

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO  
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL  
**REPORT NUMBER 163 OF**  
**THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD**

**April 12, 2011**

To the Governing Council,  
University of Toronto.

Your Board reports that it met on Tuesday, April 12, 2011 at 4:30 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, with the following members present:

Ms B. Elizabeth Vosburgh, In the Chair  
Professor Jill Matus, Vice-Provost, Students  
Ms Lucy Fromowitz, Assistant Vice-President,  
Student Life  
Ms Diana A.R. Alli  
Dr. Louise Cowin  
Mr. Andrew O.P. Drummond  
Ms Joeita Gupta  
Professor Ira Jacobs  
Ms Natalie Melton  
Professor Elizabeth M. Smyth  
Mrs. Rachel Trozzolo  
Dr. Sarita Verma

**Non-Voting Assessors:**

Mr. Jim Delaney, Director, Office of the Vice-Provost, Students  
Professor Angela Hildyard, Vice-President,  
Human Resources and Equity  
Mr. Mark Overton, Dean of Student Affairs,  
University of Toronto Mississauga (UTM)  
Mr. Desmond Pouyat, Dean of Student Affairs,  
University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC)

**Secretariat:**

Mr. Henry Mulhall (Secretary)

**Regrets:**

Mr. John Switzer, Vice-Chair  
Mr. Arman Hamidian  
Mr. Samuel Oduneye  
Miss Meera Rai  
Miss Melvin Sert  
Miss Priatharsini Sivananthajothy  
Ms Rita Tsang  
Ms Neeharika Tummala

**In Attendance:**

Professor William Gough, Member of the Governing Council, and Chair, Elections Committee  
Mr. Adam Awad, President, Students' Administrative Council (SAC)  
Mr. Neil Dobbs, Deputy Secretary of the Governing Council  
Dr. Anthony Gray, Special Advisor to the President  
Mr. Anwar Kazimi, Committee Secretary, Office of the Governing Council  
Mr. Daniel Ottini, Audit Manager, Internal Audit Department  
Ms Mae-Yu Tan, Assistant Secretary of the Governing Council

**REPORT NUMBER 163 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – April 12, 2011**

ALL ITEMS ARE REPORTED FOR INFORMATION.

**1. Report of the Previous Meeting**

Report Number 162 (March 15, 2011) was approved.

**2. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting**

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

**3. Compulsory Non-Academic Incidental Fees: Student Society Fees****(a) Report on Financial Statements and Internal Auditor's Opinion**

The Chair noted that, under the *Policy for Compulsory Non-Academic Incidental Fees*, where the University collected a compulsory non-academic incidental fee on behalf of a student society, the society was required to present financial statements audited by an independent public auditor licensed under the Public Accountancy Act. For smaller groups, the society could be exempted from doing so by the University's Internal Auditor, who needed to satisfy himself that the society was maintaining proper books of accounts and supporting documentation.

Professor Matus added that the Report was an important annual accountability mechanism provided under the *Policy*. Each year, organizations on whose behalf the University charged a compulsory non-academic incidental fee were required to submit financial statements audited by a licensed accountant or to seek exemption from the audit requirement, the latter provision being applicable to societies with relatively low fees and other revenue. Fees were withheld from organizations which failed to submit statements until such time as the statements were received in good order. The student life offices on each campus worked with such organizations to ensure that proper statements were eventually received. The offices also noted any significant auditors' qualifications or concerns that arose, and, if appropriate, worked with the society to address the inadequacies.

In response to a question, Mr. Delaney stated that the process by which the University's Internal Auditor granted exemptions occurred on a rolling basis. Occasionally, some organizations such as residence councils, failed to submit financial statements for a number of years, often as a result of a lack of capacity or because one executive neglected to provide records to its successors. The financial statements of all of the larger organizations were audited by an independent public auditor. In response to a further question, Mr. Delaney confirmed that it could be assumed that the financial statements of organizations that did not appear in the Report were in good order.

