

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

REPORT NUMBER 129 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD

May 31, 2005

To the Governing Council,
University of Toronto.

Your Board reports that it met on Tuesday, May 31, 2005 at 4:30 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, with the following members present:

Dr. Robert M. Bennett, In the Chair
Mr. Ari D. Kopolovic, Vice-Chair
Professor David Farrar, Deputy Provost
and Vice-Provost, Students
Ms Anne E. MacDonald,
Director, Ancillary Services
Ms Mubarka Alam
Ms Katherine Anne Boyd
Dr. Claude S. Davis
Ms Shaila R. Kibria
Professor Bruce Kidd
Ms Françoise Ko
Mr. Chris McGrath
Dr. Joel A. Kirsh
Dr. John P. Nestor
Mr. Tarek Saghir
Miss Maureen Somerville

Ms Rebecca Spagnolo
Ms Maggy Stepanian
Ms Preet Viridi

Non-Voting Assessors:

Ms Susan Addario, Director, Student Affairs
Mr. Louis Charpentier, Secretary of the
Governing Council
Ms Marilyn Van Norman, Director,
Student Services

Secretariat:

Mr. Neil Dobbs
Mr. Andrew Drummond

Regrets:

Mr. Shaun Chen
Mr. Christopher M. Collins
Ms Margaret Hancock

Ms Teresa Pun
Dr. John Wedge

In Attendance:

Mr. W. G. Tad Brown, Finance and Development Counsel, Office of the Vice-President and Chief Advancement Officer
Mr. Paul Carson, Executive Assistant to the Dean, Faculty of Physical Education and Health
Mr. Jim Delaney, Assistant Director, Student Affairs
Mr. Russell Field, Co-Chair, Council of Athletics and Recreation, member of the Project Planning Committee for the Varsity Centre
Ms Liz Hoffman, Assistant Dean, Co-Curricular Education, Faculty of Physical Education and Health
Ms Karen Lewis, past-member of the Governing Council, Assistant Dean, Administrative Services and Equity
Ms Sarah Lipton, Co-Chair, Council of Athletics and Recreation, member of the Project Planning Committee for the Varsity Centre
Mr. Terry Rubenstein, Director of Financial Services and Information Technology, Faculty of Physical Education and Health

REPORT NUMBER 129 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – May 31, 2005

ITEMS 5(a) and 5(b) REPORT CONCURRENCES WITH PROSPECTIVE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD TO THE GOVERNING COUNCIL FOR APPROVAL.
ALL OTHER ITEMS ARE REPORTED FOR INFORMATION.

1. Report of the Previous Meeting

A member noted that Mr. Chris Ramsaroop, former member, the Governing Council, was present at the University Affairs Board meeting of April 26, 2005 and requested that his attendance be recorded. Report Number 128 (April 26, 2005) was approved, as amended.

2. Business Arising from the Report

There was no business arising from the Report of the previous meeting. A member pointed out that an item of discussion from the March 29, 2005 meeting regarding membership in the Council on Student Services (COSS) was in the process of being resolved.

3. Code of Conduct for Trademark Licensees: Annual Report on Implementation

The Chair welcomed Mr. Tad Brown, Finance and Development Counsel, Office of the Vice-President and Chief Advancement Officer, to the meeting. Mr. Brown briefly summarized the annual report on the implementation on the Code of Conduct for Trademark Licensees, and informed the Board that the University had a working system to track licensees and where products bearing the University of Toronto name and symbols were produced. He highlighted that the main challenge was to ensure proper verification and monitoring, especially in the apparel industry. A consortium of Canadian universities had been formed to partner with the Fair Labour Association and the Workers' Rights Consortium to help ensure that Canada would be the first country where consumers could be confident that all universities were using ethically sourced materials in their licensing. The University of Toronto could be proud of its leadership role in Canada and internationally, with Mr. Kyle Winters having been appointed as a Director of the International Collegiate Licensing System. In addition, the University of Toronto had hosted a conference to help other universities build affinity programs.

