

**UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO**  
**THE GOVERNING COUNCIL**  
**REPORT NUMBER 95 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD**

**December 13, 2000**

To the Governing Council,  
University of Toronto.

Your Board reports that it held a special meeting on Wednesday, December 13, 2000, at 5:00 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, at which the following were present:

Mr. Brian C. Burchell (In the Chair)  
Professor Ian Orchard, Vice-Provost,  
Students  
Ms Susan Addario, Director,  
Student Affairs  
Mr. Muhammad Basil Ahmad  
Ms Yvette Y. Ali  
Ms Jennifer Carson  
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. Fayed A. Quereshy  
Mrs. Susan M. Scace  
Ms Nancy L. Watson  
Ms Szu-Mae Yoon

**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:**

Dr. Robert Bennett  
Professor Marion Bogo  
The Honourable William G. Davis

**In Attendance:**

Mr. Elan Ohayon, member, the Governing Council  
Professor John Browne, Director, Residence Development  
Mr. Sam D'Angelo, former Acting Manager, Police Services, St. George Campus  
Mr. Jim Delaney, Manager, Liaison and Campus Life Services, Office of Student Affairs  
Mr. Ivan Gotlieb, Director, Administration and Services, Facilities and Services  
Mr. Dan Hutt, Manager, Police Services, St. George campus  
Mr. Jim McGhee, Manager, Police Services, University of Toronto at Scarborough.  
Mr. Len Paris, Manager, Police Services, University of Toronto at Mississauga  
Mr. Justin Saunders, University Affairs Commissioner, Students' Administrative Council  
Mr. Jorge Sousa, President, Graduate Students' Union

ALL ITEMS ARE REPORTED FOR INFORMATION.

**Chair's Remarks**

The Chair thanked members for attending the special meeting, which was necessary to complete those items of business that the Board had been unable to consider at its previous meeting owing to time constraints. He noted that the two equity reports that the Board had not been able to consider at its previous meeting would appear on the Board's January 16, 2001 agenda, along with the remaining annual equity reports for 1999-2000.

The Chair reported that he had received two speaking request to address the Board on matters on the agenda. Mr. Jorge Sousa, President, Graduate Students' Union, and Mr. Justin Saunders, University Affairs Commissioner, Students' Administrative Council, wished to address the Board on the *Code of Student Conduct* and the annual police reports respectively. The Chair noted that he would recognize Mr. Sousa and Mr. Saunders when the Board considered these items.

**1. Reports of the Previous Meetings****(a) Report Number 93 of the meeting held on August 10, 2000**

The Report of the meeting held on August 10, 2000 was approved.

**(b) Report Number 94 of the meeting held on November 7, 2000**

The Chair noted that members have received an excerpt report from the previous meeting held on November 7, 2000, which contained a record of the discussion of those items that had gone forward to the Governing Council for approval. A full report was forthcoming and its approval would be sought at the Board's January 16, 2001 meeting.

**2. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meetings****(a) 21 Sussex Avenue: Accessibility**

The Chair recalled that at previous meetings the Board had been apprised of the administration's intention to designate 21 Sussex Avenue as a site for student clubs. He invited Miss Oliver to report on any updates to this initiative. Miss Oliver noted that University of Toronto Police Services office for the St. George campus was to be relocated to 21 Sussex Avenue as were many student clubs and some equity officers. There continued to be an intensive dialogue with the Planning and Budget Office as to the space requirements for the police services. Their needs would need to be determined prior to the designation of a location for the elevator and the handicapped accessible washroom. She was hopeful that the Planning and Budget office would resolve the space plan by the end of January so that renovations to 21 Sussex Avenue could proceed.

**3. University of Toronto Police Services: Annual Reports, 1999-2000**

The Chair noted that responsibility for campus security fell within the purview of the University Affairs Board. He welcomed Mr. Sam D'Angelo, Acting Manager, Police Services, St. George Campus (1999-2000); Mr. Dan Hutt, Manager, Police Services, St. George campus; Mr. Len Paris, Manager, Police Services, University of Toronto at Mississauga; and Mr. Jim McGhee, Manager, Police Services, University of Toronto at Scarborough.

**3. University of Toronto Police Services: Annual Reports, 1999-2000 (cont'd)**

**(a) St. George Campus**

Mr. D'Angelo presented the 1999-2000 annual report for the St. George campus, which included the following highlights.