Referring to page 6 of the Report, a member questioned whether the University had the authority to disestablish a student organization, namely the Erindale Part-time Undergraduate Students Association (EPUS), without the consent of part-time students at UTM. Mr. Delaney clarified that the University had made no determination regarding the status of EPUS. Rather, following its standard practice, the administration had suspended the collection of the EPUS fee beginning with the summer of 2009 session, as EPUS had not been active in 2008-09 and had not submitted audited financial statements for six years. The member stated her view that the \$31,709 in fees collected on behalf of EPUS that were held in trust by the University should be transferred to the Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students (APUS). Mr. Delaney stated that no decision had been made with respect to the fees, but that this option would be taken under advisement.

**REPORT NUMBER 163 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – April 12, 2011****3. Compulsory Non-Academic Incidental Fees: Student Society Fees (cont'd)****(b) Student Society Proposals for Fee Increases**

The Chair noted that, as part of its responsibility for matters that concerned the quality of student and campus life, the Board was responsible for the approval of requests for fee increases proposed by student societies. She added that the Board's role was not to debate the merits of the individual fee requests, but rather to consider the processes, governed by policy, by which they had been brought forward for approval. If the Board was satisfied that these processes had been appropriate and thorough, and that any issues that had arisen had been dealt with satisfactorily, then it had a responsibility to approve the fees.

Professor Matus noted that the consideration of student society proposals for fee increases was a regular item of business for the Board. All such requests had to be supported by constitutional and fair processes within student societies. The assessment of requests for fee increases was normally based upon the following expectations. The student society was required to make the request in a manner consistent with the *Policy for Compulsory Non-Academic Incidental Fees* and the University's procedures for increases to student society fees. Each organization had to comply with the provisions of its own by-laws, rules of procedure, and specific policies and procedures approved by its board or council. Cost of living increases had to be supported by a referendum in a previous year. Increases greater than the cost of living or a pre-approved inflation factor had to be supported by a positive result in a referendum for a fee increase, and special conditions established by the society, such as quorum, also had to be met. Referendum questions needed to be clear and had to provide sufficient information to allow students to gain a full understanding of the implications of the questions and proposed fees. Referenda had to be conducted fairly, advertised and promoted in a reasonable manner, and the members of each organization had to be given a reasonable opportunity to vote. Finally, there was no University requirement for minimum voter turnout in referenda. However, some student societies had established their own minimum voter turnout requirements. The University administration relied considerably on the assurances of the officers of societies that proper procedures had been followed. If a complaint was brought to the attention of the administration, the society was first asked to respond to the allegations. In rare instances where the society's response was not satisfactory, further inquiry was made to investigate the complaint. She noted that the administration had received no complaints with respect to any of the requests under consideration.

On the recommendation of the Vice-Provost, Students,

**YOUR BOARD APPROVED**

THAT beginning in the fall 2011 session, the 89 Chestnut Residence Council fee be increased as follows: (a) an increase of \$0.30 per session in the society portion of the fee. If approved, the total 89 Chestnut Residence Council fee will be increased to \$9.47 per session, charged to all residents of the 89 Chestnut Residence.

THAT beginning in the fall 2011 session, the Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students (APUS) fee be increased as follows: (a) by \$0.11 per session in the Canadian Federation of Students (CFS) / CFS-Ontario portion of the fee; (b) by \$3.39 per session in the Accident & Prescription Drug Plan portion of the fee; and (c) by \$2.83 per session in the Dental Plan portion of the fee. If approved, the total APUS fee will be \$86.12 per session, charged to all part-time undergraduate students on all campuses.

**REPORT NUMBER 163 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – April 12, 2011****3. Compulsory Non-Academic Incidental Fees: Student Society Fees (cont'd)****(b) Student Society Proposals for Fee Increases (cont'd)**

THAT beginning in the fall 2011 session, the Engineering Society fee be increased as follows: (a) an increase of \$0.74 (\$0.69 part-time) per session in the society portion of the fee; (b) continuation of, and an increase of \$0.50 (\$0.00 part-time) per session in the Formula SAE Racing Team portion of the fee through 2012-13; (c) continuation of the Special Projects Levy portion of the fee through 2012-13; (d) continuation of the Human Power Vehicle Design portion of the fee through 2012-13; (e) continuation of the Engineers Without Borders portion of the fee through 2012-13; (f) the establishment of an Endowment Fund portion of the fee of \$50.00 (\$0.00 part-time) through 2012-13; (g) the establishment of a Robotics Association portion of the fee of \$1.25 (\$0.00 part-time) through 2012-13; and (h) the elimination of the Engineering Career Centre portion of the fee. If approved, the total Engineering Society fee will be increased to \$163.44 (\$21.68 part-time) per session, charged to all Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering students.

