

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

REPORT NUMBER 94 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD

November 7, 2000

To the Governing Council,
University of Toronto.

Your Board reports that it held a special meeting on Thursday, November 7, 2000, at 5:00 p.m. in the Council Chamber, South Building, University of Toronto at Mississauga, at which the following were present:

Mr. Brian C. Burchell (In the Chair)
Professor Ian Orchard, Vice-Provost,
Students
Ms Susan Addario, Director,
Student Affairs
Mr. Muhammad Basil Ahmad
Ms Yvette Y. Ali
Dr. Robert Bennett
Professor Marion Bogo
Ms Jennifer Carson
The Honourable William G. Davis
Ms Susan Eng
Dr. Shari Graham Fell
Mr. Ljupco Gjorginski
Ms Margaret Hancock
Professor Bruce Kidd
Mr. Vivek Krishnamurthy
Dr. Heather Lane

Mr. Darren R. Levstek
Ms Karen Lewis
Mr. Paul McCann
Professor Ian R. McDonald
Mr. Fayez A. Quereshy
Mrs. Susan M. Scace

Non-Voting Members:

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

Secretariat:

Ms Margaret McKone

Regrets:

Ms Nancy L. Watson

Ms Szu-Mae Yoon

In Attendance:

Mr. Kelvin Andrews, Race Relations and Anti-Racism Initiatives Officer
Professor John Browne, Director, Residence Development
Professor David Clandfield, Principal, New College
Mr. Jim Delaney, Manager, Liaison and Campus Life Services, Office of Student Affairs
Ms Susan Girard, Chief Returning Officer and Assistant Secretary of the Governing Council
Ms Andrea Howard, President, New College Residents' Council
Mr. Mike Lavelle, Director, University of Toronto at Mississauga Residence
Ms Myra Lefkowitz, Community Safety Coordinator
Professor Robert H. McNutt, Principal, University of Toronto at Mississauga
Ms Liza Miller, Vice-President, Students' Administrative Council
Mr. Pardeep Nagra, Diversity Relations Officer, University of Toronto at Mississauga

In Attendance: (cont'd)

Mr. Justin Saunders, University Affairs Commissioner, Students' Administrative Council
Ms Jude Tate, Coordinator of Programs and Resources for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual,
Transgendered and Queer Students
Mr. Brian Wilson, Graduate House Council

ITEMS 5 AND 6 CONTAIN RESOLUTIONS CONCURRING WITH ACADEMIC BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS.

ITEM 7 CONTAINS A RECOMMENDATION TO THE GOVERNING COUNCIL FOR APPROVAL.

ALL OTHER ITEMS ARE REPORTED FOR INFORMATION.

Time of Adjournment

The Chair noted that he was mindful of the reception following the meeting, the extra travel time some members required to get home and other commitments that members had later in the evening. He, therefore, requested a motion that the meeting adjourn no later than 7:00 p.m. In the event the Board was unable to get through today's agenda in its entirety, he would ask that a special meeting of the Board be scheduled, most likely on December 13, 2000.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the time of adjournment be no later than 7:00 p.m.

The Chair continued that there were two items of business at the end of the agenda that required the Board's approval. Accordingly, he would ask for a motion for the Board to go into closed session no later than 6:50 p.m.

1. Principal's Remarks

Principal McNutt welcomed members to the University of Toronto at Mississauga and he indicated his pleasure that the Board would hold a reception at the Principal's Residence – Lislehurst – following the meeting. He welcomed in particular the Honourable William Davis, who had been instrumental in the expropriation of lands on which the campus was now located. He noted that later in the evening the Board would be considering a proposal for residence expansion on the Mississauga campus. This could be followed by several additional projects if it was determined that the campus should grow significantly to accommodate increasing enrolment trends. The issue of enrolment growth within Ontario posed exciting challenges for the University of Toronto and he very much looked forward to the continued participation of the Mississauga campus in seeking a successful solution. In conclusion, he welcomed his many colleagues from the Mississauga campus who were in attendance and he wished the Board well in its deliberations.

2. Chair's Remarks

The Chair welcomed everyone to the first meeting of the Board for 2000-2001 and he repeated an invitation to a reception immediately following the meeting at which members and guests would have the opportunity to meet one another and the directors and managers of various services.