- The daily summary of occurrences was now being distributed by e-mail as well as being publicly available on the Police website: <http://police.sa.utoronto.ca>.
- Twelve additional emergency phones had been installed in various campus locations.
- The Police Services continued to coordinate:
  - the Work Alone Program, which benefited staff and students who were working during the evening or holidays; and
  - the Walksafer/Worksafers student services which had provided approximately 730 escorts to persons on campus at night as well as patrols of campus buildings.
- The Police Services continued to conduct campus-wide safety audits of campus buildings.
- To further improve on community outreach initiatives, a Police Service Web Page had been created and was updated frequently to provide information on safety awareness education.
- Incidents involving threats/harassment had decreased by 54% during the last year (1998: 110; 1999: 59). This might be attributable to increased community awareness on how to handle threats and harassment and to the fact that the university viewed this type of behaviour as a very serious crime.
- With respect to training, members had received training on options to use force, dealing with emotionally disturbed persons and other selected topics, as had been outlined on Appendix "C" to the annual report.
- Five formal complaints had been received in 1999 compared with two in 1998. A review of the 1999 complaints had failed to find any evidence in support of four complaints. A fifth complaint was the subject of a civil court cases involving the University of Toronto Police Service and the City of Toronto Police Service. Both complaints during 1998 had been shown to be founded. A summary of complaints received was appended to the annual report as Appendix "D".

Mr. D'Angelo and Miss Oliver responded to a number of questions for clarification concerning the annual report and the Police services. Substantive discussion of the annual report for the St. George campus focused on the following matters.

**Training programs.** At the invitation of the Chair, the Board was addressed by Mr. Justin Saunders, University Affairs Commissioner, Students' Administrative Council. Mr. Saunders drew attention to Appendix "C" to the annual report for the St. George campus, which detailed the training undertaken by University of Toronto Police during the past year. While all members of the St. George police had participated in courses entitled Use of Force Defensive Tactics and Use of Force Criminal Code, only two members had participated in the Non-Violent Crisis Intervention course. Also, at the University of Toronto at Mississauga, only one member had participated in the Mental Illness Workshop. He expressed concern that police training appeared to emphasize the use of force as a primary method for dealing with disturbances or crisis situations.

A member observed that the duration of the courses varied considerably. For example, the Police Mountain Bike Training was a two-day course whereas the Lesbian and Gay Community Sensitivity Training was only two hours in length. She asked how the courses were determined and if there was a philosophy for police training at the University.

**3. University of Toronto Police Services: Annual Reports, 1999-2000 (cont'd)****(a) St. George Campus (cont'd)**

Miss Oliver responded that the training programs had been set up a number of years ago when the University of Toronto had been working with the City of Toronto Police to create the special constable status for University police officers. The courses offered reflected the training required for the special constable status. She recalled that in the recent review of the Campus Police, the types of courses offered and their duration had been identified as an issue. In its response, the administration had undertaken to review the training offered. The University regarded the course for special constable status as a minimum requirement for University police.

Invited by the Chair to comment, Mr. Gotlieb added that some courses were required while others were voluntary. Some members of the police had previously taken courses that were not reflected in the statistics provided. The information did not therefore convey the overall level of training undertaken.

A member suggested that next year's report identify the philosophy of the University Police and the type of work being undertaken by its members. Also, she asked that the report differentiate between mandatory and voluntary course offerings as well as indicating which courses had previously been completed by members. This would hopefully provide a better context for Board members.

A member commented favourably on the availability of different types of training programs and advocated the inclusion of racial sensitivity courses to the offerings. Miss Oliver thanked the member for the suggestion, noting that the training programs were currently under review. She undertook to pass the suggestion on to Mr. Hutt, who was currently reviewing the diversity of the University's police and its recruitment programs and future staffing requirements. Miss Oliver continued that also arising from the review and administrative response would be the creation of a community advisory board. It would be appropriate for the new board to be briefed on the training programs offered.

**Review Process for Complaints against University police.** In response to a member' inquiries, Miss Oliver noted that the Manager of Police Services was currently responsible for reviewing and disposing of complaints received. The administrative response to the review of the Police Services had indicated this process would be changed so that the results of a review by the Manager of Police Services would in future be approved by Miss Oliver, thereby ensuring a two-level review.