A member asked if there had been any considerations of disabilities issues as the University continued to implement the Code. Mr. Brown responded that the member's suggestion was a good one and that he would take it up in the next review of the Code.

The Chair thanked Mr. Brown for the report.

4. Policy on Scheduling of Classes and Examinations and Other Accommodations for Religious Observances

Professor Farrar informed the Board that the Policy, which would proceed to the Academic Board for endorsement on June 2, 2005 and would proceed to Governing Council on June 29, 2005 for approval, represented an important element of student accommodation. It was brought forward to the University Affairs Board for information. The aim of the Policy was to solidify current practice and to assist instructors, students and administrators in ensuring that appropriate accommodation measures were taken.

4. Policy on Scheduling of Classes and Examinations and Other Accommodations for Religious Observances (cont'd.)

REPORT NUMBER 129 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – May 31, 2005

Members clarified that the Policy as proposed had already proceeded to the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs. A member stated that, in his opinion, the proposed Policy was too vague, with the phrase ‘every reasonable accommodation’ being too open to interpretation between a professor and a student. There seemed also to be no mechanism for appeal or redress. Professor Farrar responded that ‘reasonableness’ as a criterion for application was in fact key to ensuring that the Policy was both flexible and effective; the Policy merely elaborated practice that had been in place for many years. Students would have the same rights to bring concerns forward regarding the application of the Policy as on any other issue, beginning with appeal to the Department Chair and then up the administrative ladder. The member then asked how the intent of the Policy would be communicated across the University. Professor Farrar and Ms. Addario responded that there was a plan to roll out the announcement to faculty and administrators, and that the portal initiative would assist in communications efforts. Furthermore, representatives of six University faith-based and spiritual groups had given their explicit endorsement of the Policy, and many affected individuals were already well aware of practice. The Chair applauded the administration’s efforts at improving communications with all members of the community. In response to additional questions on communication, Professor Farrar and Ms. Addario noted that because the Policy had not yet been approved, it was not published in divisional Calendars; however, appropriate information was in *Getting There*, the student handbook. If approved, the Policy would be in the 2006-07 divisional Calendars.

A member stated that the requirement for ‘reasonable effort’ to accommodate was, in her opinion, insufficient, and that accommodation should be mandatory. Another member noted his satisfaction with the proposed Policy, and asked whether its implementation would involve the communication of specific days for which accommodation must be granted. Professor Farrar responded that the calendar provided by the Ontario Multi-Faith Council on Spiritual and Religious Care formed the basis of a list of major dates, and individual professors were informed of that list. Ms. Addario added that 20 major dates were entered into the University’s scheduling software, which enabled faculty members to plan their courses well in advance.

A member pointed out that the proposed Policy would be placed in the Students’ Administrative Council (SAC) handbook for the upcoming year. She then noted her concern that certain Jewish high holidays were granted specific standing in policy whereas holidays of other faiths were not specified.

The Chair noted that the concerns of members would be available in the Report of the meeting for Governing Council to see, and that the Academic Board would have the opportunity to discuss the Policy before it went forward to the Governing Council. He noted again that, as an academic policy, the Board had no jurisdiction over the proposed Policy.

5. Capital Projects

(a) Multifaith Centre for Study and Spiritual Practice: Project Planning Report

Professor Venter informed the Board that the development of the Multifaith Centre had been in the University’s plans for a long time, but it had been delayed because of the difficulties in finding a suitable site in which to house the Centre. The administration had determined that the Koffler Pharmacy Management Building, which was going to be vacated, could accommodate the multi-faith centre on its upper two floors, while the focus of the main floor would remain as a large lecture theatre. Professor Venter thanked Professor Farrar and Ms. Addario for their work on the project, and he expressed his

5. Capital Projects

REPORT NUMBER 129 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – May 31, 2005**(a) Multifaith Centre for Study and Spiritual Practice: Project Planning Report
(cont'd.)**

gratitude for the active participation of numerous groups at the University. Because of the need to relocate the current occupants of the Koffler Institute of Pharmacy Management to the new Leslie Dan Pharmacy Building, Professor Venter noted, the Multifaith Centre would be ready for use in September 2006. The Koffler family had approved of the building's uses and the renovated building would continue to bear the Koffler name.

