

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

**REPORT NUMBER 123 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD**

**September 28, 2004**

To the Governing Council,  
University of Toronto.

Your Board reports that it met on Tuesday, September 28, 2004 at 4:30 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, with the following members present:

Dr. Robert M. Bennett, In the Chair	Mr. Tarek Saghir
Mr. Ari D. Kopolovic, Vice-Chair	Ms Rebecca Spagnolo
Mr. John F. (Jack) Petch, Vice-Chair of the Governing Council	Ms Maggy Stepanian
Professor David Farrar, Deputy Provost and Vice-Provost, Students	Ms Preet Viridi
Ms Anne E. MacDonald, Director, Ancillary Services	Dr. John Wedge
Ms Mubarka Alam	Ms Susan Addario, Director of Student Affairs
Ms Katherine Anne Boyd	Mr. Louis R. Charpentier, Secretary of the Governing Council
Mr. Shaun Chen	Ms Marilyn Van Norman, Director, Student Services
Mr. Christopher M. Collins	
Ms Margaret Hancock	Secretariat:
Ms Shaila R. Kibria	
Professor Bruce Kidd	Mr. Neil Dobbs
Professor Joel E. Kirsh	Mr. Andrew Drummond
Mr. Chris McGrath	
Ms Teresa Pun	

Regrets:

Dr. Claude S. Davis	Dr. John P. Nestor
---------------------	--------------------

In Attendance:

Professor Angela Hildyard, Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity  
Ms Murphy Browne, President, Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students  
Mr. Jim Delaney, Assistant Director, Student Affairs  
Ms Ranjini Ghosh, President, Students' Administrative Council  
Ms Connie Guberman, Status of Women Officer  
Ms Julie McAlpine Jeffries, Employment Relations Legal Counsel  
Mr. Mahadeo Sukhai, President, Graduate Students' Union

ITEM 3 CONTAINS A RECOMMENDATION TO THE GOVERNING COUNCIL FOR APPROVAL.

**REPORT NUMBER 123 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – September 28, 2004****1. Report of the Previous Meeting**

Report Number 122 (June 1, 2004) was approved.

**2. *Ontarians with Disabilities Act Plan, 2004-05***

The Chair said that this very important Plan was being presented to all three Boards of the Governing Council. The Academic Board, and its Planning and Budget Committee, were the leads. They were responsible for (a) the institutional planning process (of which this was a part) and (b) submissions to external agencies that included new policy positions. The plan would ultimately proceed to the Governing Council. The plan was presented to the University Affairs Board for information because of the Board's responsibility for "equity issues and initiatives." The Board's role was to understand the plan, ask any questions, and raise any concerns about the plan as an equity initiative. The Board's comments would be carried to the Governing Council through this report and through the Chair's remarks when the matter went forward. The plan would also provide the context for the proposed Statement of Commitment Regarding Persons with Disabilities, which the Board would be asked to recommend to the Governing Council for approval.

Invited to present the Plan, Ms Guberman said that the University, like all other Ontario universities and public institutions, was required to file an accessibility plan annually to comply with the 2001 *Ontarians with Disabilities Act* (ODA). She acknowledged the valuable contributions towards the development of the Plan provided by a number of people in the Council Chamber, including Ms Addario, Ms Hancock, Mr. Sukhai, and Ms Van Norman. The proposed Plan built upon the University's academic plan, *Stepping UP*, which stressed the importance of equity and access. The Plan celebrated the work that the University continued to do to enhance accessibility, reflecting the work of many individuals and units, which taken together formed a whole that was much greater than the individual parts. Many areas of the University were working to achieve accessibility and had been doing so for many years. That work was continuing. The proposed Plan had been the outcome of a highly consultative process under the auspices of the Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity, who had established a broadly representative ODA Planning Committee. The Committee consisted of forty members which included faculty, staff, students and alumnae representing a range of stakeholders and constituencies. Several members of the Committee had been selected because of their professional expertise in relevant areas, for example, technology, instructional design and architectural design. Others had been included for reason of their professional knowledge of disability and accommodation issues. Particular attention had been paid to outreach to people with disabilities – some visible, some not – and people with disabilities had served on the Committee.