**Number of Occurrences in Relation to the Size of the University.** A member noted that the number of annual occurrences appeared to be relatively small compared to the size of the University. Mr. D'Angelo agreed, noting that the number of incidents on the University's St. George campus were relatively low when compared to American universities of comparable size. Miss Oliver and Mr. Hutt added that number of incidents on the St. George campus were also low when compared to those of the Toronto Police's 52 Division, in which the University was located.

In response to members' questions concerning the review of Police Services, the Chair noted that the review would be reported on by Miss Oliver under the Reports of the Administrative Assessors. It would be appropriate for members to discuss the review and the administrative response at that time.

**3. University of Toronto Police Services: Annual Reports, 1999-2000 (cont'd)****(b) University of Toronto at Mississauga**

Mr. Len Paris presented the 1999-2000 annual report for the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM), which included the following highlights.

Mr. Paris explained that the special constable status of the UTM Police was established through an agreement with Peel Regional Police and UTM. As part of this agreement, training and educational programs were discussed and reviewed annually with Peel Regional Police. Mr. Paris noted that 1999-2000 had been a relatively light year for training; however, the Supervisory Course, offered by Peel Police, had been two weeks in duration. Topics covered in this training had included mental health issues and non-violent crisis intervention. In response to concerns expressed earlier in the meeting about the training programs dealing with use of force, Mr. Paris clarified that the names of these courses did not always accurately convey the course content. For example, many topics were covered in these programs, including how to improve communication skills and how to settle crises without force.

Mr. Paris continued that the UTM Police Service worked in partnership with the community in developing programs and conducting activities to promote safety and security on campus. These initiatives included: personal safety, protection of property, conflict resolution, maintenance of public order, community service and referral, emergency response assistance, crime prevention and detection, enforcement of the criminal code and selected provincial and municipal statutes as well as University policies and regulations. There was a great deal of student involvement in these initiatives.

Mr. Paris then drew attention to the statistical review within his report. The total number of occurrence reports filed had increased by 17 percent in 1999. In 1998, a total of 259 reports had been filed, whereas in 1999, 311 reports had been filed. He attributed this increase to a 17 percent increase in crime occurrences. There had been 163 crime reports in 1998 compared to 191 crime reports in 1999. Also, accident type occurrences had increased by 15 percent in 1999 compared with 81 reports in 1998. Mr. Paris recalled that the previous year, the Board had expressed concern over reported hate crimes. He was pleased to report that hate crimes had declined, with no report in 1999 compared with two reports in 1998. He believed some of the credit for this decline was due to initiatives undertaken by the new Diversity Officer.

**(c) University of Toronto at Scarborough**

Mr. Jim McGhee introduced the annual report for the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSc). The Polices at UTSc consisted of the Manager, three Corporals and six Constables. In 1999, members had received training on Use of Force Options, as well as Sexual Assault Investigations/Crime Scenes. The various training programs undertaken by UTSC Police were those offered by the St. George Police. Details concerning the core training program were outlined on page 11 of the annual report. The availability of members was sometimes a factor in the scheduling of training courses.

Mr. McGhee continued that the statistical overview of the report outlined the following. The UTSc Police had investigated and submitted 398 General Occurrence Reports on or in relation to the campus in 1999, a significant decrease from 1999 (501 reports). There had been a decrease in assaults and other violent crimes from 11 in 1998 to 4 in 1999. The decrease was a result of community awareness and prevention. Threats/harassment had decreased from 19 in 1998 to 9 in 1999. The decrease could be attributed to a zero tolerance policy initiated by the UTSc Police. There had been a substantial decrease in property-related mischief/vandalism reported involving University property. This could be attributed to the Anti-Graffiti program

**3. University of Toronto Police Services: Annual Reports, 1999-2000 (cont'd)**

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

started in 1999. The monetary value of University property stolen had risen from \$10,249 in 1998 to \$37,778 in 1999, although the number of theft reports had decreased. There had been a decrease in break-and-enter reports from 10 in 1998 to 6 in 1999. This decrease was due in part to the arrests of three University of Toronto students who had been involved in a break and enter, resulting in the theft of 33 examinations. Finally, there had been a decrease in violations under the Liquor License Act from 27 in 1998 to 16 in 1999. This was a result of aggressive enforcement and prohibitions from entering licensed events.

