

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

REPORT NUMBER 137 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD

September 26, 2006

To the Governing Council,
University of Toronto.

Your Board reports that it met on Tuesday, September 26, 2006 at 4:30 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, with the following members present:

Dr. Claude Davis, In the Chair
Professor David Farrar, Deputy Provost
and Vice-Provost, Students
Ms. Anne E. MacDonald,
Director, Ancillary Services
Professor Varouj Aivazian
Ms. Diana A.R. Alli
Mr. John M. Badowski
Mr. Terry Buckland
Ms. Simona Chiose
Miss Coralie D'Souza
Mr. Robin Goodfellow
Professor William Gough
Ms. Margaret Hancock
Mr. Richard Hydal
Ms. Rae Johnson
Professor Bruce Kidd
Mr. Josh Koziembrocki
Mr. Steven Kraft
Mr. Chris McGrath
Mr. Faraz Rahim Siddiqui
Ms. Melanie Tharamangalam

Non-Voting Assessors:

Ms. Susan Addario, Director, Student Affairs
Mr. Louis Charpentier, Secretary, Governing
Council
Mr. Jim Delaney, Associate Director and
Senior Policy Advisor, Student Affairs
Mr. Tom Nowers, Assistant Principal, Students
and Executive Director, Student Affairs,
University of Toronto at Scarborough
Ms. Elizabeth Sisam, Assistant Vice-President,
Campus and Facilities Planning
Mr. Ron Swail, Assistant Vice-President,
Facilities and Services
Ms. Marilyn Van Norman, Director, Student
Services

Secretariat:

Mr. Andrew Drummond, Secretary
Mr. Henry Mulhall

Regrets:

Ms. B. Elizabeth Vosburgh, Vice-Chair
Professor John Wedge

Ms. Johanna L. Weststar

In Attendance:

Mr. Ashwin Balamohan, Vice-President, University Affairs, Students' Administrative Council (SAC)
Ms. Connie Guberman, Special Advisor on Equity Issues and Status of Women Officer
Ms. Oriel Varga, Interim Executive Director and Liaison Officer, Association of Part-Time
Undergraduate Students (APUS)

ALL ITEMS ARE REPORTED FOR INFORMATION.

REPORT NUMBER 137 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – September 26, 2006**1. Chair's Welcome and Opening Remarks**

The Chair welcomed everyone to the first meeting of the Board for the 2006-07 academic year. He reminded members that they had received a detailed orientation memo, dealing with their role in governance and their status as a fiduciary at the Board and within the governance system at the University of Toronto. If members had questions, they could direct them to the Secretary, to him, or to any member with significant governance experience. In lieu of going through the memo in detail, the Chair had determined that a brief presentation was in order.

He informed the Board that it was one of three boards reporting directly to the Governing Council, and had overall carriage of non-academic matters relating to campus and student life. Many saw the University Affairs Board as the body that had the greatest ability to carry the voices of students forward through the governance system. It had several areas of responsibility within the ambit of the general heading of 'campus and student life', most notably, campus and student services, equity issues, oversight of elections to Governing Council, non-academic relations within the community (including Campus Police and non-academic discipline), student societies and campus organizations, and fees charged for the operation of services and for student societies. It had two voting assessors, and several non-voting assessors. Its 26 members included both a majority of members of the Governing Council (so that the Board could act under delegated authority in approving items coming before it) and a majority of membership from within the University (i.e. students, staff and faculty).

The Board's main functions were: to approve fees of student societies; to approve operating plans and mandatory fees for campus and student services; to review capital project plans for residences, parking and 'campus life' facilities and to concur with the Academic Board in recommending them to the Governing Council; to approve Elections Guidelines; to approve bylaws and bylaw changes for incorporated student societies; and to receive reports for information. The receipt of reports was an important monitorial function that allowed the Board to communicate with the administration about numerous elements of the student experience.

Board members (and all participants in the governance process) had a responsibility to ensure that the University was managed well, but not to manage the University. That is, the Board oversaw the administration to make sure that it was acting according to the policies and priorities that governance had approved. Members acted as fiduciaries, in the best interests of the University as a whole, and not of any particular constituency or group. As a result, members had the responsibility to come to meetings prepared, to ask good questions, and to satisfy themselves that the administration was effectively meeting its mandate. Members were charged with the duty of acting as stewards for the institution, not just for the current year, but for the long term.

2. Report of the Previous Meeting

Report Number 136 (May 30, 2006) was approved.

3. Business Arising from the Report

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

4. Calendar of Business for 2006-07

REPORT NUMBER 137 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – September 26, 2006

The Chair explained that the Calendar of Business showed the items planned to come before the Board for the current year. It was subject to change for a variety of reasons. The updated Calendar was on the website of the Office of the Governing Council.