2. Chair's Remarks (cont'd)

The Chair invited members to introduce themselves and to indicate their constituencies. Following the introductions, the Chair referred members to a memorandum that had been placed on the table which provided a succinct description of the scope of the Board's work and procedures. Finally, the Chair noted that items of business were normally brought to the Board by its administrative assessors (voting and non-voting). Following the introduction of items, he would invite questions for clarification and then call for discussion and debate. The Board could approve, recommend to the Governing Council for approval, amend, reject or refer back to the administration proposals that were brought to it for consideration. He requested members always to address their questions and comments through him as Chair, following which he would invite an assessor to respond or direct further discussion as appropriate. He hoped this procedure would help facilitate productive discussions throughout the year.

3. Report of the Previous Meeting held August 10, 2000

The Chair noted that the Report had been distributed to members electronically the previous Monday. Given that at least one member had not had adequate opportunity to review the Report, he would defer its consideration until the next meeting.

4. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting

The Chair noted that the Board would also defer consideration of any business arising from the Report until the next meeting.

5. Compulsory Non-Academic Incidental Fees: Graduate House Council Request for a New Fee

The Chair said that the University Affairs Board was responsible for approving the establishment of and changes to compulsory non-academic incidental fees, including those collected on behalf of student societies.

Professor Orchard noted that with the opening of the new graduate/second-entry residence – Graduate House – in the summer of 2000, the residents of the building had sought to establish a new student society¹ named the Graduate House Council (GHC). Subsequently, representatives had been elected to serve on the Council and a constitution had been designed.

As part of a \$200 deposit collected from applicants to the residence, the GHC had designated a \$50 portion, which, upon occupancy, would be converted to a \$50 annual GHC fee. Because this fee had not been approved prior to the collection of the deposit, the \$50 portion would be credited back to residents' accounts prior to collection of any new GHC fee.

In support of its activities offered, the GHC had requested the establishment of a new fee of \$35 annually to be paid by all Graduate House residents. The GHC planned to charge the fee in pro-rated monthly amounts payable at the beginning of each lease (i.e. a student entering into an eight-month lease at Graduate House would pay two-thirds of the total annual fee at the beginning of the lease).

¹ A "student society" is an organization on whose behalf the University collects a compulsory non-academic incidental fee and in which membership is automatic and defined by registration in one or more academic divisions or, in the case of a residence council, by residency in a particular residence.

5. **Compulsory Non-Academic Incidental Fees: Graduate House Council Request for a New Fee** (cont'd)

Professor Orchard noted that a referendum had been held on October 19 and 20, 2000, in which Graduate House residents had been asked to support the establishment of the new fee and, by implication, the establishment of the new society. The results of the referendum were as follows:

YES	49	55.7%
NO	18	20.5%
Spoiled Ballots	<u>21</u>	23.9%
TOTAL	88	
Approximately 20% of residents (approximately 430)		

A member commented that the percentage of spoiled ballots, approximately 24%, was very high. Had there been confusion in the voting process? Professor Orchard responded that this question had also been posed by the agenda planning group for this meeting. He had since had an opportunity to confer with representatives of the GHC. Most of the spoiled ballots arose from the double-envelope system used by the GCH. Mr. Brian Wilson, member of the GHC elaborated. Voters had been asked to complete a ballot, to place it in a plain un-marked envelope and then to place the un-marked envelope in a second envelope on which they were required to identify themselves to ensure the validity of the process. Eighteen voters had not followed these instructions accordingly.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT beginning December 1, 2000, a new annual fee of \$35.00 (assessed in monthly installments) be established for the Graduate House Council to be paid by all Graduate House residents.

6. **Capital Project: Users' Committee Report – New College Residence Expansion**

The Chair noted that the Academic Board, on the advice of its Planning and Budget Committee, approved in principle reports of users' committees including such elements as site, space plan, overall costs and sources of funds. The role of the University Affairs Board was to offer advice on capital projects within its area of responsibilities. In considering the next two reports, he noted that members should consider the type and style of residence proposed, anticipated residence fees, parking, and the quality of student life within each project.

