

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

REPORT NUMBER 92 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD

May 23, 2000

To the Governing Council,
University of Toronto.

Your Board reports that it held a meeting on Tuesday, May 23, 2000, at 5:00 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, at which the following were present:

Mr. Brian C. Burchell (In the Chair)
Ms Nancy L. Watson (Vice-Chair)
Professor J. Robert S. Prichard, President
Professor Ian Orchard, Vice-Provost, Students
Ms Susan Addario, Director,
Student Affairs
Professor Ethel Auster
Dr. Robert Bennett
Dr. Shari Graham Fell
Mr. Ljupco Gjorgjinski
Ms Margaret Hancock
Professor Bruce Kidd
Mr. Vivek Krishnamurthy
Dr. Heather Lane
Ms Alicia Maund
Professor Ian R. McDonald
Mr. Ahmed Rafi Mian
Ms Rosie Parnass

Mr. Kashif S. Pirzada
Mr. Robert G. Spencer
Ms Wendy Talfourd-Jones
Ms Sally Walker

Non-Voting Members:

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

Secretariat:

Mr. Neil Dobbs
Ms Margaret McKone

Regrets:

The Honourable William G. Davis

Ms Mary Ann Pilskalnietis

In Attendance:

Ms Karen Lewis, member-elect, the Governing Council, and Assistant Dean of Administration,
Faculty of Physical Education and Health
Mr. Elan Ohayon, member, the Governing Council
Mr. Adam Bretholz, President, Students' Administrative Council
Professor John Browne, Director, Residence Development
Ms Christine Capewell, Director, Business Services, University of Toronto at Mississauga
Mr. Jim Delaney, Manager, Liaison and Campus Life Services, Office of Student Affairs
Dr. Jack Dimond, Secretary Emeritus of the Governing Council, and Co-ordinator,
Varsity/Devonshire/Bloor Precinct Project
Ms Rebecca Dolgoy, University Affairs Commissioner, Students' Administrative Council
Ms Manon LePaven, President, Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students
Mr. Terry Rubenstein, Director, Financial Services, Faculty of Physical Education and Health
Ms Catherine Seymour, Board Member, Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students

In Attendance (cont'd):

Mr. Jorge Sousa, President, Graduate Students' Union
Mr. Paul Tsang, Past President, Graduate Students' Union
Mr. Glenn Walker, Chief Administrative Office, University of Toronto at Mississauga

ALL ITEMS ARE REPORTED TO THE GOVERNING COUNCIL FOR INFORMATION.

Chair's Remarks

The Chair noted that there were at least two residence users' committee reports that would be ready for review by governance in the near future. Therefore, there might be need for a summer meeting of the Board. Members would be notified as soon as possible if a summer meeting was required.

The Chair continued that he had been informed that the recommendation for the COSS chair had not yet been finalized. Therefore, with members' consent, this item was withdrawn from the agenda. The Chair added that if there was a June meeting of the Board, this item would appear as an agenda item. In the absence of a June meeting, a recommendation would be circulated to Board members by mail ballot.

ITEM 1 WAS CONSIDERED IN CLOSED SESSION.

1. Report of the Striking Committee (cont'd)

(a) University Affairs Board Membership – Non-Governing-Council Positions, 2000-2001

The Vice-Chair presented the recommendations of the Striking Committee. She pointed out that, under the terms of By-Law Number 2 of the Governing Council, it was mandatory that the majority of the Board members be governors. In addition to the four *ex officio* members of Governing Council on the University Affairs Board (the Chairman and the Vice-Chair of the Governing Council, the Chancellor, and the President), eleven other governors, representing four of the five estates, would be Board members in 2000-2001. Co-opted members took up the remainder of the Board seats. Two of the co-opted members were also *ex officio*, namely, the Warden of Hart House, under the category of administrative staff, and the Dean of the Faculty of Physical Education and Health, under the category of teaching staff. Seven co-opted members were being recommended by the Striking Committee to complete the Board's membership for 2000-2001. The Vice-Chair noted that the calibre of nominees this year had been very high, and that it had been particularly difficult to choose from among the strong nominations. The Committee had looked for a suitable number of continuing members and diversity within constituencies.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