THAT beginning in the fall 2011 session, the Erindale College Student Union (operating as the University of Toronto Mississauga Students' Union; UTMSU) fee be increased as follows: (a) an increase of \$0.42 per session in the society portion of the fee; (b) an increase of \$0.30 per session in the On-Campus First Aid Emergency Response portion of the fee; (c) an increase of \$0.03 per session in the Academic Societies portion of the fee; (d) an increase of \$0.02 per session in the Food Bank portion of the fee; and (e) an increase of \$0.03 per session in the Student Refugee Program portion of the fee. If approved, the total UTMSU fee will be increased to \$99.07 per session, charged to all full-time undergraduate University of Toronto at Mississauga students.

THAT, beginning in the fall 2011 session, the Graduate Students' Union (GSU) fee be increased as follows: (a) an increase of \$0.96 (\$0.48 part-time) per session in the society portion of the fee; (b) an increase of \$0.13 (\$0.07 part-time) per session in the Canadian Federation of Students (CFS) – CFS-Ontario portion of the fee; (c) a decrease of \$0.07 (full-time students only) per session (including an administration fee and sales tax) in the Supplementary Health Coverage portion of the fee; and (d) an increase of \$6.55 (\$6.55 part-time) per session (including an administration fee and sales tax) in the Dental Plan portion of the fee. If approved, the total GSU fee will be increased to \$222.98 per session (\$94.81 part-time), charged to all graduate students.

THAT beginning in the fall 2011 session, the Master of Information Student Council (MISC) fee be continued as follows: (a) continuation of the Technology Upgrade Fund portion of the fee through 2012-13. If approved, the total MISC fee will continue to be \$62.50 (\$31.25 part-time) per session, charged to all Master of Information students.

THAT, on the condition that Faculty of Information doctoral students support this proposal by referendum on April 15, 2011, beginning in the fall 2011 session, the Faculty of Information Doctoral Student Association (FIDSA) fee be continued as follows: (a) continuation of the Technology Upgrade Fund portion of the fee through 2012-13. If approved, the total FIDSA fee will continue to be \$50.00 (\$25.00 part-time) per session, charged to all Faculty of Information doctoral students.

**REPORT NUMBER 163 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – April 12, 2011****3. Compulsory Non-Academic Incidental Fees: Student Society Fees (cont'd)****(b) Student Society Proposals for Fee Increases (cont'd)**

THAT beginning in the fall 2011 session, a Museum Studies Graduate Students' Association (MSGSA) fee be established as follows: (a) establishment of a Technology Upgrade Fund portion of the fee through 2012-13. If approved, the total MSGSA fee will continue to be \$50.00 (\$25.00 part-time) per session, charged to all Faculty of Information museum studies students.

THAT beginning in the fall 2011 session, the Innis College Student Society (ICSS) fee be increased as follows: (a) an increase of \$8.07 per session in the society portion of the fee; and (b) the establishment of the designated portion of the fee of \$50.00 per session for Orientation (first year students only). If approved, the total ICSS fee will be \$80.00 per session for first year students and \$30.00 per session for all other students, charged to all full-time and part-time Innis College students.

THAT beginning in the fall 2012 session, the Nursing Undergraduate Society (NUS) fee be increased as follows: (a) an increase of \$2.50 per session (full-time only) in the Canadian Nursing Students Association portion of the fee. If approved, the total NUS fee beginning in the fall 2012 session will be \$22.00 (\$1.00 part-time) per session, charged to all undergraduate Faculty of Nursing students.

THAT beginning in the fall 2011 session, the Scarborough Campus Community Radio (SCCR) fee be increased as follows: (a) an increase of \$1.26 in the society portion of the fee. If approved, the total SCCR fee will be increased to \$4.85 per session, charged to all full-time University of Toronto Scarborough students.