Mr. McGhee responded to a number of questions for clarification concerning the report and the training programs shared with the St. George Campus Police. In response to a member's question concerning trends in occurrences, Mr. McGhee noted that crimes of a violent nature had declined. Theft of property was a major concern. The Police would be working with the UTSc community to raise public awareness in this area.

A member expressed his gratitude to the Managers of the Police Services for the uniformity in which they had produced their annual reports. This change made it easier for Board members to compare the difference services.

A member drew attention to the statistics for reported occurrences of sexual assaults and threats/harassment. He noted that there were many avenues within the University as well as externally for members to report complaints. Was there a mechanism for gathering this data to provide an overall summary that reflected the actual number of reported cases? Ms Addario agreed that members of the University community sought different avenues for assistance as a result of harassment, intimidation or threatening behaviour. Many of those people who reported such occurrences did not wish for the involvement of University or Toronto Police. Complainants sought assistance from various University Offices, including the Sexual Harassment, Education, Counselling and Complaint Office, the Counselling and Learning Skills Service, which included a Sexual Assault Counsellor, and the Community Safety Co-ordinator.

A member asked if there were areas within the three campuses that were specifically targeted for crimes. She also wondered if the success rate for solving crimes was tracked. Mr. McGhee reported that each campus maintained statistics. Areas that had traditionally proved vulnerable to theft included libraries and cafeterias. There was a 75 percent conviction rate for those UTSc cases that went before the divisional courts. Miss Oliver added that representatives from each of the three campuses met quarterly at tri-campus police meetings to discuss areas of common concern and to develop joint strategies.

A member suggested that future reports included statistical comparisons with other Canadian universities.

The Chair thanked the three Managers for attending the meeting.

#### **4. Varsity/Devonshire/Bloor Precinct Project: Update**

The Chair noted that members had received a written update from Dr. John Dimond on this project. Professor John Browne, Director, Residence Development was in attendance to provide a further update.

Professor Browne noted that the progress report before members concerned the overall planning for residences, athletic facilities and associated service facilities at the north end of the St. George campus. As outlined in Dr. Dimond's memorandum, the overall concept for the developments remained as previously shown to the Board. In the areas under study, it was proposed that a total of 5 or 6 new residences be built, accommodating between 1600 and 1700 students (approximately 700 undergraduates, 700 graduate and second-entry students, with the balance undetermined at present). In addition the existing Varsity Stadium would be demolished and replaced with a 5,000-seat stadium containing an all-weather field and track. Varsity Arena would be extensively renovated and a second ice surface would be built immediately to the south of the Arena, allowing the existing Robert Street open-air ice surface to be decommissioned. The planning report on these projects also would recommend significant new green spaces and more vigorous landscaping, in keeping with the principles of the *Investing in the Landscape Report*.

Planning over the summer had been concentrated in a number of areas. First, in response to comments made in various public presentations, the Faculty of Physical Education and Health had been focusing on detailed space planning, emphasizing that the Stadium/Arena complex would function as a second St. George campus center for a wide range of physical activities for individual users as well as intramural and intercollegiate teams. The facility would be broadly accessible for a wide range of users and activities. Also, detailed planning was now underway for the first of the proposed residences, at the southeast corner of Bloor and St. George Streets. This would be the first residence for Woodsworth College. It was projected for completion in 2003.

A detailed report from the planners retained by the University to advise on the overall approach to the areas would be in hand shortly. This would be the catalyst for completing examination of a number of development options whose feasibility needed to be verified before a final area plan could be recommended. The most prominent of these options, all of which were being examined closely, were: City requirements for building setbacks along Bloor Street, discussions with Trinity College about boundary issues between its campus and the Varsity Stadium/Arena site, and the feasibility of two potential revenue-generating options - a multiplex cinema and a parking garage, both under the Varsity Stadium field. An alternative option, an underground classroom complex, had been developed in the event that the cinema option was not feasible. It was possible that none of these three options (cinema, major garage, and classroom complex) would be in the final plan and a good deal of time was being spent on analyzing them. It was anticipated that this would be completed in the next two months.

Members asked a number of questions for clarification. In response, Professor Browne elaborated on the process of development of residences and the discussions concerning a multiplex cinema and parking garage.

The Chair thanked Professor Browne for attending the meeting.