On the recommendation of the Deputy Provost and Vice-Provost, Students,

**YOUR BOARD CONCURRED WITH THE (PROSPECTIVE)
RECOMMENDATION OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD**

THAT the Project Planning Report for the Multi-faith Centre for Study and Spiritual Practice be approved in principle, to be located on the second and third floors of the existing Koffler Institute for Pharmacy Management at 569 Spadina Avenue including the renovation of 615 net assignable square metres of planned program space.

(b) Varsity Centre for Physical Activity and Health: Project Planning Report

The Chair welcomed several guests to the meeting room: Mr. Paul Carson, Executive Assistant to the Dean, Faculty of Physical Education and Health, Mr. Russell Field, Co-Chair, Council of Athletics and Recreation, member of the Project Planning Committee for the Varsity Centre, Ms Liz Hoffman, Assistant Dean, Co-Curricular Education, Faculty of Physical Education and Health, Ms Karen Lewis, past-member of the Governing Council, Assistant Dean, Administrative Services and Equity, Ms Sarah Lipton, Co-Chair, Council of Athletics and Recreation, member of the Project Planning Committee for the Varsity Centre, and Mr. Terry Rubenstein, Director of Financial Services and Information Technology, Faculty of Physical Education and Health

The Chair stated that no project in his memory had consumed more discussion time and planning expense, or had been as controversial both within the University or the neighboring community. Indeed, there were those who had argued that there was too much discussion, and that time and money had been wasted. In the Chair's opinion, however, at the end of the day, because of our participatory, democratic system of governance, this project had addressed the very best needs of the University with approval and respect from our neighbors.

Professor Venter provided a detailed presentation on the proposed Varsity development. The Project Planning Committee had been meeting since November, 2004, with broad representation from numerous groups including the Council on Athletics and Recreation (CAR), the Physical and Health Education Undergraduate Association (PHEUA), as well as the Students' Administrative Council (SAC), the Graduate Students' Union (GSU) and the Association of Part-Time Undergraduate Students (APUS). It had consulted extensively both internally and externally to the University.

The project was designed to address first and foremost the needs of the University community, to enhance learning beyond the classroom, and to enhance the academic programs, both in teaching and research, of the Faculty of Physical Education and Health. The facility would provide athletic space for numerous sports and teams, and would help meet a huge demand for recreational space on campus. Over

5. Capital Projects

REPORT NUMBER 129 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – May 31, 2005**(b) Varsity Centre for Physical Activity and Health: Project Planning Report
(cont'd.)**

300 teams were on waiting lists to use space, and, because of both the artificial playing surface and the year-round use of the field, would allow much of the demand for athletic space to be met. In fact, the total hourly usage of the facility would rise from approximately 2,200 hours per year to approximately 9,500 hours per year, while maintenance time would fall from 49% of the available time to 6%. Elements of previous proposals that had been rejected included additional development of the Bloor Street frontage, parking facilities, residences, or a second ice surface.

Professor Venter noted that the proposal had four phases, the first of which would entail the completion of an all-weather track surrounding a field that would have the capability of having a temporary dome placed above it during the winter months. In addition, a 5,000 seat stadium would be placed on the eastern edge of the site, with change facilities and washrooms located in a building underneath the bleachers. Future phases contemplated the construction of a four-storey U-shaped building (of almost 4000 net assignable square metres (nasm)) at the southern end of the site that would expand the athletic facilities further and provide additional space for student and academic activity. The planning process would allow for an immediate start on phase one of the proposed development. Phase one would enable the construction of the 8-lane track, the field, the supports for the dome, and fencing, landscaping, and lighting. Phase 2 development would be the installation of the dome. Phase 3 would entail the construction of the U-shaped building, and Phase 4 would address much-needed renovations to the Varsity arena.