The following co-opted membership for the University Affairs Board for 2000-2001:

Administrative Staff

Ms Yvette Ali (University of Toronto at Scarborough)
Dr. Heather Lane (Victoria College)*
Mr. Paul McCann (Faculty of Arts and Science)

1. Report of the Striking Committee (cont'd)

(a) University Affairs Board Membership – Non-Governing-Council Positions, 2000-2001
(cont'd)

Alumni

(no vacancies for co-opted members in 2000-2001)

Teaching Staff

Professor Marion Bogo (Faculty of Social Work)

Students

Mr. Vivek Krishnamurthy (Innis College, full-time undergraduate)*

Mr. Darren R. Levstek (Woodsworth College, full-time undergraduate)

Ms Szu-Mae Yoon (University College, full-time undergraduate)

* Indicates re-appointment.

(b) Discipline Appeals Board – Membership, 2000-2001

The Vice-Chair explained that the Discipline Appeals Board heard appeals from decisions rendered under the *Code of Student Conduct* and the *Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters*. Four of the six members selected by the University Affairs Board must be students. Eligible for membership were those who had served on the University Affairs Board or who had been members of Governing Council.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the following be appointed to the Discipline Appeals Board for 2000-2001:

Name

Status in 2000-2001

Professor Ethel Auster

former member, Governing Council - faculty

Mrs. Margo Coleman*

former member, Governing Council - alumnus

Mr. Peng Fu

former member, University Affairs Board - student

Mr. Ljupco Gjorginski

member, Governing Council - student

Mr. Kashif Pirzada

former member, Governing Council - student

Mr. Faisal Raja*

former member, Governing Council - student

* Indicates re-appointment.

THE BOARD RETURNED TO OPEN SESSION.

2. Report of the Previous Meeting held on April 18, 2000

The Chair noted that the Board Secretary had been notified of two corrections to the attendance list for the previous meeting: Dr. Lane and Mr. Spencer had been in attendance.

Report Number 91 of the University Affairs Board (April 18, 2000), as amended, was approved.

3. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting

Item 8 (e) Student Club Space at 21 Sussex Avenue - Accessibility

The Chair recalled that at the previous meeting, Ms Addario had reported that 21 Sussex had been designated as a site for student clubs. It was also reported that the site would be made wheelchair accessible.

At the invitation of the Chair, Professor Orchard reported on the timeline for making the building accessible. Ms Addario had met with a design team to discuss the required renovations to the building, design plans and a cost estimate. This information would be available by the end of June. He reiterated that there currently existed an elevator within the building and, therefore, the accessibility issues pertained only to the building's exterior.

4. Faculty of Physical Education and Health: Co-curricular Programs – Operating Plans 2000-2001

The Chair reminded members that the Council on Student Services (COSS) had declined to recommend the proposed 2000-2001 operating plan and budget for the Faculty of Physical Education and Health's co-curricular programs, which had been based on a request to increase student fees by 5%. At its previous meeting, the Board had approved an interim appropriation to enable the Faculty to continue to operate for two months, pending submission and approval of a new operating plan by the Board.

Professor Orchard noted that the proposed plan and budget had been supported by a majority of the members of COSS, but it had failed to win the required support of a majority of student members. The senior management team for the co-curricular programs had convened the Budget Committee of the Council on Athletics and Recreation to consider budget options in light of the COSS decision, and a revised operating plan and budget was now before the Board. During the last few years, as reported in Dean Kidd's memorandum to the Board, the Faculty of Physical Education and Health had made a concerted effort to broaden and extend its co-curricular activities to all students and other members on a "needs based" basis. This effort had followed the recommendations of a Task Force on Gender Equity in 1994 and a Task Force on Intercollegiate Athletics in 1997. Hours of service had been extended, new programs had been introduced, facilities had been renovated, and budgets had been redistributed in order to achieve the goal of full accessibility and opportunity. Dean Kidd's memorandum had outlined the great strides that had been made. Professor Orchard related a conversation he had had with a British Physical Education graduate during a recent visit to the United Kingdom. That graduate had an extensive knowledge of the achievements of the University of Toronto's co-curricular programs, which had been cited as a highly favourable example in the British student's courses.