Professor Orchard recalled that in February, 1999, the Board had endorsed *Student Housing: A Plan for the Next Phase*, a companion document to *Raising our Sights*, which called for an increase of approximately 2500 residence spaces on the University's three campuses. The objective was to accommodate up to 25% of the student body on the University's three campuses. Currently, the University was able to offer residences to only 16% of its student body. Professor Orchard continued that the Board had also previously endorsed the directions and priorities outlined in *Expanding Residence Capacity at the University of Toronto* at its November 1, 1999 meeting. This document had built upon *Student Housing: A Plan for the Next Phase* and had designated a general direction and particular sites for new residences.

6. **Capital Project: Users' Committee Report – New College Residence Expansion**
(cont'd)

The proposal for a new student residence at New College as well as the next proposal for a residence at the University of Toronto at Mississauga, along with the two proposals for new residences considered by the Board at its previous meeting, arose from these documents.

Professor Orchard indicated that the proposed new residence at New College would house 280 undergraduate students, seven dons and a residence life coordinator. Residences were run as service ancillaries with the amortized cost of construction and the operating costs normally covered by revenue from residence fees. In this project the increased costs of construction and the absence of funding in the ancillary for a down-payment, would produce unacceptably high room rates. The University therefore proposed to subsidize the ancillary until the planned break-even point in eight years, with an allocation to the New College budget from the Academic Priorities Fund (APF). Funding for this purpose had been added to the APF in the Budget Report for 2000-01.

Discussion ensued on the following aspects of the proposal.

Residence design. A member asked who would determine the design of the residence. Invited to respond, Professor John Browne, Director of Residence Development, explained that following the approval of the project in principle by the Governing Council a process for selection of architects would ensue. Following the selection of an architect, design would proceed and the project would be tendered. The drawings would be reviewed by the Physical Planning and Design Advisory Committee.

Approval of residence fees. In response to a member's inquiry, the Chair clarified that the University Affairs Board was responsible for approval of the annual operating budgets of the University's various service ancillaries, which included residences. Therefore, the fee for the proposed residence would be subject to the Board's approval after its completion.

Proposed bridge to link residence to Wilson Hall. A member drew attention to the provision for a raised walkway to link the new residence hall with Wilson Hall, an existing residence, at the second floor level. He asked if the users' committee had considered the potential for a below-ground walkway instead. Principal Clandfield responded in the affirmative, noting that existing mechanical rooms in Wilson Hall would complicate such an endeavour. He added that the walkway would proceed only if municipal approval was realized and private funding was forthcoming.

Elimination of "bunk doubles" in Wilson Hall. A member noted that the proposal called for the elimination of 71 "bunk-doubles" in Wilson Hall upon the completion of the new residence. He understood that there was an increased demand on campus for shared occupancy and he asked about the rationale for this initiative. Invited to respond, Ms Howard noted that the member was correct that many students wished to share a residence room. However, the "bunk-doubles" were residence rooms that had originally been built as single rooms and later converted to double rooms to meet increased demand for residence spaces. The size of these rooms was neither desirable nor adequate for more than one occupant.

Meal plan. In response to an inquiry, Principal Clandfield noted that he anticipated that occupants of the new residence would be charged the same rate for the College's meal plan as were the occupants of Wetmore and Wilson Hall. Currently, the meal plans averaged \$2700 per year.

6. **Capital Project: Users' Committee Report – New College Residence Expansion**
(cont'd)

Residence fees. A member noted that the winter fee for the New College residence, exclusive of meal plan costs was projected to be \$4,048 (\$506 monthly). The fee for the proposed new University of Toronto at Mississauga Residence, the next agenda item, was projected at \$4,120 (\$515 monthly). He wondered about the differential in costs, particularly given that construction costs were known to be higher in the downtown core. Invited to comment, Professor Browne clarified that there were many factors which contributed to the cost of a residence including the down-payment, interest rates, occupancy rates, residence furnishings, etc.... He clarified that the projected costs were estimates only and that they would be more clearly defined after the projects were tendered. The Chair added that the operating plans for both residences as well as the proposed residence rates would be subject to the approval of the University Affairs Board when the residences were completed. It would be appropriate at that time for Board members to question the proposed fees.

Total project cost estimate. A member recalled recent capital projects on campus which had had considerable cost over-runs. He wondered about the contingency costs that had been factored into the preliminary total project cost estimate and asked if the proposal would be brought back to the Board for consideration if its costs began to exceed significantly the projected estimate. Miss Oliver responded that the project would be overseen by an implementation committee. The proposed cost estimate had taken into account previous experiences with capital projects.