Ms Guberman said that it was important to remember that the Province, while putting the *Act* into effect, was providing no resources to assist institutions with implementation. Therefore, the costs of implementation were contained within the operating budget of each unit. The capital costs of making facilities accessible were built into the budgets of various capital projects and were included in the process of planning all capital projects. A report on spending on

**REPORT NUMBER 123 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – September 28, 2004****2. *Ontarians with Disabilities Act Plan, 2004-05* (Cont'd)**

accessibility projects was provided annually to the Board. A substantial part of the cost of implementing the accessibility plans was the cost of the time of faculty and staff members, with a commitment to equity being a component of everyone's work.

Ms Guberman reported that the 2004-2005 Accessibility Plan included a status report on the forty-five initiatives identified in the 2003-2004 Plan. Of those, thirty-six had been completed and nine were on-going. The Plan before the Board identified fourteen new initiatives and twenty-three continuing initiatives. Among the accomplishments identified were the Statement of Commitment Regarding Persons with Disabilities, that would come before the Board and (with its endorsement) the Governing Council for approval. Student Affairs had developed an awareness campaign. The University had hosted a Conference on "Breaking Down Barriers," which was now planned to be an annual event. It had sponsored a symposium on disability scholarship entitled "Claiming Disability." The University's Adaptive Technology Resource Centre had led a group, including eleven other organizations, in the Canadian Network for Inclusive Cultural Exchange, which worked to make artistic representations available to people with disabilities. There were numerous other educational and awareness initiatives.

Ms Guberman outlined some of the University's goals for 2004-05 and beyond. The University had begun a comprehensive assessment of signage and way-finding. The Human Resources Department would begin developing a new equity survey. The University would identify best practices with respect to chemical and environmental sensitivity. It would explore issues related to mental health and mental illness – a key concern. Finally, it would encourage further scholarly work in the area of disability studies.

Among the matters that arose in discussion were the following.

**(a) University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC) Student Centre.** The Chair observed that he had recently visited the newly opened student center at UTSC. He commended it as a model for efforts to enhance accessibility and as evidence that the University's policies were having a good effect. Invited to comment, Ms Guberman said that the University was constantly improving in its barrier-free design and construction of facilities.

**(b) Accommodation for students with mental illness and learning disabilities.** In response to a member's question, Ms Addario said that there were AccessAbility Services offices at all three campuses. Students with mental illness or learning disabilities were invited to register with those offices, which would provide expert information and advice. Assistance was customized to each student, but it often took the form of providing additional time to complete academic work at the University's usual high level of academic standards. Ms Addario added that many faculty, staff and students with mental and learning disabilities were participating very successfully in the University.

**(c) Consultation with student groups.** A member complimented Professor Hildyard, Ms Guberman and their colleagues on the Plan and particularly on their efforts to consult with student groups. Those efforts were very much appreciated.

**REPORT NUMBER 123 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – September 28, 2004****3. Statement of Commitment Regarding Persons with Disabilities**

Ms Guberman was invited to present the proposal for a new Statement of Commitment Regarding Persons with Disabilities. The memorandum from Professor Hildyard making the proposal is attached hereto as Appendix “A”. The proposed Statement is attached hereto as Appendix “B”.

Ms Guberman said that the proposed Statement was one of the initiatives identified in the University’s 2003-2004 Accessibility Plan. The proposal was of particular importance because it was to replace the Services to Disabled Persons Policy, which had been approved in 1987 and which outlined the purpose and activities of a specific office that no longer existed at the University. The proposed new Statement of Commitment outlined a broad vision of the University community for the benefit of all of its members. It set out some of the efforts that the University would make with respect to persons with disabilities in order to realize that vision, and it also identified various members of the University community whose participation would assist in creating the envisioned community. The University committed to efforts to accommodate disabilities and to address barriers, as well as to provide information to all. The process of developing the proposed Statement of Commitment had been far reaching. It had begun with work to collect the best practices and policies not only from North American institutions but also from those in the United Kingdom and Australia. This information had been reviewed by a small committee headed by Ms Jeffries and had been followed by broad consultation within the University. In addition to the forty members of the ODA Planning Committee (who represented a wide range of stakeholders and constituencies in the University including unions, faculty, alumnae and people with disabilities), the draft Statement had been sent for comment to student members of the Governing Council and the leaders of the Students’ Administrative Council, the Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students, and the Graduate Students’ Union. Over 25 commentaries had been received, which had been valuable and very supportive. All had been considered carefully and many incorporated into the proposed Statement now before the Board.