5. Report on Approvals under Summer Executive Authority

The Chair reported for the record that no approvals were made under Summer Executive Authority within the Board's mandate during the summer of 2006.

6. *Ontarians with Disabilities Act: University of Toronto Accessibility Plan, 2006-07*

The Chair welcomed Ms. Connie Guberman, Special Advisor on Equity Issues and Status of Women Officer, to the meeting. He then informed members that the Plan was being presented to all three Boards of the Governing Council, and that the Academic Board (along with its Planning and Budget Committee), were the leads. It was being presented to the University Affairs Board because of the Board's responsibility for equity issues and initiatives.

Ms. Guberman informed members that the plan was the fourth to be presented, and that involvement of members of the University community continued to grow. Fully 78 individuals were involved in the crafting of the plan, which, she was proud to say, enjoyed significant support from within the University. The plan for 2006-07 had been built around four thematic areas: the built environment, access to and delivery of academic programs, awareness/education and professional development, and accommodation /services for persons with disabilities. The plan represented an enormous commitment from the University. All initiatives, whether major or minor, were funded by operating budgets. For example, the University had budgeted \$1.8 million to support accessibility on campus. Addressing issues required resources.

Ms. Guberman noted that the *Accessibility of Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA)* was supplanting requirements in the *Ontarians with Disabilities Act (ODA)*, but that the University was well positioned to meet the more stringent requirements of the new legislative framework.

There was no discussion.

7. Report of the Committee to Review Student Activity Space on the St. George Campus

Professor Farrar presented the Report and the accompanying administrative response to the Board for information. He noted that he had established the Committee to Review Student Activity Space as a result of questions received at governance bodies. The Committee had met five times and compiled a significant amount of data, including from surveys and previous reports on the topic. The Report made 19 recommendations, the most significant of which was to establish a project planning committee for a new large node of student activity space on the St. George campus. As a result of the recommendation, the administration would strike a project planning committee and report this to the Planning and Budget Committee at its meeting of October 17, 2006.

The Chair invited Mr. Ashwin Balamohan, Vice-President, University Affairs, Students' Administrative Council (SAC), to speak to the Board. Mr. Balamohan stated that SAC welcomed the report and its administrative response, noting that SAC shared the administration's commitment to the enhancement of the student experience both inside and outside the classroom. He felt that the University would benefit by adopting the report's recommendations. SAC recognized the important role of existing large nodes of

7. Report of the Committee to Review Student Activity Space on the St. George Campus (cont'd)

REPORT NUMBER 137 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – September 26, 2006

student activity (such as Hart House and the Athletic Centre) but felt that a new large node would help serve many of the needs of the diverse student population, by providing a home for a wide range of activities.

SAC wished to reaffirm the role of students in the allocation and management of student space, and felt that the new node should be student-owned and operated. Lastly, Mr. Balamohan welcomed the administration's ongoing commitment to the student experience, and expressed his desire that student groups and the administration continue to work together to help ensure the success of the University as a whole.

The Chair invited Ms. Oriel Varga, representing the Association of Part-Time Undergraduate Students (APUS), to speak to the Board. Ms. Varga thanked the Board for the opportunity to address the important issue of student space, noting that the new capital project proposed by the report represented an opportunity to fulfill an important need on campus. She stated that the current Capital Plan of the University planned \$770 million in capital spending, but that in her opinion none of that would be allocated to student needs.

In the opinion of APUS, if the building were to go ahead, it should be funded without any dedicated levies; APUS felt that no additional financial burden should be placed on students. Ms. Varga then alluded to the pending move of the APUS office, noting that the executive of APUS felt that the move was an eviction from their space. APUS had identified the former Margaret Fletcher Day Care building, which had been largely vacant for three years, as an appropriate site for relocation. Ms. Varga then stated that APUS had been promised space in the Woodsworth College Residence at the corner of St. George St. and Bloor St., but that the administration had reneged on its promise. Housing APUS would therefore fill a much-needed gap in the allocation of University space.

A member asked if the administration was assuming that the only way the proposed student centre could be built was with a levy. Professor Farrar noted that a planning committee would be struck, and among its mandates would be to examine how the project could be funded. The Provost had committed to match any student levy at 50¢ for each dollar raised by the levy; if students rejected a levy, the rejection would delay the prospect of construction. In response to Ms. Varga's comments, Professor Farrar stated that the Capital Plan had as its highest priority to address student needs, and that the student experience was the top institutional priority. He then cited two projects – the Multifaith Centre and the Varsity Centre – whose creation was explicitly to address student priorities. Lastly, Professor Farrar noted that the space in the Margaret Fletcher building was undergoing renovations, and he anticipated that APUS would be able to move in when those renovations were complete. He clarified that APUS had not been evicted from their former offices at Woodsworth College; those offices occupied space that was allocated to Woodsworth College; and the administration had a responsibility to provide APUS space centrally. APUS had proposed the former Margaret Fletcher child care building (which is situated on a future development site: "Site 12"), which was centrally allocated. It was possible to renovate the structure to meet APUS' needs, and Professor Farrar was pleased to report that the administration was able to meet the request. Lastly, Professor Farrar clarified that, on the topic of space in the Woodsworth College Residence, the then-President of APUS had rejected an offer from the administration to relocate APUS there. To state that the administration had reneged on an offer was an inaccurate reflection of reality.

