

Summary Report  
of the  
Disability-Related Support Review

Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities  
Winter 2004

## Table of Contents

---

<b>Introduction</b>	3
<b>PART I: Background</b>	
Students with Disabilities Attending Postsecondary Institutions	4
Roles and Responsibilities	4
Ministry Funding in Support of Students with Disabilities	4
Current Methods of Disbursing Ministry Funding in Support of Students with Disabilities	5
<b>PART II: The Review</b>	
Rationale for the Review	7
Review Design	8
Stakeholder Participation	8
Regional Meetings	9
Other Feedback	9
<b>PART III</b>	
Summary of Feedback	10
<b>APPENDICES</b>	
APPENDIX A: List of Participants	20
APPENDIX B: List of Written Submissions	23

## Introduction

At the request of the Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities, the Director of the Universities Branch undertook a series of five regional meetings with college and university stakeholders in January and February 2004. The purpose of the meetings was to gather information on how the ministry's support for students with disabilities could best be structured to maximize its impact. In addition, meeting participants were invited to provide written submissions to the ministry on the same topic.

**Part I** of the Report provides information regarding the roles and responsibilities of the ministry and postsecondary institutions with respect to the provision of supports for students with disabilities. It also provides a description of the ministry's funding assistance in support of students with disabilities.

**Part II** of the Report outlines the rationale, the objectives, and the process for the review.

**Part III** of the Report provides a brief summary of the information that was gathered at meetings and from subsequent submissions.

## **PART I: BACKGROUND**

### **Students with Disabilities Attending Postsecondary Institutions**

In 2002-2003, more than 460,000 full-time equivalent students were enrolled in Ontario's postsecondary system. The number of students who identified themselves as having a disability to the Offices for Students with Disabilities at colleges and universities was approximately 24,300, or 5.3%.

In the coming years, it is anticipated that the number of students with disabilities attending colleges and universities will increase. The reason for this is twofold. First, enrolment at colleges and universities is increasing as a result of overall growth in the 18-24 age group and rising participation rates. As the number of students enrolled in Ontario's postsecondary system increases, the number of students with disabilities can be expected to increase accordingly.

Second, the postsecondary participation rate of students with disabilities is increasing. This is demonstrated by the increase in students with disabilities as a proportion of the student population: in 1989-90, approximately 3.03% of the student population registered with institutional Offices for Students with Disabilities. By 2002-03, this percentage had increased to 5.3%.

### **Roles and Responsibilities**

In Ontario, postsecondary institutions have a legal obligation under the *Ontario Human Rights Code (OHRC)* and the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms* to make their programs and services accessible to students with disabilities.

The ministry provides funding to publicly-funded postsecondary institutions to assist them in meeting their legal obligations. In general, ministry funding in support of students with disabilities is disbursed in one of two ways, either through grants provided to postsecondary institutions or through bursaries provided directly to students with disabilities.

### **Ministry Funding in Support of Students with Disabilities**

The ministry provides more than \$30 million annually in support of students with disabilities. Currently, two funds cover a broad range of disability-related expenditures:

- the Accessibility Fund for Students with Disabilities (AFSD) assists institutions in providing supports to students with disabilities, including the operation of Offices for Students with Disabilities. The AFSD was increased in 2003-2004 by 25% and now totals \$16.9M.

- the Bursary for Students with Disabilities provides direct funding support to eligible students for disability-related educational expenditures.

All other ministry grants target specific disabilities.