Completion of phase 1, if approved, would occur in Fall, 2006, and, depending on funding, future phases would follow in 2007 and beyond. Professor Venter expressed gratitude for the support of Professor Vivek Goel, Professor Bruce Kidd, and the many students who had served on the project planning committee and supported its work.

Professor Kidd declared his strong support and enthusiasm for the project, which would be a significant enhancement to physical activity. He complimented the project planning committee for the intelligent design proposed on the historic site, avoiding overcrowding or convoluted plans. The project would provide better space for the community and restore the site's and the University's reputation. He noted his pride that the proposal represented the best solution to the needs facing the University, and he was delighted that the project was proceeding in tandem with the Multifaith Centre, which was another important element in the ongoing enhancement of the student experience.

A member noted the strong student representation on the project planning committee, and asked if the representation would continue on the implementation committee. Professor Venter responded in the affirmative, noting that APUS, SAC and GSU felt that representation from CAR would serve the University community best in this instance. This assertion was confirmed by another (student) member of the Board. The member then asked what impact the Varsity Centre would have on costs to students. Professor Kidd noted that, once the project was in full operation with the projected increased use, including administrative and programming staff, the additional cost would approximate \$10 per full-time student.

A member noted that many students were reluctant to pay any levy to support the Varsity Centre. Another student asked if parking were a concern, but was assured that it was not. Another member noted his strong satisfaction with the status of the proposal, noting that it combined both openness and achievability.

5. Capital Projects

REPORT NUMBER 129 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – May 31, 2005

(b) Varsity Centre for Physical Activity and Health: Project Planning Report (cont'd.)

On the recommendation of the Deputy Provost and Vice-Provost, Students,

**YOUR BOARD CONCURRED WITH THE (PROSPECTIVE)
RECOMMENDATION OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD**

Subject to the understanding that the campus life implications of subsequent phases of the project will be reviewed by the University Affairs Board,

- (i) THAT the planned four phases Varsity Centre space and facilities program located on site 21 be approved in principle; and
- (ii) THAT the planned first phase of this multi-phased project for Varsity Centre be approved to allow for completion of the track and field plus the immediate support facilities.

Members applauded.

(c) Lash Miller / McLennan Courtyard: Project Planning Report

Professor Venter informed the Board that the Academic Board would consider (at its June 2, 2005 meeting) a proposal to construct new green space at the Lash Miller / McLennan courtyard. He noted with satisfaction that the Faculty of Arts and Science, the Departments of Chemistry and Physics, as well as the Students' Administrative Council Wheelchair Accessibility fund (SACWAC) and the Accommodation and Facilities Directorate had combined to fund the project. He noted his hope that the proposal would enhance student life on campus.

(d) Report on Barrier-Free Access

The Chair informed the Board that the Accommodation and Facilities Directorate (AFD) had a Standing Committee on Barrier-Free Accessibility, and that the administration had undertaken to make an annual accountability report on the progress of physical accessibility measures to the Planning and Budget Committee; the report was also provided for information to the University Affairs Board.

Professor Venter provided a thorough summary of the report, emphasizing the wide range of efforts undertaken to enhance physical accessibility to the University and its facilities.

A member asked what links existed between the Ontarians with Disabilities Act (ODA) implementation committee and the Committee on Barrier-Free Accessibility. Professor Venter responded that, in addition to having several common members, the ODA committee provided useful insight on policy and structure. Ms. Addario added that the ODA subcommittee on barrier-free access was in regular communication with the AFD committee.

6. Recognized Campus Groups: Report #2

Professor Farrar presented the above-noted report. There was no discussion.

7. Report of the Senior Assessor

REPORT NUMBER 129 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – May 31, 2005

Professor Farrar acknowledged the strong leadership of Professor Venter in his role. It was appropriate, he believed, that two issues of long-standing discussion (the Varsity Centre and the Multi-Faith Centre) should come before the Board at Professor Venter's final meeting.