Among the matters that arose in discussion were the following

(a) Action by the Council on Student Services. A member asked why the Council on Student Services had rejected the recommendation of the Council on Athletics and Recreation for approval of the original operating plan, including its 5% fee increase. Professor Orchard replied that the representatives of the Graduate Students' Union (GSU) in particular had opposed the proposal, in accordance with that group's long-standing policy opposing any increase in the fees for co-curricular programs in the Faculty of Physical Education and Health. The GSU opposed the use of a part of the fee to fund inter-collegiate athletics. A two-thirds majority of the GSU would have been required to overrule that policy, and only a simple majority had supported a change. In addition to the GSU representatives, other students on COSS had voted against the proposed operating plan, budget and fee increase. They took the general view that fee increases should be limited and if possible avoided altogether. The

4. Faculty of Physical Education and Health: Co-curricular Programs – Operating Plans 2000-2001 (cont'd)

student representatives were highly complimentary about the plan itself and the process of developing it. Representatives of the GSU had participated actively in the Council on Athletics and Recreation's process of developing the plan and the Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students and the Students' Administrative Council had had representation on the Council. Therefore, student representatives were not opposed to any aspect of the plan apart from the proposed fee increase.

A member noted that the executive of the GSU had on this occasion recommended approval of the plan, but the recommendation had failed to garner the needed two-thirds majority vote of the membership.

Invited by the Chair to speak, a member of the Governing Council said the executive of the Graduate Students' Union had brought the proposed plan, budget and fee increase to the membership not as a recommendation but as an item for debate. The GSU had considered the value of each 1% increment in the fee but in the end concluded that no increment would be appropriate. There had been no absence of support for the co-curricular programs themselves. Athletics and recreation programs were very important and should be seen as an intrinsic part of education. The co-curricular programs should, therefore, be supported by provincial funding. For a number of years in a row, the GSU had taken the view that students should not have to pay more for athletics and recreation programs. The total of incidental fees at the University of Toronto was as high as the full fees - tuition and incidental fees - paid by students in many European countries. Many students were simply unable to attend the University because of the burden of fees, and other students who were able to attend found their fees to be an excessive burden. There should, therefore, be no increase in the fees for co-curricular programs in Physical Education and Health. In other areas, program fees had not been increased; there had, indeed, been reductions in some cases. The fees for athletics had, over the past several years, received the largest increases.

(b) Response to the rejection of the original plan. A member noted that one of the steps taken in response to the rejection of the original plan was the deferral of the installation of a lift in the Benson Building pool to provide easier access for persons with disabilities. Another step was the withdrawal of additional support to the David L. Macintosh Sports Medicine Clinic beyond the additional funding to meet the incremental cost of the new contract with the United Steelworkers of America. The member asked why these items were selected for reductions. In particular, the lift in the Benson Building pool was a capital item for which funding could presumably be sought elsewhere.

Professor Kidd replied that COSS's rejection of the plan proposed by the Council on Athletics and Recreation had forced the Council to find \$250,000 in savings through reductions in its original plan and budget. The increased costs arising from the settlement with the United Steelworkers' union increased the necessary reductions to \$300,000. The Council had agonized over the reductions required to bring in a new budget, with all reductions being small ones. If there was any opportunity to find the money in the next fiscal year, the Council would very much like to restore funding for the items that had been reduced. In the absence of an increase in income, however, it would be very difficult to do so.

Invited by the Chair to speak, a member of the Governing Council said that he shared the distress about the omission of the lift in the Benson Building pool. There were, however, solutions other than increasing the fee for the co-curricular programs in Physical Education and Health. The proposal was a capital project, and the University's budget guidelines should be adjusted to permit the funding of such projects from capital sources. The member would at the

4. Faculty of Physical Education and Health: Co-curricular Programs – Operating Plans 2000-2001 (cont'd)

next day's meeting of the Planning and Budget Committee make a proposal for the use of the use of the Capital Renewal Fund for physical accessibility projects.

(c) Consequences of increases in salary and benefit costs negotiated with the University's unions. In response to a member's question, the Chair and Professor Kidd replied that all ancillary operations as well as all academic units were responsible for finding means to deal with salary and benefit increases arising from negotiation with the University's unions. No central funding was provided to do so. The member questioned the fairness of various units' having to bear the consequences of centrally negotiated salary and benefits settlements. He was "appalled" that no central fund was provided for this purpose. At the very least, if there was no special fund to assist divisions, there should at least be some process by which units could delay making budget reductions to accommodate labour settlements on such short notice.