## **Current Methods of Disbursing Ministry Funding in Support of Students with Disabilities**

### 2003-2004 Funding to Postsecondary Institutions

- Accessibility Fund for Students with Disabilities (AFSD) - \$16.9M
- Interpreters Funds (college and university) - \$1.4M
- Support Services for the Hearing Impaired (GBC) - \$1.03M
- Learning Opportunities Task Force (LOTF) - \$8.04M

In general, operating grants allocated by the ministry through each of the above disability funding envelopes can be characterized as follows:

- funding is provided directly to colleges and universities with their general transfer payment allocations (the exceptions are the Interpreter Funds, which reimburse expenditures on a pro-rata basis at the end of the fiscal year for expenses incurred);
- funding is intended to be used by institutions solely for the purpose of supporting students with disabilities;
- funding is not intended to cover all of the costs of the institutions' disability-related initiatives – institutions have the legal obligation to make their services and programs accessible;
- the amount of funding per grant is capped;
- institutions are required to submit annual financial and activity reports to the ministry for each fund and, in the case of the AFSD, proposals for activities in the upcoming fiscal year; and
- with respect to LOTF funding, institutions report to LOTF, with LOTF setting the reporting requirements. LOTF, then, reports to the ministry through annual reports.

### 2003-04 Funding to Other Organizations

*Canadian Hearing Society (CHS) for Educational Support Services (ESS)* - \$0.206M

- this grant is flowed directly to CHS, which administers the fund and arranges for interpreter or computerized note taker services for part-time students attending one credit course per semester; and
- allocation is based on institutional usage.

*Ministry of Education (through Provincial Schools Branch) for Print-Alternate Materials - \$1.125M*

- a transfer payment is made to the Ministry of Education (EDU), which, through its Provincial Schools Branch, arranges for the procurement of existing transcribed materials or arranges for the transcription of materials; and
- each institution has a contact person, funded by the institution, who liaises with EDU.

Direct Funding to Students with Disabilities

*Bursary for Students with Disabilities (BSWD) - \$2M budgeted*

- through this bursary, students with temporary and permanent disabilities can access up to \$2,000 annually for disability-related educational expenses;
- education costs *and* disability-related educational support costs are included in the OSAP needs assessment, which determines eligibility for the BSWD; and
- the federal government has a similar bursary, the Canada Grant for Students with Permanent Disabilities. Students who apply for the BSWD are automatically eligible for it (up-to \$8,000 annually).

## PART II: THE REVIEW

### Rationale for the Review

In December 2003, the Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities, the Honourable Mary Anne Chambers, asked the Director of the Universities Branch to undertake a review of the ministry's disability-related support for students with disabilities. The purpose of the review was to gather information on how ministry support could best be structured to maximize its impact for students with disabilities.

Timing for this review was appropriate given the following:

- In October 2003, the Ontario Human Rights Commission (OHRC) released its report, *The Opportunity to Succeed: Achieving Barrier-Free Education for Students with Disabilities*, which identified a number of barriers that prevent students with disabilities from having equal access to education. The Commission is expected to release guidelines to accompany this report in Fall 2004.
- An ad hoc joint committee, composed of members of the College Committee on Disability Issues (CCDI) and the Inter-University Disabilities Issues Association (IDIA), submitted a proposal to the ministry in 2002 recommending changes to the AFSD.
- Recently, the ministry has been considering the number of disparate envelopes that support institutions and students with disabilities and whether there might be a more efficient and effective method of providing funding, for example, streamlining reporting requirements, without jeopardizing the goals of the various funds.
- Following the adoption of three recommendations (out of a total of 24) outlined in LOTF's 2002 report, the ministry has been considering how the roles and responsibilities of LOTF fit within the ministry's overall approach to disability issues.
- Proclamation of the *Ontarians with Disabilities Act, 2001*, means that colleges and universities are required to prepare and make public annual accessibility plans that address barriers to people with disabilities. This has raised awareness of disability issues with senior administration at the institutions.

## **Review Design**

### **Purpose**

The review was intended to gather information on existing institutional practices and solicit suggestions on how the ministry's current support of students with disabilities could be maximized.

Specifically, the review was intended to meet the following objectives:

- gather information on how disability-related funding assistance to publicly-funded postsecondary institutions might better be structured to maximize its impact;
- get first-hand information on the implementation of activities funded through LOTF;
- hear from students;
- understand the impact of the OHRC report on institutions;
- gather information on other types of supports, beyond increased funding, that the ministry could provide in support of students with disabilities; and
- ensure accountability measures are streamlined and appropriate.