Level of down-payment for residences. A member asked if there was a formula for determining the level of central funding to be allocated towards down-payments for new residences. Professor Orchard responded that subsidization of down-payments was considered on a case-by-case basis. He recalled the significant subsidization of the recently approved Woodsworth College residence owing to the fact that the College had not previously had a residence and therefore had no residence ancillary from which to draw.

Consultation with neighbours. A member drew attention to the consultations that had been undertaken with the Graduate Students' Union and the Faculty Club. He wondered if these parties' concerns had been addressed. Principal Clandfield noted that the Manager of the Faculty Club and the Executive Secretary of the Graduate Students' Union had been non-voting members of the users' committee. The users' committee had done its best to ensure the needs of these neighbours would be taken into consideration and the implementation committee would continue to stay in touch with both groups during the design and implementation phase to ensure maximum care was taken to address their concerns.

Physical accessibility. A member inquired if there was provision in the new residence for students in wheelchairs. Invited to respond, Professor Browne said that all users' committees for new buildings were provided with documentation and charged with ensuring that all new buildings were fully accessible.

6. **Capital Project: Users' Committee Report – New College Residence Expansion**
(cont'd)

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD CONCURS WITH THE RECOMMENDATION
OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD

- (i) THAT the Users' Committee Report of the New College Student Residence Expansion, proposing a 11,355 gross square meter building on site 5 of the St. George Campus, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 102 of the Academic Board as Appendix "B", be approved in principle;
- (ii) THAT the project cost of \$22,400,880 be approved;
- (iii) THAT the sources of funding, \$750,000 from New College, and a 25-year mortgage for the remainder to be repaid from residence fees and an allocation from the Academic Priorities Fund, be approved; and
- (iv) THAT the base funding of up to \$352,000 be allocated from the Academic Priorities Fund to New College for a period of 8 years, the allocation to be reviewed at that time.

The Chair observed that the vote had been unanimous.

7. **Capital Project: Users' Committee Report – University of Toronto at Mississauga Residence Phase 7**

Professor Orchard noted that the proposed residence was the seventh residential project at the University of Toronto at Mississauga since the 1970s. In total the campus housed over 800 students. The proposed residence would continue the suite-style accommodation implemented in phase 6. The suites in Phase 7 would include four bedrooms, two bathrooms, living and kitchen areas. Also included in the space program were four two-bedroom don units and a one-bedroom suite, with an attached office for the building manager. In total, it would house 201 persons.

Professor Orchard continued that, as had been the case for the previous proposal, increased costs of construction and the absence of funding in the ancillary for a down-payment would produce unacceptably high room rates. The University, therefore, proposed to subsidize the ancillary, until the planned break-even point in eight years, with an allocation to the UTM budget from the Academic Priorities Fund (APF). Funding for this purpose had been added to the APF in the Budget Report for 2000-01.

Accessibility. A member noted that two dedicated 4-bedroom suites would be capable of conversion to 2-bedroom suites for use by special needs students. He wondered if it would be possible convert additional rooms in future to make them accessible. Professor Browne responded that the matter of accessibility had been dealt with in several ways. First, the new residence would incorporate the principles of "universal design", i.e., all corridors and doorways would be wide enough to allow easy passage of persons in wheelchairs, and the space program for the new residence called for an elevator. Second, because each person who was mobility impaired could require specific transfer devices (e.g., grab bars), all bathrooms would have sufficiently strong walls to allow the installation (and subsequent alteration or removal) of whatever devices were required. Third, recent technological

7. **Capital Project: Users' Committee Report – University of Toronto at Mississauga Residence Phase 7** (cont'd)

advances allowed specific rooms to be equipped as necessary with visual alarms and other wireless warning devices. Finally, the Users' Report specified that the UTM coordinator of AccessAbility Services would be consulted throughout the implementation of the project on design and access issues. Thus, while it might not be possible to fully convert additional 4-bedroom suites to 2-bedroom suites, the Users' Report had placed strong emphasis on the requirements of special needs students.