Professor Kidd replied that there was no alternative in a large, decentralized organization. Labour relations had to be conducted centrally with University wide unions representing various groups of employees. On the other hand, individual units were responsible for their budget planning. While it might be desirable to have a central fund to indemnify the units against the effects of increased compensation costs, with no way of increasing income, there would be no source for a special central fund apart from further budget reductions.

(d) Fees for non-student memberships. A member asked why fees for non-student memberships had in some cases been reduced. Professor Kidd and Mr. Rubenstein, who was invited to speak, replied that the fees had in all cases (apart from the faculty/staff joint membership fee) simply been rounded to the nearest five dollars to simplify administration. In some cases, fees had been rounded up and in other cases rounded down. The overall impact would be negligible. The Faculty hoped to earn an overall increase in income from this source by an increase in the number of memberships.

A member asked whether the Faculty might have been able to avoid its budget reductions by rounding up all fees for non-student members. Professor Kidd replied that fees had been rounded down in only two cases at a minimal cost of 50 cents per month in one case and twenty cents per month in another, with the rest rounded up.

Invited to respond to a member's question, Mr. Rubenstein said that in the summer of 1999, approximately 900 students who were not registered in summer programs at the University of Toronto had paid the summer rate of \$13 per month. The budget anticipated that fewer individuals would pay the new fee of \$30 per month in the summer of 2000.

(e) Implementation of the Report of the Task Force on Gender Equity. A member expressed her pleasure at the steps being taken to implement the recommendations of the 1994 Task Force on Gender Equity. She asked to what degree the Task Force's recommendations had been implemented. Professor Kidd replied that with a number of steps to be taken in connection with the intercollegiate program, and with the proposal contained in the plan now before the Board to hire an additional female track coach, the Task Force's recommendations would be approximately 95% implemented.

It was noted that with approval of the proposal, the fee for full-time students on the St. George campus would increase from \$172.18 to \$173.16.

4. Faculty of Physical Education and Health: Co-curricular Programs – Operating Plans 2000-2001 (cont'd)

On the recommendation of the Vice-Provost, Students,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the 2000-2001 Operating Plan for the Faculty of Physical Education and Health: Co-curricular Programs, as summarized in the memorandum from Professor Kidd, and the attached Operating Budget, be approved; and

THAT beginning in the 2000-2001 Winter Session, the Athletics and Recreation fee for full-time students on the St. George campus be increased from \$172.18 to \$173.16.

5. Compulsory Non-Academic Incidental Fees: Student Society Requests for Increases Beginning Fall 2000

Professor Orchard said that the terms of reference of the University Affairs Board gave the Board the authority to approve changes to non-academic incidental fees including those collected on behalf of student societies. Requests for such changes were brought forward annually. This was the first set of requests on behalf of student societies to be brought forward in this session. Professor Orchard recommended approval of five fee increases: the Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students, the Engineering Society, the Graduate Students' Union, the Innis College Student Society, and the Students' Administrative Council (SAC). He drew members' attention to a revised resolution concerning the SAC fee that had been placed on the table. Specifically, SAC had just advised that they no longer wished to have an increase in their own portion of the SAC fee to compensate for the increase in the Consumer Price Index. Also, the recommended inflationary fee increase for the dental plan portion of the SAC fee was conditional on its approval by the SAC Board of Directors at its meeting on the next day. Professor Orchard added that the Students' Law Society had resolved to continue two special levies for library acquisitions and in support of the Public Interest Advocacy Summer Employment Program. This extension was consistent with the terms approved by the law students in their original referendum. Invited to respond to a question, Mr. Delaney said that the Engineering Society's special project levy was to support the Blue Solar Racing Car Team.

A member observed that a number of elements of the otherwise compulsory student society fees had been designated as refundable at the request of individual students. Many of the fees were very small ones, and the member anticipated that the cost of administering the refund might well exceed the amount of the fee. How many students in fact requested refunds? Why were there refundable elements in otherwise compulsory fees? Who administered the refunds?