The Minister asked that staff hold regional meetings with those involved in providing services to students with disabilities, as well as with students who have disabilities. In addition to the meetings, written submissions were invited. The Minister also requested that ministry staff meet with the Chair and staff of LOTF.

To facilitate the discussions, the ministry distributed three questions prior to the meetings:

1. What administrative/operational changes to the funding envelopes might the ministry consider to maximize its funding assistance in support of students with disabilities?
2. How will the report of the Ontario Human Rights Commission (OHRC), *The Opportunity to Succeed*, influence the way in which your institution provides disability services?
3. What other supports could the ministry put in place to further assist institutions, for example, establish an advisory body to the Minister?

### **Stakeholder Participation**

Members of the following groups were invited to participate in the review:

- College Committee on Disability Issues (CCDI)
- College Committee on Student Services (CCSS)
- Inter-University Disabilities Issues Association (IDIA)



- Ontario Committee on Student Affairs (OCSA)
- Ontario Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators
- College and University Offices for Students with Disabilities
- College and University Financial Aid Offices
- Learning Opportunities Task Force

In addition, students with disabilities attending a college or university in each host city participated in the regional meetings.

### **Regional Meetings**

Approximately 170 people participated in the regional meetings. A list of participants can be found in Appendix A.

Regional meetings were held in the following cities:

- Toronto – January 29, 2004
- Sudbury – February 3, 2004
- Kingston – February 10, 2004
- Thunder Bay – February 17, 2004
- London – February 25, 2004

A professional facilitator was hired to provide third party objectivity and ensure that the ministry was able to maximize the amount of information gathered at the meetings.

### **Other Feedback**

In addition to the regional meetings, two meetings were held with LOTF. Moreover, all of those invited to attend a regional meeting were given the opportunity to send written submissions. A list of the written submissions can be found in Appendix B. The information provided in these submissions was included in the Summary of Feedback (Part III).

### **PART III: SUMMARY OF FEEDBACK**

The summary provided below is an attempt to capture all of the issues discussed by college and university stakeholders at the regional meetings and provided through written submissions. For some issues, there was consensus on what was wrong/right and what needed to change/stay the same, whereas, there was little consensus for other issues. For the purposes of this report, ministry staff undertook no evaluation of the issues or ideas listed below.

#### **QUESTION 1**

**What administrative/operational changes to the following funding envelopes might the ministry consider to maximize its funding assistance in support of students with disabilities?**

##### **Funding to Institutions**

- Accessibility Fund for Students with Disabilities
- Interpreter Funds
- Support Services for the Hearing Impaired (George Brown)
- Enhanced Services Fund
- Mobile Assessment Team
- LOTF Innovative Projects

##### **Funding to Students**

- Bursary for Students with Disabilities

##### **Funding to Other Organizations**

- Educational Support Services
- Print Alternate Materials Fund

**Examples of administrative/operational changes:**

- a. Per institution distribution formula (e.g., distribute according to FTEs or number of students with (specific) disabilities, status quo, or status quo with minimal changes).
- b. Disbursement of the envelope (e.g., variations on distribution or consolidation of funding envelopes).
- c. Accountability requirements (e.g., redesign existing reports, develop one report for all envelopes).
- d. Administration processes (e.g., relationship with service partners such as Resource Services Library, Canadian Hearing Society, Financial Aid Offices).
- e. Communication issues between departments, students and the ministry.

### General Comments:

- support for the ministry to maintain the practice of providing targeted funds for disability services;
- institutions should not be allowed to "dip" into funds to cover expenditures other than disability services; and
- continued need to raise awareness of disability issues – targeted funding and ODA Accessibility Plans assist with this.

### *Impact of Targeted Funding:*

- students with disabilities are able to attend postsecondary studies;
- profile of disability issues in institutions has increased and students with disabilities are getting better at advocating for themselves;
- access to specialized supports and services, such as learning strategists and counsellors;
- each institution can operate an office for students with disabilities;
- Ontario is held up as a model for other provinces in terms of the services/supports for students with disabilities;
- profile of offices has led to linkages with disability-specific agencies, such as the LDAO and CNIB;
- colleagues at institutions who work in support of students with disabilities generally report good collaboration with colleagues in their own institutions and in other institutions;
- networking and collaboration on such issues as student eligibility, administrative procedures and best practices;
- want to ensure that province-wide accountability measures are sufficient to demonstrate that funds are used appropriately; and
- the *Ontarians with Disabilities Act* was a team-building experience in support of students with disabilities.