THAT, on the condition that the Scarborough Campus Students Union board approves the requests for increases at its meeting on April 11, 2011, beginning in the fall 2011 session, the Scarborough Campus Students' Union (SCSU) fee be increased as follows: (a) the continuation of the Student Refugee Program portion of the fee; (b) an increase of \$0.73 (\$0.34 part-time) per session in the Student Centre portion of the fee; (c) an increase of \$0.23 (full-time only) per session in the CFS/CFS-O portion of the fee; (d) an increase of \$1.60 (\$0.32 part-time) per session in the Sports and Recreation Centre portion of the fee; and (e) an increase of \$4.74 (full-time only) per session (including an administration fee and sales tax) in the Dental Plan portion of the fee. If approved, the total SCSU fee will be \$217.39 (\$20.66 part-time) per session, charged to all undergraduate University of Toronto at Scarborough students.

THAT beginning in the fall 2011 session, the Students' Administrative Council (operating as the University of Toronto Students' Union; UTSU) fees be increased as follows: (a) an increase of \$0.54 per session in the society portion of the fee; (b) an increase of \$0.02 per session in the Student Refugee Program portion of the fee; (c) an increase of \$0.23 per session in the Canadian Federation of Students (CFS) – CFS-Ontario portion of the fee; (d) an increase of \$3.02 per session (including an administration fee and sales tax) in the Accident & Prescription Drug Plan portion of fee; and (e) an increase of \$2.57 per session for the Dental Plan portion (including an administration fee and sales tax); and (f) for full-time undergraduates on the St. George Campus only, an increase of the fee for the Student Commons Project of \$0.56 per session. If approved, the total UTSU-St. George fee will increase to \$156.56, charged to all full-time undergraduate students on the St. George

**REPORT NUMBER 163 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – April 12, 2011****3. Compulsory Non-Academic Incidental Fees: Student Society Fees (cont'd)****(b) Student Society Proposals for Fee Increases (cont'd)**

Campus; and the total UTSU-UTM fee will increase to \$148.16, charged to all full-time undergraduate students on the University of Toronto Mississauga campus.

THAT beginning in the fall 2011 session, the University College Literary and Athletic Society (UC Lit) fee be decreased as follows: (a) an increase of \$0.34 (\$0.12 part-time) per session in the society portion of the fee; and (b) the elimination of the Student Aid Fund Portion of the Fee. If approved, the total UC Lit fee will be \$16.94 (\$7.62 part-time) per session, charged to all University College students.

THAT beginning in the fall 2011 session, The Varsity fee be increased as follows: (a) an increase of \$0.04 per session in the society portion of the fee. If approved, the total Varsity fee will be \$1.33 per session, charged to all full-time undergraduate University of Toronto students.

**4. 2010 Annual Report of Equity, Diversity and Excellence**

The Chair reminded members that the University Affairs Board was responsible for matters of a non-academic nature that directly concerned the quality of life on campus. The Annual Report of Equity, Diversity and Excellence addressed the quality of life for all members of the University community, including students, faculty, and staff. This report was intended to enable the Board to monitor the University's activities in implementing its equity policies.

Professor Hildyard noted that the Report focused on the work of the Equity Offices across the three campuses during the previous year in promoting awareness of the University's values of equity, diversity, and excellence. Among the highlights had been ongoing efforts and new initiatives intended to challenge stereotypes and to promote equity, to promote mental wellness, to engage religious diversity on campus, to raise awareness of the resources and services provided by the various offices, and to develop collaborative relationships with external and community partners. The offices had been involved in the development of policies and programming, and had been proactive in identifying and addressing concerns as they arose.