**5. *Code of Student Conduct***

The Chair noted that the 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. This included non-academic discipline.

**(a) Annual Report on Decisions of Hearing Officers Appointed under the *Code of Student Conduct***

Professor Orchard introduced the report, noting that the *Memorandum on the Maintenance and Use of the Records of Non-academic Discipline Proceedings*, which was appended to the *Code of Student Conduct*, provided that “the decisions of the Hearing Officers shall be reported to the Vice-President and Provost, who shall convey the information, anonymously and in statistical form, annually to the University Affairs Board.” Professor Orchard noted that the number of reported cases continued to be low. Ms Addario added that the comparative annual report on decisions indicated a marked increase over previous years’ reports. This was attributable to charges laid by one division against students who had forged parking passes. She continued that as had been the case in previous years, only about 50 percent of the University’s academic divisions had brought charges against students under the *Code*. She was unclear as to reason for this. She continued that formal hearings were not always held following the referral of a case to an Investigating Officer. The reason in many instances was that a student could opt to negotiate a settlement with his/her divisional head in the absence of a formal hearing. Therefore, in some instances, the statistics of a finding that an offence had been committed were greater than the number of formal hearings held.

**(b) Special Committee to Review the *Code of Student Conduct*: Establishment**

The Chair noted that he and Professor Orchard had authored a memorandum to members concerning the administration’s intention to seek advice from the University Affairs Board on changes it was contemplating to the *Code of Student Conduct*. A copy of this communication had also been placed on the table. He continued that the administration was of the view that there were a number of specific ways in which the *Code* could be amended to enable it to better realize its stated objectives. The memorandum sent to members outlined the various ways in which a policy could be amended and had proposed that this Board establish its own advisory group, in the form of a special committee, whose mandate and composition was set by this Board. In this model, the administration would participate in the work of the Committee and the Committee’s advice would form the primary recommendation to the Board.

Professor Orchard noted that despite the relatively low number of hearings held under the *Code* each year, a review of the *Code* was worthwhile to ensure that it was effectively serving the University community. He believed that a special committee of the University Affairs Board should conduct a limited review of the *Code* with respect to:

- omission and ambiguities in the current wording with respect to procedure and offence categories such as computer-related behaviour;
- an interim procedure to be used in urgent or emergency situations, when it was apparent that the health, safety or well-being of the student or others in the University community were at risk;
- the role of central offices in the administration of the *Code*;
- consistency of application of the *Code* across divisions; and
- guidelines and training for officers under the *Code*.

**5. Code of Student Conduct (cont'd)**

**(b) Special Committee to Review the *Code of Student Conduct*: Establishment (cont'd)**

The proposed membership of the special committee would be three students (inclusive of a co-chair) and three non-students (inclusive of a co-chair). The Committee would consult appropriately and report by March 31, 2001.

The Chair noted that should the motion to create the special committee be approved by the Board, Dr. Heather Lane and Mr. Muhammad Ahmad had agreed to serve as co-chairs.

It was duly moved and seconded,

THAT a special committee of the University Affairs Board be created to review the *Code of Student Conduct*, with the terms of reference and committee composition as outlined in the memorandum from Professor Orchard dated December 8, 2000.

Invited to address the Board, Mr. Justin Saunders, External Affairs Commissioner, Students' Administrative Council (SAC), noted that SAC, the Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students (APUS), and the Graduate Students' Union (GSU), wished to have representatives appointed to the special committee. These student organizations had a special interest in the *Code* and would like to have a voice in the process, which could lead to its amendment. An example of their concerns regarding the *Code* included the format in which the annual report came to the University Affairs Board. There was no information provided concerning the constituencies from which the cases arose nor was there any information concerning the length of time between the filing of an initial complaint and a formal hearing. He hoped that representatives of APUS, GSU and SAC could be appointed to the special committee.

Invited to address the Board, Mr. Jorge Sousa, President, Graduate Students' Union, noted that since the creation and implementation of the *Code*, several graduate students, who had been involved in peaceful political action, had been threatened under or cited for an infraction under the *Code*. Given its concerns, Mr. Sousa believed the GSU could make substantial contributions to the review. The GSU supported a focused review of University policies and a committee to review such a significant policy deserved cross-jurisdictional representation from the democratically elected leaders of the student governments. Representatives from APUS, GSU and SAC should be appointed to the special committee. Participation by these groups would also ensure less work for the student members of the Board who were being asked to serve on the special committee.