Invited to reply, Mr. Delaney, a member, Mr. Bretholz and Ms Dolgoy said that the Students' Administrative Council had the most refundable fees and the most requests for refunds. The refundable element was often very important in securing approval of the fee. The largest number of refunds had been requested for the fees for the SAC health plans - the accident and prescription-drug insurance plan and the dental plan - because SAC had advertised widely the availability of a refund to students who might have coverage in their parents' plans. About 9,500 students had requested refunds. In about 250 cases, students who took the initiative to request those refunds also requested refunds of other fees.

5. Compulsory Non-Academic Incidental Fees: Student Society Requests for Increases Beginning Fall 2000 (cont'd)

On the recommendation of the Vice-Provost, Students,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

The following student society fee increases, as outlined in Professor Orchard's memorandum of May 16, 2000:

Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students (APUS)

THAT, beginning with the Fall 2000/Winter 2001 sessions, the Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students fee be increased by \$2.89 from \$53.89 to \$56.78 (comprised entirely of a \$2.89 increase in the Accident and Prescription Drug portion of the fee) including applicable taxes.

Engineering Society (EngSoc)

THAT, beginning with the Fall 2000/Winter 2001 sessions, the Engineering Society fee be increased by \$5.81 from \$196.15 to \$201.96 (including a \$1.06 increase in the society's portion of the fee and a \$4.75 increase in the Special Projects Levy) and that the designated portion of the fee for Special Projects be continued through the Fall 2001/Winter 2002 sessions.

Graduate Students' Union (GSU)

THAT, beginning with the Fall 2000/Winter 2001 sessions, the Graduate Students' Union fee be increased by \$28.52 from \$156.50 to \$185.02 (including a \$1.48 increase in the society's portion of the fee, a 32¢ increase in the CFS/CFS-Ontario portion of the fee and a \$26.72 increase in the Supplementary Health Coverage portion of the fee, including provincial sales tax) for full-time graduate students, and by 90¢ from \$35.38 to \$36.28 (including a 74¢ increase in the society's portion of the fee, and a 16¢ increase in the CFS/CFS-Ontario portion of the fee) for part-time graduate students.

Innis College Student Society

THAT, beginning with the Fall 2000/Winter 2001 sessions, the Innis College Student Society fee be increased by \$5.02 from \$39.00 to \$44.02 (including a \$1.02 increase in the society's portion of the fee, and a \$4.00 increase in the refugee student fund portion of the fee).

Students' Administrative Council (SAC)

THAT, beginning with the Fall 2000/Winter 2001 sessions, the fee for all SAC members be increased by \$22.26 (composed of the following amounts: \$20.01 - from \$45.60 to \$65.61, including provincial sales tax, in the SAC Accident and Prescription Drug Insurance Plan portion of the fee - \$1.00 for Orientation; 25¢ for the Blue Solar Racing Car Team; and \$1.00 for a Day Care Subsidy); and

THAT, on the condition that the SAC Board of Directors approve (on May 24, 2000) a request for an inflation increase to the Dental Plan portion of the SAC fee, beginning with the Fall 2000/Winter 2001 sessions, the Dental Plan portion of the SAC fee be increased by \$7.75 (from \$77.52 to \$85.27, including provincial sales tax).

6. Compulsory Non-Academic Incidental Fees: Erindale College Athletics and Recreation Association (ECARA) and Operating Plan for the University of Toronto at Mississauga Centre for Physical Education 2000-2001

Professor Orchard said that until the current year, funding for the University of Toronto at Mississauga's Centre for Physical Education was substantially funded with revenue derived through the collection of the fee for the Erindale College Athletics & Recreation Association (ECARA). A portion of that fee was transferred to cover the operations of the athletic facilities. It had been agreed in discussions at the UTM, which included representatives of ECARA, that henceforward the ECARA fee would be reduced and a new fee established for the Centre for Physical Education. An operating plan for the UTM Centre for Physical Education, including the proposed fee, had been approved by the Quality Student Services group at UTM (equivalent to COSS on the St. George Campus) and by the appropriate governance bodies at UTM. ECARA would continue solely as a student society under a new constitution.