A member asked about the role of the Planning and Budget Committee. Professor Farrar stated that a planning committee would be struck, and the Committee would be informed of its establishment. When the planning committee had completed its work, it would present its report to the Planning and Budget

7. Report of the Committee to Review Student Activity Space on the St. George Campus (cont'd)

Committee. The project planning committee would examine needs, costs, funding, and other relevant elements of project preparation.

REPORT NUMBER 137 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – September 26, 2006

A member asked if, with the possible reintroduction of a levy with matching funds, other levies might be possible under the same circumstances. In particular, students at the Scarborough campus were interested in funding an athletic centre there, and it might represent an opportunity. Professor Farrar responded that the matching offer applied only to the student centre proposed in the report, and not to other facilities. Each facility would be considered on its own merits.

A member asked what the timeline for the project planning committee would be. Professor Farrar responded that it would work over the 2006-07 year, and present its report probably in the spring of 2007.

A member welcomed the recommendation, noting that the development had to proceed in a complementary way with other, existing nodes of student activity space. Some individuals had expressed a presumption that the new centre might represent 'competition' with existing nodes, a counterproductive assumption, because no one place stood on its own. Secondly, the member noted that the recommendation to establish a network was a good one, but that it should more broadly representative than articulated. Professor Farrar agreed with the member's points and indicated that the network would be an initiative of the Office of the Vice-President and Provost with appropriate representation from across the campus.

A member noted that the report cited possible key occupants for the proposed centre, citing the CIUT radio station as a possible one. He asked if CIUT had made a presentation to the Committee to Review Student Activity Space. Professor Farrar responded in the affirmative, and stated that CIUT required more and possibly new space if the site on which they sit is redeveloped. The recommendation was not specific, however; the Report wanted to describe possible ways to 'animate' a building by placing therein a variety of activities associated with some key occupants. CIUT was a concrete example of such activities, and other possibilities would be considered by the project planning committee.

8. Report of the Senior Assessor

Professor Farrar presented his written report. He observed that the Varsity Centre project was proceeding quickly, and that the Multifaith Centre was nearing completion. He noted that St. George Street, a major north-south thoroughfare on campus, was undergoing significant renovation.

Orientation on all three campuses had been successful. The ROSI system had functioned well during the registration period.

Professor Farrar signaled to the Board that he was beginning a review of the organizational structure supporting student life. He also reported that he had invited representatives of SAC, APUS and the Graduate Students' Union (GSU) to begin discussions on the Council on Student Services (COSS) process.

Lastly, he reported that a new learning management system was being implemented, and the platform formed the basis of a new student portal. This platform, which was based on the Blackboard system, held significant potential for students at the University.

REPORT NUMBER 137 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – September 26, 2006

9. Date of Next Meeting

The Chair informed members that the next meeting of the Board would take place on Tuesday, November 7, 2006 at 4:30 p.m.

10. Other Business

The Chair informed members of two upcoming calls for nominations. The first was for the Striking Committee, which had the responsibility for nominating co-opted members for the Board. It would meet once, in May, 2007, and required one member from each estate of the Board.

The second call for nominations would be for three spots reserved for members of the Board on the Service Ancillaries Review Group (SARG), which met annually in January to review budgets and operating plans for all the ancillaries whose operating plans were presented to the Board for approval. These ancillary operations included all the student residences, Food Services, Conference Services, and Parking Services. Service on SARG would require the commitment of a full day of meetings in the winter of 2007, as well as preparation time.

The Chair informed members that the calls for nominations would be sent to members in the days following the meeting, and urged them to consider serving.

Finally, the Chair noted that the Secretary of the Board, Mr. Andrew Drummond, would be leaving the Office of the Governing Council as of September 29, 2006 to take up a new position in the Faculty of Information Studies. During three years working in a secretarial capacity for the Board, Mr. Drummond had provided valuable assistance and advice to many current and previous members. On behalf of the Board, the Chair thanked Mr. Drummond for his service and wished him the best in his new endeavours.

The meeting adjourned at 5:20 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

October 19, 2006