### Accessibility Fund for Students with Disabilities

#### *Funding Formula:*

- having a minimum base funding for institutions ensures some stability of funding;
- institutions are able to "claw back" money from the AFSD, although this practice may be declining because of the high financial needs of offices;
- colleges reported that initiatives to increase the number of students in non-postsecondary programs (e.g. apprenticeship) means increased demand for disability services without a corresponding increase in funding (these students are not included in the count of full-time students in the funding allocation formula);
- concern that smaller institutions or those with high numbers of part-time students are disadvantaged by this formula; and

- the 25% increase to the total AFSD was an important and welcomed increase, although those institutions with declining enrolments received less than a 25% increase and those with increasing enrolments received more.

*Reporting:*

- satisfaction with the reporting requirements, although there is a desire to streamline the reporting to ensure all institutions (colleges and universities) report in the same way;
- reporting once a year seems reasonable;
- the templates (used by colleges) are appropriate and, for at least one institution, provide a useful planning tool; and
- rolling LOTF funding into the AFSD would cut down on staff time dedicated to report writing.

*Other:*

- several institutions reported that their institution had implemented a mandatory student fee that supports disability services.

Bursary for Students with Disabilities (BSWD)

*General:*

- for students who are eligible, the amount of money provided is sufficient to cover the costs of the necessary supports;
- would like to see the fund based on disability needs rather than financial needs;
- would like to see eligibility tied to a financial means test other than the one used for OSAP;
- allowing the inclusion of disability-related educational expenses in determining OSAP eligibility is appreciated, thus allowing additional students to access the fund and/or increase the amount of funding per eligible student;
- for the most part, disability services and financial aid offices have well-developed positive relationships, but some institutions have problems;
- once the student's OSAP loan is approved, the administration of the BSWD is quick and simple;
- appreciation for the ministry's confirmation that disability services' offices make the final decision on the type of equipment and service accommodations provided through the BSWD;
- Aboriginal students who are sponsored by their band are not eligible for OSAP, therefore not eligible for the BSWD;
- students receiving employment insurance or injured workers cannot access OSAP and BSWD;
- international students with the same needs of accommodation as Ontario students do not qualify for the BSWD;
- having the BSWD cover the costs of assessments is appreciated; and

- need to look at how ODSP and BSWD work together.

*Administration:*

- there are differences in interpreting the guidelines;
- reporting requirements are easy to meet;
- so long as there is a “needs component” to the BSWD, the administration of this fund is best served by Financial Aid Offices; and
- the 90 day rule is problematic for students who self-identify late in the semester.

*Suggestions for Improvement:*

- decouple/de-index the BSWD from OSAP;
- remove taxable requirement from BSWD, as some services are expensive, e.g. interpreter services;
- develop a definition of permanent vs temporary disability especially as it relates to students with mental health disabilities (i.e. create a temporary category for recovering people);
- give students the option to disclose when identifying a disability (currently, students have to disclose, even when documentation is on file);
- expand eligibility expenses (i.e. medications, assessments);
- harmonize federal/provincial program for part-time students;
- allow automatic renewal of OSAP for students with permanent disabilities;
- transfer unused BSWD money to the Disability Offices to be used for all students;
- inform disability offices of BSWD changes/information early in the year; and
- make the bursary more inclusive, supporting all students with disabilities.