During the discussion that followed, a number of members praised both the Report and the work of the equity offices that it detailed. Among the further matters that arose in discussion were the following. Mr. Awad urged that the equity offices should have a more active presence on the UTSC and UTM campuses. Professor Hildyard responded that the offices were aware of this need, and were working to respond to it, but that resource constraints meant that it would be an ongoing challenge. In response to a question, Professor Hildyard clarified that detailed data concerning the types and numbers of cases dealt with by the various equity offices could be found on their individual websites. Such data had not been included extensively in the Report, as it was intended to raise awareness rather than to be complaint driven. In response to a further question, Professor Hildyard stated that that the province-wide shortage of professional sign language interpreters made it a continuing challenge for the University to provide appropriate support for hearing impaired students. It had met the need in the previous year, and technological advances were assisting in meeting this challenge. Professor Hildyard emphasized that the equity offices worked together in a highly collaborative manner reflecting the close intersection that existed between the various issues that they addressed. A member recommended that the excellent Report, which relied largely on self-reporting, could be improved further in future years by the inclusion of external measures and multivariate analysis. Professor Hildyard agreed and took the suggestion under

**REPORT NUMBER 163 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – April 12, 2011****4. 2010 Annual Report of Equity, Diversity and Excellence (cont'd)**

advisement, but noted that it was a challenge to identify appropriate external measures such as benchmark surveys and performance indicators.

**5. Report of the Elections Committee**

Members received for information Report Number 64 (March 22, 2011) of the Elections Committee. The Committee had met in its capacity as overseers of the elections process to consider an appeal by a candidate arising from the conduct of the recent election. A member of the Board stated that he had found the Committee's decision, as recorded in the Report, somewhat incongruous. Professor Gough responded that, while the Committee had sympathized with the candidate's appeal, it had determined that there was no remedy that would redress the inappropriate actions that had been directed towards the candidate's campaign during the election.

**6. Report of the Senior Assessor**

Professor Matus updated the Board on a number of matters.

**(a) Response to the Earthquake in Japan and Tsunami in the Pacific Rim**

The University had undertaken a number of responses to this recent tragic disaster. The Centre for International Experience (CIE) had immediately contacted the University's students who were located in Japan for exchanges and field studies. In some cases, these students had been advised to relocate to unaffected regions in Japan or elsewhere in Asia, consistent with the advisories from the Canadian Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade (DFAIT). Eventually, it had been decided to move beyond the DFAIT advisories and ask all students to return to Canada at the University's expense. The CIE was working with the affected students to minimize the impact of these events on their studies. In addition, the CIE and the student life divisions across the three campuses had begun offering support to students at the University from Japan, those with links to Japan, and those others who required some sort of support. To assist the disaster response in Japan, a number of fundraising and support activities had been organized by student groups and administrative units across the three campuses. In addition, the Office of the Vice-Provost, Students and the Office of the Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity had planned and presented "A Public Observance of Solidarity with the People of Japan and the Pacific Rim" on March 29, 2011 at the Multi-Faith Centre. The President, the Consul-General of Japan in Toronto, a student, a faculty member, and others had spoken at the event, and a quartet from the Faculty of Music had played a traditional Japanese musical arrangement. A video feed had been provided for UTM and UTSC community members, and the video presentation was available on the web site of the Office of the Vice-Provost, Students.

**(b) Student Consultation Initiatives**

Professor Matus reported that, in addition to the usual consultation and interaction that occurred within committees and task forces, she and various members of her staff had been meeting regularly with student societies, student governors, various campus organizations, and others upon request. These had largely been informal meetings, providing opportunities to exchange views and provide updates on initiatives underway within the administration. During the past year there had been several meetings with student governors, an increased number of meetings with the Students' Administrative Council (SAC) and the Graduate Students' Union (GSU), as well as several lunch meetings with student leaders from organizations on all three campuses. Professor Matus had also attended a meeting of the St. George Roundtable. A new initiative had recently been undertaken in response to a request at a previous meeting of the University Affairs Board for periodic updates on initiatives in the Provosts office. The Office of

## REPORT NUMBER 163 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – April 12, 2011

## 6. Report of the Senior Assessor (cont'd)

the Vice-Provost, Students had established a blog to provide information, primarily to students in leadership positions, about various initiatives in the Office, and other current issues in the central administration.<sup>1</sup> Rather than advertising events and programs, the blog was intended as a place to connect with student leaders regarding initiatives, particularly those calling for student interaction, consultation and participation. Recent examples had included the course evaluation project, the Next Generation Student Information System (NGSIS) consultation process, and the provision of enhanced electronic communications for students.