Invited to respond to a member's question, Ms Capewell said that the \$80,000 deficit incurred by ECARA in 1999-2000 would be absorbed by the Erindale College Operating Budget through additional revenues realized in 1999-2000.

On the recommendation of the Vice-Provost, Students

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT, beginning with the Fall 2000/Winter 2001 sessions, the Erindale College Athletics & Recreation Association fee be decreased from \$62.00 (\$19.95 part-time) to \$8.60 (\$2.77 part-time);

THAT the annual Operating Plan and Operating Budget for the Centre for Physical Education at the University of Toronto at Mississauga be approved; and

THAT beginning in the Fall 2000/Winter 2001 sessions, a UTM Centre for Physical Education fee of \$83.00 (\$24.90 part-time) be established.

7. Hart House: Board of Stewards' Recommendation Regarding an Accessibility Fund

(a) Introduction

The Chair noted that he had granted speaking privileges on this item to Mr. Paul Tsang, past president of the Graduate Students' Union. He would recognize Mr. Tsang after the matter had been introduced and after questions for clarification had been addressed.

Professor Orchard recalled that the Board had approved the 2000-2001 Operating Plan and Budget for Hart House at its last meeting. The approved fee of \$117.95 amounted to a 1.5% reduction from the 1999-2000 fee, equivalent to a temporary inflationary increase approved three years previously. The Hart House Board of Stewards had passed a motion at its meeting of April 13, 2000 recommending that the 2000-2001 fee instead be retained at the 1999-2000 level of \$119.66, and that the revenue surplus to the operating budget be externally restricted to an accessibility fund and used to fund the construction of a much-needed elevator at Hart House. This funding would hopefully provide leverage in securing external donations to the project. The Council on Student Services had considered the Hart House Board of Stewards' motion at its meeting of April 28, 2000 and had not recommended the additional fee. Nonetheless, the proposal was being brought to the University Affairs Board for consideration.

7. Hart House: Board of Stewards' Recommendation Regarding an Accessibility Fund (cont'd)

(a) Introduction (cont'd)

Professor Orchard clarified that, as had been the case with the Operating Plans and Budget for the Faculty of Physical Education and Health: Co-curricular Programs, the proposal had been supported by a majority of the members of COSS, but it had failed to win the required support of a majority of student members. Accessibility issues had been considered a high priority within COSS; however, student members were of the view that the cost of renovations to make buildings accessible should not be borne by students, but rather by the University's Operating Budget.

(b) Address by a Non-Member: Mr. Paul Tsang, Graduate Students' Union (GSU)

Invited by the Chair to address the Board, Mr. Tsang noted that the proposal did not enjoy the required support of COSS or the GSU for the following reasons.

First, students were already paying for this project. \$130,000 had been transferred from Student Affairs (Student Affairs received its funding from the Student Services fee) and the Students' Administrative Council Wheelchair Accessibility Committee (SACWAC) had approved \$75,000 for this project (SACWAC had raised \$3,000,000 in a student-levy for accessibility projects).

Second, students did not support a student-levy funding of this project. Mr. Tsang, noted that students had spoken against the plan at the Hart House Board of Stewards and he referred members to Ms Hancock's letter appended to the proposal. He continued that at the April 28, 2000 meeting of COSS, representatives of the Students' Administrative Council, the Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students and the GSU had voted against the student-levy proposal.

Third, Mr. Tsang suggested that the plan before members was incomplete. The proposed student-levy would not fund this project to completion. Possible outcomes could include the fact that additional student funding would be required at a later date or that corporate donations would be required for the balance of the project, thus leading to the potential for corporate naming of the elevator.

Fourth, Mr. Tsang believed the proposal was a violation of the University's *General Budget Policies and Procedures* (September, 1993), which stated that the Student Services fee would not be used to cover capital costs of building renovations and construction. The administrative interpretation of the Student Services fee included cultural services, including Hart House.

In conclusion, Mr. Tsang noted that funding alternatives for this project included the Accommodations and Facilities Directorate (AFD) Fund, federal and provincial government infrastructure funds (e.g. Canada/Ontario Infrastructure Works Program), and the Physical Accessibility Initiative Fund that was scheduled for discussion by the Planning and Budget Committee at its Wednesday May 24, 2000 meeting.