Discussion ensued on the following aspects of the proposed special committee to undertake a limited review of the *Code*.

A member noted that the reporting deadline for the special committee was appropriate if it conducted the limited review as outlined. However, if it was determined to broaden the review to include issues raised by the GSU, then consideration should be given to extending this deadline. The Chair responded that the administration was seeking guidance on ways that the *Code* could be improved. While the review would be focused on the points addressed in the administration's memorandum, it would not preclude other avenues of consideration. Professor Orchard clarified that the GSU's concern regarding the *Code* being used against students involved in "peaceful and political action" could be included under "omissions and ambiguities," one of the mandates of the special committee.

**5. Code of Student Conduct (cont'd)**

**(b) Special Committee to Review the *Code of Student Conduct*: Establishment (cont'd)**

Following a member's motion, and with the required two-thirds majority, the Board approved that a member of the Governing Council be permitted to address the Board on the matter.

The member of the Governing Council argued that it was imperative that the membership of the special committee be expanding to include representatives of the APUS, GSU and SAC. He had serious concerns regarding the implementation of the *Code*, which had been used recently to expel two students from the University. As well, the *Code* applied only to students and did not extend to other constituencies of the University. He believed that the review of the *Code* should include those constituencies to which it should apply and the conditions under which someone could be charged. The member continued that he had provided notice of motion at the October 19, 2000 meeting of the Governing Council that the *Code* be repealed. The Executive Committee had declined to put the motion on the agenda of the subsequent meeting of the Governing Council because it had been informed of the administration's intention to bring forward to the University Affairs Board a proposal concerning a special committee to review the *Code*. In the absence of broad representation on the special committee, he intended to reintroduce his motion to the Council to have the *Code* repealed.

A member asked about the composition of the committee that had first recommended the *Code*. Ms Addario responded that that committee had included representatives from the University Affairs Board and the University community. She believed that to be customary practice when policies were first created.

A member expressed her agreement that it was reprehensible that students were held to a different level of conduct than were other members of the University. This, too, should be a consideration of the special committee.

It was duly moved and seconded,

THAT the terms of reference for the proposed special committee be amended to include "and any other matters the special committee deems appropriate."

The vote was taken on the proposed amendment to the terms of reference.

The motion to amend was carried.

In response to members' questions concerning whether the proposed committee membership could be amended to include representatives of APUS, GSU and SAC, Professor Orchard and the Chair clarified that the motion currently before members was for a special committee composed solely of representative of the University Affairs Board. A motion to broaden the Committee membership would be contrary to the spirit of the proposal. If the Board did not agree with the proposed composition, it should vote against the motion.

Dr. Lane addressed the Board as the potential co-chair for the proposed special committee. She believed that for the committee to do its work properly, it would consult with APUS, GSU and SAC.

**5. Code of Student Conduct (cont'd)**

**(b) Special Committee to Review the *Code of Student Conduct*: Establishment (cont'd)**

The Chair noted that the Board should deal with the proposed motion in two parts. First, it should consider whether a special committee of the Board should be created to review the *Code*, the terms of reference and composition of which were outlined in the memorandum from him and Professor Orchard. Following approval of the establishment of the special committee, the Board would then consider the appointment of University Affairs Board members to the Committee.

A member expressed concern that if the Board approved the establishment of the special committee, its membership would preclude representatives from APUS, GSU and SAC, who were qualified to bring the concerns of students to the table.

The Chair reiterated that the motion before members was for a committee composed solely of University Affairs Board members.

The vote was taken on the motion to create a special committee of the University Affairs Board to review the *Code of Student Conduct*.

The motion was carried.

The Chair then invited expressions of interest from Board members to serve on the special committee.

Some members indicated their dissatisfaction that the special committee would not include in its membership representatives of APUS, GSU and SAC, who would have greater knowledge of the issues and have more time to devote to the Committee's work.

A member expressed surprise at the concerns expressed. It had been stated earlier that APUS, GSU and SAC would be consulted during the special committee's deliberations. It was logical that the special committee comprise members of the University Affairs Board, which was responsible for policy in the area of non-academic discipline. She had tremendous respect for the student representatives on the University Affairs Board who were being asked to undertake the work required of the special committee.