The Chair invited Ms Jeffries to outline the highlights of the proposed Statement. She reiterated that the objective of the Statement was to set out a broad vision, conveying a message from the University that it wished to create an inclusive community and setting out how it would go about doing so. The proposed Statement used positive language to state what the University wished to do and it established goals. Those goals included: the establishment of a climate of understanding and mutual respect; the provision of support for, and accommodation of, individuals with disabilities so that all would share the same level of access to opportunities; the elimination or minimization the adverse effects of barriers, including physical, environmental, attitudinal, communication and technological barriers; the provision to all the members of the University community of information and education regarding disability and the University's policies on disability. At the same time, the University would endeavour to protect the individuals’ privacy, confidentiality and autonomy. The University would assist individuals with disabilities to satisfy the essential requirements of their programs of studies or employment,

**REPORT NUMBER 123 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – September 28, 2004****3. Statement of Commitment Regarding Persons with Disabilities (Cont'd)**

providing, where necessary, reasonable accommodations to enable them to do so. The University would develop means to encourage the involvement of all members of the University community in creating an equitable and inclusive environment.

The Chair stated that the Board's terms of reference (section 5.4) required that, in the area of relations within the University community, "new policies or major changes to existing policies will normally require the approval of the Governing Council." The Board was, therefore, being asked to recommend this policy to the full Council for approval.

A member observed that it would be important for the Board to ensure that the University was not only setting out a theoretical statement of good intentions but that it would also put the proposed Statement into practice. Professor Hildyard replied that the proposed Statement was one of the steps taken to implement the University's Accessibility Plan, and the University was required by the *Ontarians with Disabilities Act* to file such a plan annually. That Plan would come to the Board annually, and would include reports on steps taken to implement the previous year's Plan, including the Statement of Commitment. In addition, the Board received annual reports from the equity officers, including the AccessAbility Services Officers on all three campuses. The Board would therefore be able to monitor the steps being taken to translate the proposed Statement into practice.

On the recommendation of the Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity,

**YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS**

THAT the proposed Statement of Commitment Regarding Persons with Disabilities, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "B", be approved, replacing the Services to Disabled Persons Policy approved by the Committee on Campus and Community Affairs on December 9, 1987.

THE FOLLOWING ITEMS ARE REPORTED FOR INFORMATION.

**4. Chair's Introductory Remarks and Orientation**

At the beginning of the meeting, the Chair introduced himself, the Vice-Chair and the administrative officers who served as the Board's assessors. He gave a special welcome to the heads of the University-wide representative student committees, whom he had specially invited to the meeting: Ms Murphy Browne of the Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students, Ms Ranjini Ghosh of the Students' Administrative Council, and Mr. Mahadeo Sukhai of the Graduate Students' Union. (Mr. Adam Watson of the Scarborough Campus Students' Union was not in attendance.) The Chair invited members to introduce themselves.

**REPORT NUMBER 123 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – September 28, 2004****4. Chair's Introductory Remarks and Orientation (Cont'd)**

To orient members, the Chair commented on the University Affairs Board and its role within governance at the University.

- **Membership.** Of the 25 places, the majority were held by members from within the University community. In addition, a majority were members of the Governing Council. A Governing Council majority was required for any committee with the delegated authority to make decisions on behalf of the Council. In addition, the Board had two voting assessors and eight non-voting assessors.
- **Committee of the Board.** The University Affairs Board had one Standing Committee – the Elections Committee. The Chair of the Elections Committee was Professor Michael Marrus.
- **Role.** The University Affairs Board was responsible for consideration of matters of a non-academic nature that directly concerned the quality of student and campus life. That was a very important role. The University should provide two things to its students: a high-quality education in its classrooms and laboratories and a high quality experience outside of the classroom. The second aspect was very important; experience outside of the classroom and laboratory were of paramount importance in the development of a well rounded individual.
- **Fit in the Governing Council structure.** The governance system at the University of Toronto was a nearly unique unicameral system. At most other universities, governance was the responsibility of a Board of Governors, dominated by external appointees, and an academic Senate, dominated by the faculty. At the University of Toronto, there was a single governing body – the Governing Council. It consisted of an equal number of external individuals – alumni and Government appointees – and internal ones – faculty, students, staff and Presidential appointees. Much of the work of the Governing Council was, however, performed by its three Boards. The Academic Board, with a majority of faculty, was responsible for academic matters and budget. The Business Board, with a majority of external members, was responsible for business matters. Those Boards in some ways resembled the Senates and Boards in other university governance structures. The University Affairs Board was a special feature in the University of Toronto's governance system. It was responsible for oversight of areas related to the quality of student and campus life. Given its mandate, the Board had a high proportion of student and administrative staff members, compared to other Boards.