Professor Farrar then reported that the administration had hosted a workshop on the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), and that numerous discussions had taken place on best practices and on enhancing the Survey's effectiveness.

8. Date of the Next Meeting

The Chair informed members that the next meeting would occur in the Fall of 2005.

9. Other Business

- (a) **Compulsory Non-Academic Incidental Fees: Individual Requests from Student Societies for Increases Beginning Fall, 2005 – Scarborough Campus Students' Union Establishment of a New Designated Portion of the Fee for Frontier College Students for Literacy**

The Chair informed the Board that the item before them was placed on the agenda as a late addition. He had agreed as an exception to the usual practice on the ground that Frontier College's work with literacy was very important and meaningful, and that it represented a good-will gesture to include it on the agenda. The addition should not be regarded as precedent-setting. The Chair then related a story how he, as a young man, had observed a literacy course provided by Frontier College that took place in a box car and was aimed at bringing literacy to itinerant workers.

A member congratulated the executive of the Scarborough Campus Students' Union for bringing the matter forward. She then asked if, in the future, levies such as the one proposed could be brought to the attention of the Association of Part-Time Undergraduate Students (APUS) formally, since APUS still represented part-time students at the Scarborough campus.

On the recommendation of the Deputy Provost and Vice-Provost, Students,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT beginning in the fall 2005 session, the Scarborough Campus Students' Union fee be increased by \$0.50 per session (fall and winter sessions only), from \$168.11 to \$168.61,¹ charged to all full-time undergraduate University of Toronto at Scarborough students and by \$0.10 per session (fall and winter sessions only), from \$11.12 to \$11.22, charged to all part-time undergraduate University of Toronto at Scarborough students.

9. Other Business (cont'd.)

- (b) **University Affairs Board, 2004-05**

¹ While SCSU is authorized by the University Affairs Board to charge \$59.28 per session (including the administration fee and PST) for the Dental Plan, SCSU has elected to charge only \$38.86 (including the administration fee and PST) per session in 2005-06. Similarly, although SCSU is authorized to charge \$41.58 for the Accident and Prescription Drug Insurance Plan (including the administration fee and PST), SCSU has elected to charge only \$40.67 (including the administration fee and PST). Therefore, the total SCSU fee that will be charged to full-time undergraduate UTSC students is \$146.62.

REPORT NUMBER 129 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – May 31, 2005

A member thanked the Chair for showing strong leadership of the Board during the 2004-05 academic year. She also thanked Professor Venter for the respect he showed members of the Board, especially student members.

The Chair noted that it had been a remarkable year for the University Affairs Board. In his eight years of service on the Board, he had seen it move ahead steadily, but, in his opinion, it had never carried out its duties as well as it had this year. The Board had initiated some new ways of handling items. The report of the equity officers this year, for example, had focused in on the key issues they were facing: climate, safety, and parental leave and childcare. The Board had received outstanding information, well prepared and well presented, and the Board had a first-class discussion. The annual report on police services, as a second example, followed a similar pattern – again focusing attention on the key issues.

The Chair thanked members of the Office of the Governing Council, who organized meetings and handled issues of space scheduling, technical preparation, coordinating scheduling, meeting preparation, accurate reporting, and institutional memory, and did so effectively during a very busy governance year. The Chair cited the Presidential Search, the Rae Review, the *Stepping UP* academic planning exercises, the Varsity Centre discussions and many other issues with enormous commitment. In particular, the Chair thanked Mr. Neil Dobbs and Mr. Andrew Drummond for their service to the Board, and to Mr. Louis Charpentier, who directed the Office of Governing Council with great effectiveness.

The Chair thanked the Board's assessors, who had consistently prepared excellent proposals and reports that were presented clearly, logically and concisely. In particular, he thanked Professor Dave Farrar, the senior assessor, for his proposals and reports, and for keeping the Board well informed of what was happening in its areas of responsibility. In particular, the Chair noted his pleasure that the "Student experience" initiative of the Academic Plan -Stepping Up – had entered governance at this Board. Again, this was unique to a unicameral governance process and recognized the value of engaged, participatory governance. The University Affairs Board was the first governance body to receive a briefing on that major student-experience initiative, beginning with the report on the University's first participation in the National Survey on Student Engagement. He looked forward to hearing during the upcoming year about progress on many fronts in that initiative.