## (c) Provost's Advisory Committee on the Temporary Use of Space

Professor Matus reminded members that the *Policy on the Temporary Use of Space at the University of Toronto* had been approved by the Governing Council on October 28, 2010. It had replaced the previous *Policy for the Allocation of Rooms – Extracurricular Bookings*, and it outlined the overarching principles by which space was to be used and assigned for temporary use. While the former policy had applied only to a limited amount of space on the St. George Campus, the new policy was more comprehensive as it applied a consistency of approach to the temporary use of space on all three campuses. It also articulated relevant and important policies and statements which reflected important University values and commitments that were relevant to the use of its space in a more complete and transparent way. Under the Policy, the Provost could establish procedures which provided guidance to room booking offices in handling various matters related to the temporary use of space. The initial set of Procedures had been provided when the Policy had been approved, and the Procedures would evolve over time to reflect changing needs. The new Policy and new Procedures modernized the approach to the temporary use of space and clarified the policy framework and its implementation.

A number of concerns had been articulated regarding the initial set of procedures under the Policy. In response, the Provost had committed to the establishment of an advisory committee to review and make recommendations with respect to the Procedures established under the new Policy. Professor Matus had been asked to chair the committee, and it had met three times and would do so again in May. Calls for nominations for the committee had been distributed widely across the three campuses to student governments, college and faculty student societies, recognized campus groups, and student governors. A recommendation for the committee's membership, reflecting the desire for broad representation from across the three campuses, had then been provided to the Vice-President and Provost. Professor Matus considered the work of this particular committee to have been a highlight of the year. It had allowed meaningful conversations about the Procedures under the Policy, and had been a model of effective dialogue with student leaders. The discussions had centered on the cost of using some spaces at the University (including the cost of room set-up and audio-visual equipment), the need for a St. George inventory of bookable space which indicated parameters of the space as well as information about room booking processes, and the need for clarity around some procedures regarding references to the University in campus group event advertising, advertising for public events, and the recording of events. The committee was developing a number of recommendations that would be provided to the Provost at a later date.

A member commended the University's staff, particularly those from the Centre for International Experience, for their efforts in assisting students based in Japan following the recent earthquake. Their efforts had resulted in a timely and very effective response to the disaster.

In light of the fact that concerns regarding the *Policy on the Temporary Use of Space at the University of Toronto* had been raised during its final approval by governance, a member asked

---

<sup>1</sup> Available at: [vpstudentsblog.utoronto.ca](http://vpstudentsblog.utoronto.ca).

**REPORT NUMBER 163 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – April 12, 2011****6. Report of the Senior Assessor (cont'd)**

whether a communications strategy had been developed to allow, in future cases, for effective prior consultation with relevant stakeholders. In her view, such consultation might have helped prevent what was an operational matter from becoming politicized. In addition, there was a need for more effective education regarding the distinction between a high-level policy and operational procedures. Professor Matus agreed that greater clarity was needed regarding the nature and purposes of policies. She stated that effective communication with the University's more than 77,000 students across three campuses remained a challenge, but that significant progress had been made in recent months. The University was adopting best practices regarding both electronic and personal consultation. Among the multiple methods of consultation that were being utilized and enhanced were web sites; student e-communications; the Vice-Provost, Students' blog for student leaders; town hall sessions; as well as the many informal meetings with student organizations that she had cited previously.

In response to a question regarding the status of the *Code of Student Conduct* consultation process, Professor Matus referred the member to the update that she had provided to the Board as part of her Senior Assessor's Report at a recent meeting.<sup>2</sup> The 'question and answer' companion document to the *Code* was being drafted, and the working draft would be circulated for further feedback among the groups which had been involved in the consultation process. It had not yet been determined when the document would come forward for information to governance.

**7. Date of the Next Meeting**

The Chair informed members that the next regular meeting of the Board was scheduled for Tuesday, May 31, 2011 at 4:30 p.m.

**8. Other Business**

There was no other business.

The meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

---

 Secretary

---

 Chair

April 25, 2011

---

<sup>2</sup> See: Report Number 161 of the University Affairs Board (February 1, 2011), page 7, at: <http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/AssetFactory.aspx?did=7602>.