Percentage of students housed in residence. A member commented on the non-residential nature of the area surrounding the UTM campus. He wondered about primary sources for students applying to UTM and what percentage of the campus's students would be housed in residences upon completion of the proposed residence. Principal McNutt agreed that the surrounding neighbourhood was expensive for students seeking accommodation. The majority of the UTM's students came from Brampton, Peel and western Toronto. The objective was to accommodate all first-year students who wished to live in residence. Invited to elaborate, Mr. Mike Lavelle, Director, UTM Residence, noted that of the 300 first-year students in residence at UTM, 11 came from Mississauga, 5 from Brampton, and 5 from Toronto. The remainder came primarily from small towns within Ontario.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD CONCURS WITH THE RECOMMENDATION
OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD

- (i) THAT the Users' Committee Report of the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM) Student Residence proposing a 7278 gross square meter building on the UTM Campus, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 102 of the Academic Board as Appendix "C", be approved in principle;
- (ii) THAT the project cost of \$14,059,095 be approved;
- (iii) THAT the sources of funding, \$40,000 from the Parking Ancillary, and a 25-year mortgage for the remainder to be repaid from residence fees and an allocation from the Academic Priorities Fund, be approved; and
- (iv) THAT the base funding of up to \$100,000 be allocated from the Academic Priorities Fund to UTM for a period of 8 years, the allocation to be reviewed at that time.

8. **Governing Council Elections: Web-based Voting / Teaching Staff Constituencies / Election Guidelines 2001**

The Chairman noted that the Elections Committee was responsible for developing guidelines for procedures to be used in the election of staff and students to the Governing Council and to the Academic Board. Members of the Committee also served as the Election Overseers. Major amendments to policy or procedures relating to the conduct of elections required the approval of the Governing Council.

8. **Governing Council Elections: Web-based Voting / Teaching Staff Constituencies / Election Guidelines 2001** (cont'd)

(a) **Web-based Voting**

Mr. Charpentier recalled that the previous year the University Affairs Board had approved a recommendation that the election for undergraduate student representatives on the Governing Council for 2000-2001 be conducted by a combination of web-based and ballot-box voting. The introduction of web-based voting had been necessitated in part because of the new student identification card. The absence of a registration sticker on the card made it difficult to verify that students had voted only once given the multiple polling stations on the three campuses. One of the reasons for maintaining ballot-box voting for last year's elections had been the fact that the Students' Administrative Council (SAC), which ran its elections concurrently with the Governing Council elections, had not been ready to proceed with web-based voting. A second reason for the combined method had been the unease expressed by some members of the Board about the potential for security breaches with the web-based voting technology.

Mr. Charpentier understood that SAC was planning to use web-based voting this year and would be ready for the election period at the end of March. A full-time undergraduate student would, therefore, be able to vote in both the Governing Council and SAC elections on the web.

Mr. Charpentier continued that in response to concerns expressed the previous year regarding the security of web-based voting, he had requested that the Student Information Systems staff who designed the web-based voting program monitor carefully its implementation. To the best of their knowledge, there had been no attempts to hack into the voting system. They had, however, noticed several attempts to vote twice. The program had successfully prevented this activity.

It was duly moved and seconded,

THAT the 2001 election for undergraduate student representatives on Governing Council be conducted by web-based voting.

Discussion ensued on the following aspects of the proposal.

Increased advertising of election. A member spoke in favour of last year's election which had for the first time permitted electronic voting by the web. He commented that more advertising of the election in addition to those advertisements placed in the student newspapers, could be a means of increasing the historically low voter interest and turnout. Mr. Charpentier thanked the member for this comment, noting that last year the Chief Returning Officer had requested that the Information Commons create a link from the University of Toronto homepage to the Governing Council election page to increase the visibility of the election. He hoped that in the coming year, more aggressive advertising strategies could be implemented. The Chief Returning Officer would work in cooperation with SAC on this area. He added that the Secretariat was very interested in suggestions members might have to increase interest in the election process.

Access to computers equipped for web-based voting. Two members noted that while web access was available free on computers in the Information Commons, some students would not be in the vicinity of these computers or not have access because of long line-ups. Additional computers were suggested for high volume areas such as the lobby of Sidney Smith Hall and the Athletics Centre as well as a dedicated computer at the Information Commons specifically for web-based voting. Mr. Charpentier responded that there were a

8. **Governing Council Elections: Web-based Voting / Teaching Staff Constituencies / Election Guidelines 2001** (cont'd)

number of sites across the University on which computers were available for web-based voting. Also, there had been designated computers within the Information Commons for the previous year's web-based voting. He hoped that this access could be further expanded in the coming year.