Funding for Interpreters

*General:*

- targeted funding for interpreter services is essential for the deaf community;
- the fund recognizes the disproportionate financial impact these expenses have on institutions;
- distribution of funding for this high-cost accommodation should continue to be based on the actual services provided;
- lack of qualified interpreters, particularly in remote areas of the province;
- because the fund is pro-rated based on demand, each institution’s allocation is determined at the end of the fiscal year;
- institutions would like to know their allocation at the beginning of the fiscal year;
- the actual cost of an interpreter ranges from \$40 - \$75/hr and the profession is not regulated;
- would like to revisit rates paid to interpreters and give consideration to rates on a sliding scale, depending on the experience of the interpreter;
- ESS is generally hard to access;

- would like to see CHS' Educational Support Services (ESS) rolled into the Interpreter Fund
- create one fund for deaf students (combine the Interpreter Fund, ESS, and George Brown College Grant); and
- more funding is required.

*Reporting:*

- reporting requirements are simple, although one annual report is preferred to the current two reports;
- reporting should reflect actual costs associated with interpreters, including preparation time; and
- need to look at how interpreter funding is allocated.

Print Alternate Fund

*General:*

- getting materials on time is the biggest challenge;
- many institutions produce their own materials;
- suggestions for improvement: decentralize and disburse funds to every institution to purchase a scanner and hire a clerk, or establish a Centre of Excellence approach through one institution;
- there are problems with WRMS, but it is a needed service;
- concern that decentralizing the service would result in duplication of materials transcribed;
- would like to see legislation that requires publishers to provide electronic texts;
- institutions would benefit from sharing transcribed materials; and
- legislate in the Copyright Act that a large print issue is to be published.

Learning Opportunities Task Force

*General:*

- significant progress has been made in meeting the needs of students with LD;
- covering the costs of assessments was noted as an important positive result;
- programs have increased collaborative working relationships between faculty and students;
- support for the ongoing development of research-based programming;
- services offered only to students with learning disabilities could be considered inequitable by those with other types of disabilities who also require specialized services;
- it is unclear how financial decisions are made and how institutions go about accessing funding - would like more transparency;
- would like students with other disabilities to be eligible for LOTF services; and
- would like to see specialized services for other disability groups.

*Enhanced Services Fund:*

- invaluable support for students learning how to utilize their adaptive technology;
- dedicated staff dealing with students with specific disability results in faculty acknowledging the significance of the disability;
- would like to see these specialized services made permanent;
- would like all students with disabilities to benefit from the services currently designed for LD students only; and
- consider streamlining the current reporting by rolling it in with AFSD annual reporting.

*French-language Assessment Project:*

- appreciation expressed on behalf of francophone students for support; and
- release of the French-language assessment tool for francophone students with learning disabilities is much anticipated.

*Mobile Assessment Team:*

- offers access in areas where assessments are not available;
- a second option for institutions whose in-house resources are stretched;
- a quick and free service that benefits students who do not qualify for BSWD; and
- mobile assessment teams may not be needed in all regions.

*Innovative Projects:*

- projects have benefited institutions that have received this funding, Summer Institutes noted;
- see benefit of trying new ideas on a small scale;
- need additional regional assessment centres - (i.e. Hamilton, Simcoe, Grey, Bruce); and
- would like clear guidelines on criteria/how to access funds.

Other Feedback

*General:*

- funding envelopes should be flexible in order to maximize accessibility in all areas, e.g. institutions should have the ability to use any surplus in funding envelopes for interpreter funding;
- more connection between funds;
- too many funds;
- more research required, e.g. look at best practices, such as the Dawson College Study);
- shared college/university programs are problematic; and
- there is a lack of bridging between high school disability assessments/services to postsecondary institutions.

*Suggestions for Ministry-Institution Communications:*

- would like the ministry to copy the disability office on all communications sent to schools/financial aid office related to envelopes for students with disabilities;
- Advisory Committee to the Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities should be established for communication between all stakeholders (CCDI, IDIA, FAOs, Ministry Rep).

*LOTF-Type Services:*

- there is not adequate or specialized funding for other groups beyond LD;
- create an assessment fund for those with LD.

*Psychiatric Disorders:*

- need separate fund for psychiatric disorders, they require specific service and adaptive technology; and
- need temporary category so that students are eligible for accommodation.