The Board's work occasionally related to the work of the Academic Board. While the Academic Board recommended priorities for capital projects, the University Affairs Board was responsible to review and endorse projects in non-academic areas, for instance residences and day-care facilities. The University Affairs Board also had a relationship

**REPORT NUMBER 123 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – September 28, 2004****4. Chair's Introductory Remarks and Orientation (Cont'd)**

with the Business Board. For example, the Business Board set out the financial policies that governed the residences and parking operations, for which the University Affairs Board was responsible.

- **Other Levels of governance.** It was very important to bear in mind that the Governing Council, while ultimately responsible for the governance of the University, was not the only level of governance. Each of the faculties and colleges had its own council and committees, which made key policy decisions affecting that unit. All proposals for programs, courses and changes in degree regulations came to the Academic Board – or one of its committees - from a faculty council. It was very important that the Governing Council respect the work at that level, which was most knowledgeable about the unit's affairs. Similarly, some of the proposals brought to the University Affairs Board originated from local governance. There was a Board of Stewards at Hart House and a Council on Athletics and Recreation, for example, whose operating plans came to the Board for approval. The expertise and work of those divisions' governing bodies should be respected; their work was far more extensive than could be completed in the brief time available to this Board. Similarly, the Board was asked to consider proposals for student society fees and by-law changes; there were of course governance structures in those bodies, led by the Board's guests at this meeting.
- **The Board's responsibilities.** The terms of reference had been distributed to members, which outlined the Board's responsibilities, which included the following:
  - Campus and student services such as the Counseling and Learning Skills Service, athletics and recreation, the Career Centre, services to disabled persons, residences, parking, food and beverage services, Hart House, and day care.
  - Student societies and campus organizations.
  - The fees charged by the services and the student societies.
  - Relations within the University community – that is, those policies that fall outside of our academic and employment policies. This included non-academic discipline.
  - Equity issues.
  - Oversight of the Governing Council elections.
- **Carrying out the Board's responsibility: general.** The Board's responsibility was not to manage the areas of the University listed above. Its responsibility was to be sure that those areas were managed well. The Board has several means of doing so.
- **Carrying out the Board's responsibility: approvals.** First, the Board was responsible for approving the policy framework within its areas of responsibility. It approved, or recommended to the Governing Council, particular policies. On the agenda today, for

## REPORT NUMBER 123 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – September 28, 2004

### 4. Chair's Introductory Remarks and Orientation (Cont'd)

example, was a policy on persons with disabilities. Some other examples: policies on freedom of speech, sexual harassment, non-academic discipline, day care and campus security. The Board was also called upon to review and, if appropriate, approve:

- The annual operating plans for various campus and student services, including (for example) athletics and recreation, residences, food and beverage services and Hart House.
  - Certain by-law changes for the incorporated student societies – the Students' Administrative Council, the Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students, the Graduate Students' Union, the Erindale College Student Union (at the University of Toronto at Mississauga) and the Scarborough Campus Students' Union.
  - Compulsory non-academic incidental fees – the fees that supported the student services and the various campus or divisional organizations.
  - The Governing Council Election Guidelines.
- **Carrying out the Board's responsibility: monitoring.** The Board was also responsible for monitoring the work being carried out in its areas of responsibility. That function was carried out by the review of regular reports brought to the Board for information. The Vice-Provost, Students made a report at each meeting. There were also numerous annual reports. For example: a full meeting was usually devoted to reports from the equity officers. The Board's calendar of business included a wide range of other reports that were provided each year. Members were also welcome to ask questions about matters within the terms of reference that were not included on agendas. That opportunity arose under the "other business" item on each agenda. The Chair urged members to give the Secretariat notice of such questions so that the relevant assessor could be alerted and prepare the requested information and any invite colleagues who might assist. In the absence of such notice of questions under "other business" - or indeed unusual questions under other items on the agenda - members could not necessarily expect to receive full answers. Governance operated best in a "no surprises" environment.
  - **Board Operations: usually accept, reject or refer back.** Proposals for approval were brought to the Board by its assessors. The Board reviewed the proposals and usually approved them. If the Board had serious concerns, it could vote to refer the proposal back to the administration with a view to its considering specified changes or undertaking further review of some specified matter. If the Board concluded that a proposal was wholly inappropriate, it could vote to reject the proposal outright. The Board would not normally amend a proposal. It would be a very serious step, after only a brief discussion, to amend a proposal that had been the outcome of very careful work by experts in the operating units and the senior officers of the University. Therefore, the preferred step would be to vote to refer the proposal back. It did sometimes occur that the assessor would accept a relatively minor, "friendly" amendment. Nonetheless, while doing so would be a very serious and unusual step, the Board did have the authority to make