Ratio of ballot-box voting to web-based voting for 2000. In response to an inquiry, Ms Girard provided the following information concerning the 2000 Governing Council election.

Constituency	Ballot-box Votes	Web-based Votes
F/TArts and Science	959	498
F/T Professional Faculties	463	226
P/T Undergraduates	98	101

Desirability of ballot-box voting. A member noted that 100 part-time undergraduate students had voted the previous year at a ballot-box polling station. He expressed concern that there might be a decline in the participation of this constituency should the ballot-boxes be eliminated. Also, students who were unaware of the elections often cast last-minute votes after seeing the ballot-box polling stations. While he supported the move to web-based voting, he believed that the ballot-boxes should be eased out more slowly than was proposed. An alternative would be a declining number of ballot-boxes over a period of years until they were eliminated.

Mr. Charpentier responded that the introduction of the new student identification card had complicated the voting process. It was no longer possible to mark a student's identification card after he/she had voted to ensure that he/she would vote only once. Instead, last year's students had been required to complete a confidential ballot and to seal it in a blank envelope. This envelope was then placed in another envelope, on which the student was required to provide his/her name and student number to enable the voter to be validated. The process for counting these ballots was very time-consuming and costly. Advice obtained from sister institutions was that only one method of voting should be used. Those institutions which had implemented web-based voting had enjoyed increased participation rates over time.

Review of web-based voting. A member suggested that if the proposal to conduct the 2001 election solely by web-based voting was approved, that a full review of the process be undertaken, with a report being made to the University Affairs Board in November 2001. At that time, the web-based voting could be revisited based on the information provided. Mr. Charpentier responded that a review of the process would be undertaken regardless of any direction by the University Affairs Board. The information obtained would as a matter of course be reported to the Board prior to its consideration of the 2002 election procedures.

8. Governing Council Elections: Web-based Voting / Teaching Staff Constituencies / Election Guidelines 2001 (cont'd)

It was duly moved and seconded,

THAT the motion be amended as follows

THAT the 2001 election for undergraduate student representatives on the Governing Council be conducted by web-based voting; and

THAT a review of the 2001 election process be undertaken with a report being made to the University Affairs Board at its November meeting at which time the method for conducting the election of undergraduate student representatives on the Governing Council by web-based voting would be reconsidered.

Mr. Charpentier responded to a number of questions for clarification. Among the substantive points raised were the following.

A member asked what a review of the election process would entail. Mr. Charpentier responded that an election review would normally include whether participation rates had been adversely affected by the elimination of ballot-box voting and an identification of any difficulties faced by voters. Any anomalies in the voting process (e.g. decline in voter participation) would be reported by the Elections Committee to the University Affairs Board. He continued that participation rates in the Governing Council student election had been very low (7-8%). He hoped that by conducting the election by web-based voting, voter turnout would increase.

A continuing member of the Board noted that the Elections Committee reported annually to the Board on the previous year's election process, at which time the Board was asked to approve the next year's election guidelines. Therefore he did not see the need for the proposed amendment.

The Chair responded that the proposed amendment would mandate the Elections Committee to undertake the review along broad lines. It would therefore have an effect.

A member noted that the proposed amendment illustrated the Board's concern with the move to full web-based voting. He expressed concern that there was not enough information available after only one-year of web-based voting and that future voter participation rates were uncertain.

It was duly moved and seconded,

THAT the motion be further amended as follows:

THAT the 2001 election for undergraduate student representatives on the Governing Council be conducted by web-based voting;

THAT a review of the 2001 election process be undertaken with a report being made to the University Affairs Board at its November meeting at which time the method of conducting the election of undergraduate student representatives on the Governing Council by web-based voting would be reconsidered; and

THAT if future voter participation decline by over 30% from the average participation rate, the issue of web-based voting be reconsidered by the University Affairs Board.

8. **Governing Council Elections: Web-based Voting / Teaching Staff Constituencies / Election Guidelines 2001** (cont'd)

A member responded that the Board and its Elections Committee should be proactively seeking ways to increase voter participation. If strategies were successfully implemented, the proposed amendments to the main motion would be unnecessary.