## **Question 2**

**How will the report of the Ontario Human Rights Commission (OHRC), *The Opportunity to Succeed*, influence the way in which your institution provides disability services?**

Promoting Increased Awareness of Disability Issues

- release of guidelines will raise awareness of disability issues across campuses;
- will provide encouragement to students who have been reluctant to self advocate;
- an important step forward for people with disabilities to see issues raised based on education instead of employment; and
- need training for faculty and staff to become more aware of disabilities and the educational strategies for accommodation.

Dispute Resolution

- will ensure that a process will be established;
- students will be aware of the process to resolve issues; and
- should make the process less cumbersome for students with disabilities.

Duty to Accommodate

- need a definition of “timely”;
- need clear definition and examples of previous human rights cases;
- sometimes difficult to provide accommodations when student demands accommodation at last minute;



- need to acknowledge the shared responsibility of both the institution and the student;
- enhanced bridging of the transition from high school to postsecondary is needed; and
- concern about lack of total system funding.

#### Physical Accessibility

- Ontario Building Code is not sufficient;
- Facilities Renewal Fund should target renovations for physical accessibility;
- MTCU should establish retrofit fund and take applications each year to provide some financial relief for institutions; and
- washroom accessibility is still a problem (e.g., stall may be retrofitted, but the entry and exit are still problematic).

#### Undue Hardship

- would like clear definition;
- recognition that a publicly-funded postsecondary institution would have difficulty claiming “undue hardship”;
- senior administrators do not always allocate resources sufficient to meet the institution’s legal obligations; and
- need strong institutional leadership.

#### Universal Instructional Design

- would facilitate providing accommodations;
- would benefit all students;
- faculty buy-in required;
- need assistance/initiative to implement; and
- funding issues unresolved.

#### Government Funding

- agreed with issues related to the BSWD;
- to fully meet OHRC requirements, increase in government funding is required;
- inconsistent expectations of OHRC and requirements of BSWD/ODSP;
- report references part-time students and institutional policies, yet funding is not based on the number of part-time students, continuing education students, etc.;
- there is no infrastructure to support part-time students; e.g., part-time students need greater access to medical plans, bursaries, etc.; and
- complexity of funding is a barrier.

#### Disclosure of Disability Documentation and Confidentiality

- would like clarification of the confidentiality requirements of documents;
- concern about statements that disclosure of disability and validating documentation are not required; and

- not having documented evidence could jeopardize buy-in of faculty who rely on expertise of disability offices to confirm disability and type of accommodations.

#### Release of Guidelines

- looking forward to guidelines for clarification of support service provision within the postsecondary educational sector; and
- need institutional policies and procedures that acknowledge needs of students and academic integrity.

#### Alternate Format Texts

- require legislation to require publishers to provide text in print alternate format;
- purchasing power - faculty should limit choice of texts to those publishers that would provide alternate format texts; and
- ministry should work with other ministries to develop initiatives in support of students with disabilities.

#### Part-Time Students

- student assistance programs do not meet the needs of part-time students; and
- students with disabilities, who are part-time because of their disability, are disadvantaged by graduate and professional school admission requirements that specify full-time status in undergraduate programs.

### **Question 3**

**What other supports could the ministry put in place to further assist institutions:**

- What are your top three priorities**
- How do you think the ministry should move forward**
- Other**

#### Top Priorities

Other than increased funding, the following priorities for ministry action were identified:

- decouple the BSWD from OSAP;
- focus on transition from secondary to postsecondary studies, as well as postsecondary studies to the workplace;
- harmonize funding to reduce overlap and inequities, e.g. Interpreter funds;
- simplify reporting requirements;
- resolve issues related to print alternate materials;
- require mandatory training to increase faculty/staff awareness of disability issues;
- make ESF funding permanent; and

- apply LOTF-type best practices to other disability groups.

#### Vehicle for Moving Forward

- advisory body to the Minister;
- transition committee/inter-ministerial committee; and
- Centres of Excellence.