## REPORT NUMBER 123 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – September 28, 2004

## Chair's Introductory Remarks and Orientation (Cont'd)

amendments. Where any amendment was approved, the administration had the authority to delay consideration of the amended proposal until the next regular meeting so that it could give considered advice about the consequences.

- **Board Operations: origination of proposals.** Similarly, it would be very unusual for a proposal to come to the Board from individual members. Members who would like to see a proposal brought forward were urged, at least initially, to speak with the relevant assessor. While that was not a dramatic way of achieving consideration of a proposal, it was usually the most effective. There were, however, procedures in the Governing Council by-law by which members could bring a proposal to the Board. The Secretariat would provide any member with information on those procedures.
- **Board Operations: agenda.** Like the other Boards, the University Affairs Board had a small agenda planning group, made up of the Chair, the Vice-Chair and the assessors. It met prior to each meeting to review the items that were to come to the Board. That meeting set the agenda for the Board. It also worked to ensure that items had been appropriately prepared so that focused, constructive discussion and debate could occur at the Board itself.
- **Board Operations: meeting materials.** Agenda packages were mailed one week before the Board meeting. If there was a delay, the packages were delivered by courier. When packages were sent, the Secretary would send an e-mail message, which (among other things) provided a web-address where members could view the agenda and material (except confidential material) even before their package arrived. The Chair urged members, if they had not received their materials for the Tuesday meeting by their mail delivery on the previous Friday, to call the Secretary so that a duplicate could be hand delivered. He also urged members, if they were concerned that they had not received information essential to dealing with an agenda item(s) to notify him as soon as possible, and well before the meeting, through the Secretariat.
- **Conduct of meetings: members' fiduciary duty.** All members of the Board were fiduciaries. Members undertook a duty, when accepting membership of the Governing Council or one of its Boards, to act in the best interests of the University, and to exercise diligence in doing so. Members were individually and collectively stewards for the University. The *University of Toronto Act* made that duty very clear; section 2(3) stated that "members of the Governing Council [and by extension members of the Board] shall act with diligence, honestly and with good faith in the bests interests of the University."
- **Conduct of meetings: non-members' participation.** The Chair stated that his duty was to conduct meetings in an orderly way so that the Board, and all of its members, had the opportunity to carry out their fiduciary duty. The Board usually met in open session, so that other members of the University, and the public, could observe the Board's

**REPORT NUMBER 123 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – September 28, 2004****4. Chair's Introductory Remarks and Orientation (Cont'd)**

deliberations. There were occasions when people other than members would be invited to address the Board. First, the Chair sometimes invited guests associated with particular proposals or reports. For example, Ms Guberman and Ms Jeffries had been invited to today's meeting to present items. Second, other non-members with an interest in a matter could, well in advance of meetings, request permission to speak. Governing Council policy stipulated that when the leaders of the representative university groups, such as the Faculty Association or the representative students committees (APUS, G.S.U., SAC and S.C.S.U.) asked to speak to items on the agenda, their requests were normally granted. The Chair encouraged the student society leaders to examine the Board's calendar of business to see when items of interest to them would be coming to the Board. The calendar of business was in today's agenda package and it was kept up to date on the web, <http://www.utoronto.ca/govcncl/tgc/consolidate04-05.pdf>. The most effective way to influence an outcome was often to make views known in advance to the relevant assessor. If the leaders of the campus groups still wished to bring their views to the Board, the Chair urged that they prepare a written paper and give it to the Secretary at least eight days in advance of the meeting. The paper would then be included in the agenda package, and members would have the opportunity to consider it at the same time as the proposal. If representatives did wish to address the Board, the Chair asked that they let the secretariat know well in advance. If the student groups shared a common view, he suggested that a joint presentation would be most effective.