Next, he thanked Professor Farrar's colleagues, who also served as assessors: Ms. Susan Addario and Ms. Marilyn Van Norman, as well as Mr. Jim Delaney. They had provided a great deal of excellent information and leadership to the Board. He thanked Ms. Anne MacDonald, the Director of Ancillary Services, for clearly engaging the Board in administrative substance when it was asked to approve operating plans for the Ancillary Services. Clarity in presentation made approval by Board members easier. He then asked the assessors to convey his thanks also to all of the members of the assessors' teams and their colleagues in the Faculties and Colleges - not only for their input to this Board but more importantly for the tremendous work they did to make this University a great place to study, work and to be a part of.

The Chair then thanked Professor Ian Orchard, Vice-President and Principal from Mississauga, who was Professor Farrar's predecessor as senior assessor to the Board and still served as an assessor in his new capacity. The Chair was grateful that he attended meetings when his schedule allowed. He also thanked two other assessors, whose participation had been very much appreciated: the Provost, Professor Vivek Goel, and the Chief Capital Projects Officer, Mr. John Bisanti. He then thanked a Vice-President who

9. Other Business (cont'd.)

(b) University Affairs Board, 2004-05

REPORT NUMBER 129 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – May 31, 2005

was not formally one of the Board's assessors, but who nonetheless had coordinated excellent reports on equity matters, including the report on the University's compliance with the Ontarians with Disabilities Act and the annual reports of the equity officers: Professor Angela Hildyard, the Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity.

Lastly, the Chair noted his very special thanks to Professor Ron Venter, who was attending his last meeting of the Board prior to his retirement. Professor Venter had kept the Board very well informed on the building program for facilities that would enhance the quality of student and campus life. On a personal level the Chair noted that he had brought to governance a high level of professionalism and set a standard that would remain as the benchmark for effective, people-friendly space use as the University sought to accommodate more people and more programs in the 21st century. Although Professor Venter was about to retire from the University, the influence of his thoughtful planning, his energetic drive and good judgement would be felt for decades.

The Chair thanked all members for their service. The Board had been very engaged with all the issues it faced. The discussions that the Board had begun at meetings had continued long after adjournment. Many members had contacted the Chair and the assessors about issues well in advance of meetings – to make their views known at a time when they could make a difference. Lastly the Chair specially thanked members who were concluding their service on the Board, namely:

- Mr. Ari Kopolovic, the Vice-Chair;
- Ms. Mubarka Alam;
- Ms. Shaila Kibria;
- Ms. Teresa Pun;
- Mr. Tarek Saghir;
- Ms. Maggy Stepanian; and
- Ms. Preet Viridi.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

The meeting continued *in camera*.

10. Governing Council Elections – Chief Returning Officer: Appointment

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT Dr. Anthony Gray, Judicial Affairs Officer, be appointed Chief Returning Officer, effective immediately and continuing until his successor is appointed.

11. Report of the Striking Committee

(a) University Affairs Board: Co-Opted Members, 2005-06

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

REPORT NUMBER 129 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – May 31, 2005

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the following be appointed as co-opted members of the University Affairs Board for one-year terms from July 1, 2005 to June 30, 2006:

Katherine Anne Boyd
Christopher M. Collins
Chris McGrath
John Nestor
Sam Rahimi
Faraz Rahim Siddiqui
Rebecca Spagnolo; and

(b) Discipline Appeals Board: Membership, 2005-06

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the following be appointed to the Discipline Appeals Board for one-year terms from July 1, 2005 to June 30, 2006:

Sherwin Desser
Françoise Ko
Sam Rahimi
Cheryl Shook
Mahadeo Sukhai
Adam Watson

The meeting adjourned at 6:15 p.m.

Secretary
June 20, 2005

Chair