A member echoed his colleague's earlier assertion that the Elections Committee would as a matter of course identify and recommend on any problems encountered with the method of voting. He was wary of the Board's treading on the role and responsibility of the Elections Committee.

The vote was taken on the second amendment requiring reconsideration of web-based voting if voter participation declined by over 30%.

The motion failed.

The vote was taken on the first amendment for a review of the 2001 election process with the possibility of re-visiting web-based voting.

The motion passed.

Increased use of information technology. A member noted that he had seen an increased usage of information technology on campus, including the use of e-mail for communications. He believed that the move to the web-based voting was very timely.

Use of best practices in voting technology. A member encouraged the Secretariat to explore best practices among universities for voting procedures. The successful move to web-based voting would involve a culture change among students. He also advocated increased promotion of the annual election (e.g. screen savers on public terminals).

A member echoed an earlier concern that there might not be an adequate number of terminals available for students to cast their votes owing to long lineups. Also, not all students had personal computers from which they could gain access to the web-based voting program. Finally, she encouraged the wide dissemination of information concerning the Governing Council election through existing student listserves within divisions.

The vote was taken on the main motion as amended.

The motion passed.

Documentation concerning this item is attached hereto as Appendix "A".

(b) Teaching Staff Constituencies

Mr. Charpentier introduced the proposal which called for various revisions to the distribution of teaching staff seats on the Governing Council. He noted that with the transfer of employment contracts of members of the federated universities' teaching staff to the University several years ago, there were now only three people who met the definition of the federated universities constituency. The term for the current incumbent of the seat, Professor Robbins, would end on June 30, 2001 and therefore it was timely to consider the distribution of the twelve teaching staff seats on the Governing Council.

8. Governing Council Elections: Web-based Voting / Teaching Staff Constituencies / Election Guidelines 2001 (cont'd)

Dr. Jack Dimond, Secretary Emeritus, had conducted a review of the matter during the summer at the request of Mr. Charpentier. Dr. Dimond's review had been distributed to the Elections Committee and was included in the documentation distributed to the University Affairs Board. He had concluded that the basis on which the twelve seats were evenly divided in 1972 between the Arts and Science constituencies and the other constituencies had altered significantly enough to justify a change. Accordingly, he had proposed that there should be 5 Arts and Science teaching seats and 7 from all other faculties combined.

Mr. Charpentier continued that another proposal concerned moving the teaching staff in the Faculty of Information Studies from its current constituency, where it shared a seat with OISE/UT, to another constituency of small/single department professional faculties. This would leave OISE/UT, a large multi-departmental faculty, with a seat of its own and would be in keeping with the representation accorded the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering.

The Chair recognized Mr. Justin Saunders, University Affairs Commissioner, Students' Administrative Council. Mr. Saunders referred to the supporting documentation for the proposal which called for a redistribution of Governing Council seats among the 12 assigned to faculty. He noted that the rationale for the proposal was that there had been significant change in the relative sizes of the various constituencies. Mr. Saunders continued that the size of the student body had also changed significantly since the Governing Council had been established in 1972. Currently, there was one teaching seat on the Council for every 250 faculty members. The representation of students on the Council was somewhat disproportionate and had not been revisited since the *University of Toronto Act* had been created in 1972.

A member asked if the proposal before the Board would require revisions to the *University of Toronto Act*. Mr. Charpentier responded in the negative, noting that the *Act* provided for twelve faculty seats on the Council. This number would not change, only the distribution of seats across the various faculty constituencies. In response to Mr. Saunders' comments, he clarified that the number of faculty seats on the Council would not change. He continued that the appropriate time to advocate increased student participation in governance would not be at a time of enrolment growth but rather in a steady state of increased enrolment.

A member asked if the proposal extended also to the distribution of constituencies on the Council's various boards and committees. Mr. Charpentier clarified that committee and board memberships had been defined by the Governing Council when it had approved their terms of reference. The proposal before members was not the mechanism for approving changes to the distribution of constituencies within boards and committees.

In response to further questions concerning the scope of the proposed amendments, Mr. Charpentier clarified that there had been need to revisit the distribution of faculty seats owing to the fact that there were only 3 faculty members remaining in the federated universities' constituency. The proposal would address a long-standing imbalance.