#### Other

- include non-postsecondary students in the disability funding formula (AFSD), e.g. Apprenticeships and Continuing Education;
- resolve ODSP/OSAP issues;
- address special issues of the North, e.g., francophone students, aboriginal students;
- resolve data collection issues;
- resolve OHRC documentation issue; and
- establish standards for providing accommodations.

## **APPENDIX A: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS**

### **Toronto**

January 29, 2004

Diane Addie, York	Eva Nichols, LOTF
Craig Barrett, Humber	Tim Nolan, McMaster
Beryl Buckley-Golder, Sheridan	Virginia Nusca, Mohawk
Arthur Burke, Seneca	Peter Olteanu, George Brown
Eileen Burns, Seneca	Linda Petty, Toronto
Jenny Casselman, Sheridan	Josephine Polera, OCAD
Caroline Cayuga, McMaster	Scott Pope, York
Sharon Clark, McMaster	Desmond Pouyat, McMaster
Marion Creery, Ryerson	Kim Raymer, Seneca
Parveen Dhatt-Sangha, Centennial	Gina Robinson, McMaster
Olga Dosis, George Brown	Susanne Seinader, OCAD
Tina Doyle, Toronto	Laura Selleck, Ryerson
Frank Folino, York	George Seravalle, York
Lucy Fromowitz, Centennial	David Sidebottom, Toronto
Scherry George, Centennial	Karen Swartz, York
Debra Glass, York	Rob Till, Sheridan
Alan Gordon, George Brown	LesliAnna Thompson, CHS
Judy Harvey, Humber	Sharon Tracy, Seneca
Joe Henry, Sheridan	Susie Vallance, Seneca
Sandra Hornby, Sheridan	Irene Volinets, Centennial
Linda Kingsland, Centennial	Karen Walker, George Brown
Maxine Laine, Ryerson	Enid Weiner, York
Sunshine Lecard, George Brown	Marc Wilchesky, York
Judi Linton, George Brown	
Tanya Lewis, Ryerson	Kevin French, MTCU
Gary Malkowski, CHS	Eydie Troper, MTCU
Janice Martin, Toronto	Paddy Buckley, MTCU
Michael Miceli, York	Laurence Péchère, MTCU
Rachel Matthews, Mohawk	Lesley Langdon, MTCU
Hazel Nanton, George Brown	

### **Sudbury**

February 3, 2004

Terry Ableson, Sault	Barb Muio, Algoma
Susan Alcorn MacKay, Cambrian	Melissa Pafford, Laurentian
Nancy Baron, Boréal	Joseph Palmateer, Laurentian
Christine Bazinet, Boréal	Denise Piovesan, Boréal
Janice Beatty, Sault	Dan Pletzer, Nipissing
Kate Beatty, Georgian	Barbara Pontes, Cambrian

Diane Beuparlant, Laurentian  
Denise Bellehumeur, Boréal  
Earl Black, Laurentian  
Al Carfagnini, Nipissing  
Jim Chalmers, Northern  
Laurent Charbonneau, Northern  
Liane Cheshire, Georgian  
Réjeanne Dénommé, Boréal  
Donna Ducharme, Northern  
Tori Hanson, Northern  
Suzanne Huot, Boréal  
Sydney King, Georgian  
Ken McLellan, Nipissing  
Raymond Morin, Laurentian

Jeremy Potter, Cambrian  
Dawson Pratt, Canadore  
Michelle Sylvester, Laurentian  
Glen Toikka, Cambrian  
Raymond Tremblay, Hearst  
Nigel Ward-Paige, Georgian  
Tracie Wilson, Northern  
Krista Yerman, Algoma  
Kim Zaroski, Cambrian

Frances Lamb, MTCU  
Eydie Troper, MTCU  
Laurence Péchère, MTCU

**Kingston**  
February 10, 2004

Brij Bali, St. Lawrence  
Claude Bergeron, La Cité Collégiale  
Willona Blanche, Durham/UOIT  
Mike Condra, Queen's  
Katie Cudmore, Loyalist  
Angie, Dunphy, Queen's  
Mike Evans, St. Lawrence  
Linda Fielding, Algonquin  
Diane Gameiro-Sutton, Ottawa  
Susan Goulding, Carleton  
Allyson Harrison, Queen's  
Doug Hone, St. Lawrence  
Kelly Johnson, Queen's  
Ryan Klomp, Ottawa  
Sonya Lem, St. Lawrence  
Leonard Librande, Carleton  
Eunice Lund-Lucas, Trent  
Robin Mandell, Student - Queen's  
Larry McCloskey, Carleton