Other speaking requests could also be granted, provided in all cases that interventions by others did not prevent the members of the Board from having the time to carry out their duty to discuss items carefully and fully and to make decisions. Should the Board wish to hear any non-member when the Chair has not granted a speaking request, the Board can carry a motion by a two-thirds majority. All speakers – member and guests - were limited to a maximum of five minutes in the debate on any item. In a similar vein, members of the Board, along with assessors and Governing Council staff, and those people only, sat around the meeting table. If members wish to consult with a guest, the Chair asked that they leave the table to do so.

- **Being an effective member.** The Chair observed that to be effective, a member must be knowledgeable. The University was a very complex institution, but there was a great deal of readily available background information. The Board's minutes and agenda packages for the past few years were available on the Governing Council web site, <http://www.utoronto.ca/govcncl/bac/details/uadetail.htm>. There was also a wide variety of other background information including: the Statement of Institutional Purpose, all Governing Council policies, the University's planning documents, and the Board's terms of reference. Most important, the Chair urged members to do their homework – to review the documentation provided with the agenda package.

Second, an effective member – one who had real influence at the Board – was one who was visibly working to serve the best overall interest of the University. Of course, all

## REPORT NUMBER 123 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – September 28, 2004

### 4. Chair's Introductory Remarks and Orientation (Cont'd)

members brought their own perspectives as alumni, students, faculty, and so on. But effective members were those who earned respect and influenced others by showing an understanding of many issues – not only those affecting the member's constituency - and who clearly sought outcomes that were of benefit to the University as a whole. The agenda package contained an excellent document prepared by Ms Rose Patten, the Chair of the Governing Council, entitled, "Critical Principles on Being Effective as a Governor at the University of Toronto." The Chair warmly commended that document to members' attention.

- **Being an effective member: mentors.** One particularly valuable way of becoming an effective member was to seek out an experienced member as a mentor. Among others, he would be pleased to serve in this role, as would Dr. Nestor, a past-Chair.
- **Secretariat.** The Office of the Governing Council was available to provide support to the governance process. If members required assistance with policy information, documentation, process, etc. they were encouraged to get in touch with the secretariat to ask for the background information they required.

### 5. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting

#### Report 122, Item 9 – Other Business – Student Referendum Conduct

The Chair recalled that at the June 1 meeting, a member had suggested that Professor Farrar establish a committee to look at expectations concerning the conduct of student referenda seeking support of proposals for new, or substantially increased, compulsory non-academic fees. Professor Farrar had taken the matter under advisement and had agreed to report back in the fall.

Professor Farrar said that he had concluded that a review of the conduct of student referenda was not required. The current procedure was well aligned with the Policy on Compulsory Non-Academic Incidental Fees. That Policy established two criteria for referenda on new fees or substantial fee increases. First, the referenda had to be conducted in compliance with the student organization's own by-laws or policies. Second, they had to adhere to accepted democratic criteria. The administration's practice would be to continue to use those criteria in determining whether it would recommend the initiation or increase of fees after referenda.

### 6. Calendar of Business for 2004-05

The Board received for information its Calendar of Business for 2004-05. The Chair observed that the Calendar of Business showed the items planned to come before the Board in the coming year. It was subject to change. The timing was not precise. Changes might arise for a variety of reasons, including the emergence of new priorities and issues.

**REPORT NUMBER 123 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – September 28, 2004****6. Calendar of Business for 2004-05 (Cont'd)**

A member observed that the unscheduled items in the Calendar of Business included the By-Laws of both the Students' Administrative Council (SAC) and the Scarborough Campus Students' Union (S.C.S.U.). Professor Farrar and Mr. Delaney replied that a number of student societies had become incorporated. As a condition of the University's agreement to incorporation and use of the University's name, the societies were required to obtain the approval of the University, through the University Affairs Board, for amendments to a limited number of key sections of their by-laws. The need to amend the SAC and S.C.S.U. by-laws had arisen from the recognition of S.C.S.U. as the sole representative student committee for full-time undergraduate students at the University of Toronto at Scarborough.

**7. Senior Assessor's Report**

Professor Farrar noted that his portfolio covered various areas of responsibility including: student information systems, admissions and awards, student recruitment, student affairs and services, student exchanges and Hart House. He commented on the highlights of his written report, which had been distributed with the agenda package, and he reported on one additional matter.

