was assembled as a result of founding several offices. The member noted that, in her opinion, the public seemed not to be aware of the extensive services available for the community, and how vast an improvement had occurred over the previous several years.

The Chair noted his satisfaction with the continual improvement in equity services, and recollected that over almost nine years on the Board, he had seen the initiatives grow from a small effort designed to comply with governmental requirements to become one of the prides of the University. Although it had been difficult to get support for the equity offices during times of budget cuts, he attributed the success of the offices to the persistence and dedication of the equity officers.

REPORT NUMBER 131 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – November 15, 2005**5. Report of the Equity Officers (cont'd.)**

A member noted that he observed a disconnect between the content of the reports and the presentations given, namely, that the tri-campus model created a system whereby the 'portal' structure of equity offices might not result in sufficient resources being dedicated to the east and west campuses in particular. Although the University had indeed come a long way, it still had a long way to go to achieve true equity. Professor Farrar noted that the problem of inadequate budgets was not unique to the equity offices, but resulted from a delicate balance required by the necessity of addressing the tension between the resources available to act and the vision that was desired. Professor Hildyard acknowledged that resources were a problem, but that it was one that the administration had to continue to address. She noted that the University of Toronto at Scarborough had made two appointments to link through to the equity group, and that, collectively, the University continued to need to apply its ingenuity to address the problems facing it.

Another member stated that he was impressed by the protection of confidentiality of cases that intersected so many offices. He noted that a proactive method of addressing equity was in the improvement of instructional design. As an instructor himself, the member felt that instructional design was key to improving both equity at the institution as well as the academic experience itself. He urged members of staff who were responsible for designing accommodations for students to communicate better with instructors so that the responsibility for any individual accommodation could be better understood and supported.

A member asked what practices were in place to balance the need for confidentiality and the desire for greater understanding of the context of an individual case. Ms. Janice Martin responded that release of personal information required the written consent of the individual. Ms. Doyle noted that her Office encouraged disclosure to the highest degree of individual comfort, and was working to improve practice. A member noted that, although it was diminishing, there remained a degree of stigma attached to needs for accommodations, and he viewed it as the responsibility of all members of the University community to reduce that stigma and make the environment more comfortable to allow people to disclose their individual issues.

A member asked about accommodation for graduate students and research trainees, who generally experienced a very different study environment from undergraduate students. In particular, how could situations be dealt with in such a way to ensure the greatest level of mutual sensitivity? Professor Hildyard noted that, indeed, such situations were more complex for graduate students than undergraduate students, but given the range of possible issues encountered, she was unable to generalize a practice. She noted that the responsibility for equity meant that the question to be met was how to meet the academic standards put in place by the institution while maintaining appropriate flexibility.

The Chair thanked all members and the guests for an excellent presentation, and in particular thanked Professor Hildyard for agreeing to moderate the discussion.

REPORT NUMBER 131 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – November 15, 2005

6. Reports of the Elections Committee

Members received for information the following reports from the Elections Committee:

- a. Report Number 40 - September 20, 2005, including the Report on Elections, 2005 (for information)
- b. Report Number 41 – October 11, 2005
- c. Report Number 42 - October 26, 2005

There was no discussion.

7. Date of the Next Meeting

The Chair informed members that the next meeting would take place at 4:30 p.m. in the Council Chamber of Simcoe Hall on January 17, 2006.

8. Other Business

There was no other business to transact in open session.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

The meeting moved *in camera*.

9. Service Ancillary Review Group (SARG): Appointment of University Affairs Board Members

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the following be appointed to the Service Ancillaries Review Group for 2005-06:

Ms. Katherine Anne Boyd
Dr. Claude S. Davis
Mr. Chris McGrath

REPORT NUMBER 131 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – November 15, 2005

10. Striking Committee: Appointment for 2005-06

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the following be appointed to the University Affairs Board Striking Committee for 2005-06:

Dr. Robert Bennett (Chair)
Dr. Claude S. Davis (Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council
appointee)
Dr. John P. Nestor (alumnus)
Miss Coralie d'Souza (student)
Mr. Christopher McGrath (administrative staff)
Professor Ian R. McDonald (teaching staff)

The meeting adjourned at 5:55 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

January 10, 2005
35331