Eva Nichols, LOTF  
Meri Kim Oliver, Trent  
Catherine O'Rourke, Loyalist  
Barbara Roberts, Queen's  
Marie Robertson, La Cité Collégiale  
Chris Rocha, Durham/UOIT  
Marie-Claude Rouleau, Ottawa  
Yolaine Ruel, Ottawa  
Jen Sugar, Carleton  
Joyce Sutton, Trent  
Diane Thornhill, Algonquin  
Pearl Vani-Hill, Loyalist  
Linda Williams Erdahl, St. Lawrence

Kevin French, MTCU  
Lesley Langdon, MTCU  
Eydie Troper, MTCU  
Laurence Péchère, MTCU

**Thunder Bay**  
February 17, 2004

Phyllis Bosnick, Lakehead  
Keith Dickson, Confederation  
Vilma Filice, Confederation  
Donna Grau, Lakehead  
Jeff Howie, Confederation  
Norma Jean Kamerman, Confederation  
Andrew Kane, Confederation  
Linda Kitzan, Lakehead  
Dawnelee Klomp, Lakehead  
Sheila Noyes, Lakehead

Terry Robinson, Confederation  
Alice Trush, Confederation  
Larry Vezina, Confederation  
  
Kevin French, MTCU  
Eydie Troper, MTCU  
Paddy Buckley, MTCU

**London**  
February 25, 2004

Laurie Arnott, Guelph  
Judith Brooder, Brock  
Rick Campbell, Western  
Linda Chamberlain, Wilfrid Laurier  
Sharon Covert, Brock  
Glen Craney, Guelph  
Bonnie Dawe, Lambton  
Ildiko Denes, Waterloo  
Katherine Elliott, Wilfrid Laurier  
Susan Grindrod, Western  
Sheryl Johns, Niagara  
Peter Landoni, Guelph  
Don Leslie, Windsor  
Rhondda Lymburner, Conestoga  
Bruno Mancini, Guelph  
Connie Marion, St. Clair  
Charlie Matjanel, Conestoga  
Betty Morsinic, Conestoga

Kelly Nixon, Conestoga  
Rose Padacz, Waterloo  
Mary Beth Phillips, Wilfrid Laurier  
Shelley Reynolds, Fanshawe  
Alice Schmidt, Waterloo  
Susan Shifflett, Waterloo  
Trudy Smit-Quosai, Guelph  
Rose Sparrow, Wilfrid Laurier  
Deborah Stuart, Western  
Glen Tigert, Western  
Lois Wey, Fanshawe  
Brook White, Windsor  
Doreen Whitehead, Fanshawe  
  
Frances Lamb, MTCU  
Eydie Troper, MTCU  
Paddy Buckley, MTCU

## **APPENDIX B: WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS**

Written submissions were made by:

- Cambrian College of Applied Arts & Technology
- Carleton University
- Clark, Sharon, McMaster University
- College Committee on Disability Issues (CCDI)
- College Committee on Disability Issues (CCDI)/Inter-University Disability Issues Association (IDIA)
- Durham College/University of Ontario Institute of Technology
- Gow, Athol, University of Guelph
- Henry, Joe, Sheridan College
- Inter-University Disability Issues Association (IDIA)
- Klomp, Ryan, University of Ottawa
- Learning Opportunities Task Force
- Linton, Judi, George Brown College
- Martin, Janice, University of Toronto
- MTCU Transcription Services Steering Committee
- Nolan, Tim, McMaster University
- Ontario Council on Student Affairs
- Roberts, Barbara, Queen's University
- Treviranus, Jutta, University of Toronto