- **Hart House – Accessibility.** The new elevator in Hart House had been launched on September 23, 2004, representing a tremendous success. The Students for Barrier-Free Access Centre at Hart House had been launched on September 27th. With a group of staff and students, Hart House would be developing an accessibility plan for the entire House, which would propose solutions not only for physical and architectural barriers but also for barriers related to attitudes, policies and procedures, information and communication, information technology, student life and human resources. Ms Hancock observed that she was very pleased to see Hart House become open to members with physical disabilities, who would for the first time be able to reach such previously inaccessible parts of the House as the Theatre and the third floor.
- **Student Recruitment.** Technology innovations were helping to provide a high standard of responsiveness to prospective students. The <http://www.myfuture.utoronto.ca/> portal provided students with personalized program information about undergraduate, graduate, professional, continuing education and/or ESL programs. By signing on to the system, prospective students could access personalized information about all aspects of life at the University of Toronto, including programs of study, housing, admission requirements, life on campus, and fees calculated in any international currency. Because the database stored the prospective student's information by school, city, country, and program of interest, recruitment staff at all levels of the organization could communicate directly to the students who had indicated their program of interest.

For the second year, the University had conducted an online survey of all admitted students to determine their level of satisfaction with its recruitment / admission process.

**REPORT NUMBER 123 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – September 28, 2004****7. Senior Assessor's Report (Cont'd)**

This responses had identified the level of importance of recruitment activities and processes to applicants and rated their perception of our service. Issues identified as very important and low satisfaction with our service had become priority action items.

A member asked about the privacy implications of storing information about potential students. Professor Farrar said that the practice had been very valuable. For example, it had demonstrated that students with high secondary school averages were seeking more personal contact with the University, leading to a decision to expand the University's open house program. There was no risk to privacy; no information about individuals was disclosed.

- **AskUs** was a second-generation search engine that had been launched by the University of Toronto at Scarborough in September 2003, by Student Recruitment, Nursing and Dentistry in March 2004, and by Arts and Science, St. George, Music and Physical Education and Health in September 2004. To date, 45,652 people had used AskUs and had received responses to 114,479 individual inquiries.
- **Student Services** had enjoyed a robust beginning to the year. The First Year Initiative Program (FYI), launched last year, had registered close to 1,100 students in the first two weeks of September. As part of FYI, the Career Centre had offered a workshop for parents of Arts and Science students called Supporting Your Daughter/Son's Career Development, with over 40 parents attending. The Graduate Initiative Program, offered in partnership with the Graduate Students' Union, had been launched in September. Over 1,000 graduate students had already registered with the program which offered a wide range of workshops and seminars targeted to the needs of graduate students. Thousands of students had taken part in the Student Services Fest on September 14.
- **Policy on Compulsory Non-Academic Incidental Fees: Withholding of fees from the Varsity.** The Varsity newspaper had experienced some difficulties in the 2003-04 year and it had failed to elect a Board. The administration had sought to assist with an election or to establish a trusteeship, but that initiative had not succeeded. Pursuant to its responsibility to fee-paying students under the Policy on Compulsory Non-Academic Incidental Fees, the University had been withholding the transfer of the Varsity fee since mid-September. The editors of the Varsity were seeking to organize a Board election to take place at the same time as forthcoming student society elections.

**8. Striking Committee and Service Ancillaries Review Group Appointments**

The Chair reported that he would bring forward recommendations for appointments to the Board's Striking (nominating) Committee and to the Service Ancillary Review Group to the next regular meeting.

**REPORT NUMBER 123 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – September 28, 2004**

**9. Date of Next Meeting**

The Chair reminded members that the next regular meeting was scheduled for Tuesday, October 26, 2004 at 4:30p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall.

THE BOARD MOVED IN CAMERA.

**10. Governing Council Elections: Chief Returning Officer – Appointment**

The Board considered a recommendation from the Secretary of the Governing Council for the appointment of the Chief Returning Officer for Governing Council Elections.

THE BOARD RETURNED TO OPEN SESSION.

The Chair reported that the Board had resolved

THAT Mr. Paul Holmes be appointed Chief Returning Officer, effective immediately and continuing until June 30, 2005.

The meeting adjourned at 5:40 p.m.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Secretary

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chair

October 6, 2004