Professor Orchard re-iterated that the special committee was to consult broadly in its deliberations. Members of the special committee would receive submissions from APUS, GSU and SAC, in addition to others, so that they were fully apprised of the issues. He clarified that any recommendations brought forward by the special committee and endorsed by the University Affairs Board would have to be brought to the Governing Council for final consideration. There were therefore various opportunities for community input.

During the course of the discussion, Professor McDonald volunteered to serve on the special committee.

**5. Code of Student Conduct (cont'd)**

**(b) Special Committee to Review the *Code of Student Conduct*: Establishment (cont'd)**

It was duly moved and seconded,

THAT Dr. Heather Lane and Mr. Muhammad Ahmad be appointed as co-chairs of the special committee, with the four remaining members (2 students and 2 non-students) to be filled by volunteers from the University Affairs Board. In the absence of a sufficient number of volunteers, the co-chairs in consultation with the Chair of the University Affairs Board will report back to the University Affairs Board on a recommended course of action.

A member re-iterated earlier concerns that the student members of the Board did not have the time or the expertise to devote themselves to the special committee. Professor Orchard responded that the administration would provide a great deal of assistance to the special committee, including the gathering of best practices.

A member moved that the member of the Governing Council who had previously addressed the Board on this issue be permitted to address the Board again. The Chair ruled that the motion was out of order. The Chair continued that the Governing Council member had already been granted five minutes to address the Board on the matter and he reiterated that he would not grant the individual's request for a second intervention. The member of the Governing Council protested the Chair's ruling at length. The Chair stated that the member of the Governing Council had not been recognized and that his speaking in protest was out of order. The member continued to challenge the Chair during the vote on the matter.

The vote was taken on the motion concerning the membership of the special committee.

The motion was carried.

**6. Recognized Campus Groups: Report #1**

Professor Orchard noted that in accordance with the *Policy on Recognition of Campus Groups*, Mr. Delaney had prepared for the Board's information a list of campus groups that had been given recognition until September 30, 2000.

In response to a member's question, Professor Orchard clarified that the listing pertained only to recognized campus groups on the St. George campus. The approval process for recognizing campus groups varied by campus.

**7. University Affairs Board: Calendar of Business - 2000-2001**

The Chair noted that the Calendar of Business was provided for members' information. It would be updated to include the report of the special committee to review the *Code of Student Conduct* approved earlier in the meeting.

He invited members with comments to get in touch with him as Chair, the Board's Secretary or one of the Board's assessors.

**8. Reports of the Administrative Assessors**

Professor Orchard noted that he very much hoped that Ms Marilyn Van Norman, a non-voting assessor to the Board, would be returning soon from a medical leave.

Professor Orchard also reported that he was pleased to report that the Hart House theatre, which was not previously part of Hart House itself, had been integrated into the House for use by its cultural programs. The University had provided transitional funding to Hart House to support this initiative, and the House would seek to raise \$6 million in the next five years towards an endowment to support the ongoing use of the theatre. He expressed his gratitude to Hart House Warden, Margaret Hancock, and her colleagues, for their visionary plan for the theatre.

Members joined Professor Orchard in applauding this initiative.

In conclusion, Professor Orchard drew members' attention to the Calendar of Business for the year, which included consideration of a users' committee report for a Multi-Faith Centre, residence expansion and day care facilities. He also reported on successes in offering multi-year financial support packages to doctoral students that would ensure the University remained competitive with its peers institutions.

A member asked about a recent survey he had received concerning the provision of student services at the University. Professor Orchard responded that the survey had been commissioned by the Ontario Government, which was looking into efficiencies within the University. The member expressed concern that as a member of a professional faculty, who had completed the course requirement portion of his program, his opinion had been sought on enrolment and course selection issues. If the survey had been sent to other students enrolled in the professional faculties, the results of the survey would be skewed. Professor Orchard agreed and undertook to pass on the member's concern to the author of the survey.

Ms Addario reported on initiatives undertaken to accommodate multi faith issues. In response, a member who had placed a communication on the table at the previous meeting from the Muslim Students' Association noted his appreciation for the work being undertaken.

**9. Date of Next Meeting**

The Chair reminded members of the next meeting scheduled for Tuesday, January 16, 2001 at 5:00 p.m.

The meeting adjourned at 7:35 p.m.

---

Secretary

---

Chair

February 1, 2001