A member indicated his support for representation based on population. He supported the motion as it would correct an imbalance in faculty representation. A member echoed his colleague's support of the proposal.

8. Governing Council Elections: Web-based Voting / Teaching Staff Constituencies / Election Guidelines 2001 (cont'd)

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT Constituency IA for members of the teaching staff who have their major appointments in the federated universities be disestablished and the remaining members of that constituency be assigned to the appropriate Arts and Science constituencies;

THAT the number of seats in Constituency III be increased from 2 seats to 3 seats; and

THAT the teaching staff members in the Faculty of Information Studies be moved from Constituency VI to Constituency V.

Documentation concerning this item is attached hereto as Appendix "B".

(c) Election Guidelines

Mr. Charpentier noted that the proposed Guidelines reflected the proposals recommended by the Board.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT the *Election Guidelines 2001*, amended to reflect all the above changes, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "C", be approved.

9. Equity Offices: Annual Reports, 1999-2000

The Chair noted that the University Affairs Board was responsible for consideration of policy of a non-academic nature concerning the University community and for monitoring matters within its area of responsibility, many of which were touched upon in the annual reports of the University's Equity Officers.

(a) Community Safety Coordinator

The Chair welcomed Ms Myra Lefkowitz, Community Safety Co-ordinator.

Ms Lefkowitz provided the Board with the following highlights of her first annual report as Community Safety Co-ordinator. During the past eight months, she had dealt with approximately 84 cases (compared with 73 in 1999 and 56 in 1998). Formal statistical collection had not begun until December, 1999 and, therefore, this figure understated the cases responded to by her office. In the overwhelming number of cases involving sexual assault and sexual harassment the respondents were known to the complainants. With respect to the location of incidents, she noted that a significant number of cases began off campus but continued to impact on a student, staff or faculty member while they were on campus. In a number of these instances, the Community Safety Co-ordinator had worked with the complainants to develop safety plans. Ms Lefkowitz continued that the length of the cases varied and were not often resolved with only one intervention. In addition to case work, she

9. Equity Offices: Annual Reports, 1999-2000 (cont'd)

(a) Community Safety Coordinator (cont'd)

assisted with training, and educational and prevention initiatives. In conclusion, she noted that it was a constant challenge to juggle the many competing priorities within her mandate.

A discussion ensued during which Ms Lefkowitz provided more detailed information concerning the reported cases of sexual assault on campus and the various mechanisms available, both on and off campus, for reporting incidents.

(b) Diversity Relations Officer, University of Toronto at Mississauga

The Chair welcomed Mr. Pardeep Nagra, Diversity Relations Officer, University of Toronto at Mississauga.

Mr. Nagra noted that his position had been created in July 1999 as a result of an allocation from the Academic Priorities Fund. This allocation was for a three-year term. He was responsible for developing, implementing and evaluating programming directed to the maintenance of an inclusive learning environment and for addressing issues of gender, sexual orientation, differently-able, culture, race and equity for students, staff and faculty.

The primary functions of his position were to:

- act as a confidential counselling resource for students, staff and faculty in dealing with diversity issues or cross-cultural conflict;
- develop diversity programming initiatives for students and student leaders and club executives;
- work with the orientation term to develop diversity workshops for new students;
- work with Human Resources to support diversity sensitization workshops for staff;
- advise the Principal, Deans and other campus administrators relating to staff and diversity issues; and
- liaise with the Equity Issues Advisory Group.

In conclusion, he noted that the new position had been a welcomed addition and resources at UTM. His annual report outlined a number of activities that were planned for the coming year.

10. Striking Committee: Membership for 2000-2001

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.

10. Striking Committee: Membership for 2000-2001 (cont'd)

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
Ms Karen Lewis	Administrative Staff.
Professor Ian McDonald	Teaching Staff
Ms Nancy Watson	Student

11. 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 Dr. Heather Lane, Ms Karen Lewis, and Mr. Fayez Quereshy be appointed to the Service Ancillaries Review Group for 2000-2001.

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

THE BOARD RETURNED TO OPEN SESSION.

The Chair invited members to the Principal's Residence for a reception.

The meeting adjourned at 7:00 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

November 26, 2000