In response to a point raised by Mr. Tsang, Ms Hancock clarified that student members of Hart House were very much in support of the proposal.

7. Hart House: Board of Stewards' Recommendation Regarding an Accessibility Fund (cont'd)

(c) Discussion

Discussion of the proposal included the following matters.

Additional Funding from SACWAC. A member observed that SACWAC had previously approved \$75,000 and had recently approved that the remainder of unspent SACWAC funds for this project. Was the later amount known? Ms Hancock clarified that the unspent funds amounted to approximately \$70,000.

Status of project. A member asked about the status of this accessibility project. Specifically, how close was Hart House to securing the necessary funding? Ms Hancock responded that the preliminary cost estimate established in 1998 had been \$1.1 million. Current advice was that this price would have risen by approximately 15%. Approximately half of this amount was in hand. She clarified that the estimate included not only the installation of the elevator, but also the construction of a link between the Arbor Room and the athletic wing and the provision of accessible washrooms, all of which were required to make the building accessible.

A member asked about the prospects for securing the remaining funding for the project. Ms Hancock responded that the elevator in the House's fundraising campaign was currently its biggest priority. A group of members was canvassing private corporations and exploring government opportunities for funding. To date, no alternative sources of funding had been found. She invited members who had suggestions for funding to contact her.

Applicability of the University's *General Budget Policies and Procedures*. A member asked the administration to respond to the GSU assertion that the proposal before members was in violation of University policy. Professor Orchard responded that this issue had been discussed within COSS where the administration had clarified that the Hart House fee was separate and distinct from the Student Services fee, the latter of which was not to cover capital costs of building and renovation and construction. The proposal before members was consistent with the Hart House Operating Plan and Budget, which had been reviewed by members at the previous meeting. Ms Hancock added that the Hart House was entirely funded through the Hart House fee and did not receive funding from the central administration for renovation projects. The Hart House Operating Plan and Budget, therefore, annually took into account deferred maintenance projects.

Invited to speak, a member of the Governing Council asked for a ruling from the Chair. The Chair said that the *General Budget Policies and Procedures* provided that the Student Services fee would not cover capital costs of building renovation and construction. The Hart House fee was a service ancillary fee and not part of the Student Services fee. He continued that even if this were not the case, the University Affairs Board had approved previous annual Operating Plans and Budgets for Hart House, which had included provisions for building renovations and deferred maintenance. There was therefore precedence for using revenues from the Hart House fee to help maintain the physical infrastructure of the House.

Invited by the Chair to speak, the member of the Governing Council countered that as he had indicated earlier in the meeting with regard to the lift in the Benson Building pool, the Hart House elevator should be considered a capital project and as such should be funded from capital sources. As well, the Administrative Interpretation within the *General Budget Policies and Procedures* included Social and Cultural Services (including Hart House...). In response to the possibility that precedence had been set, he suggested that the approval of previous annual Operating Plans and Budgets for Hart House had also been in violation of the *Procedures*.

7. Hart House: Board of Stewards' Recommendation Regarding an Accessibility Fund
(cont'd)

The Chair reiterated his ruling.

Physical Accessibility Initiative before the Planning and Budget Committee. In response to a member's inquiry, the Chair noted that the initiative referred to by Mr. Tsang had been provided by a member of the Governing Council as a notice of motion to the Planning and Budget Committee. It concerned a broad range of physical accessibility issues and should not constrain members' consideration of the motion currently before the Board.

Invited by the Chair to speak, a member of the Governing Council referred members to documentation in support of this initiative which had been placed on the table. The proposal called for the expenditure of \$4.6 million on issues of accessibility on campus. It was the responsibility of the University and society to ensure that accessibility projects were undertaken and that they were not funded by student fees.

Corporate sponsorship opportunities. Ms Hancock responded to the GSU's concern that the Hart House's fundraising drive to secure funding for the elevator would lead to corporate sponsorship and corporate naming of the elevator. She assured Mr. Tsang that this concern was shared by the Hart House Board of Stewards, which had had lengthy discussions of the matter as it related to the Hart House fund-raising campaign. Hart House itself and its Justina Barnicke Art Gallery had been named in recognition of major sponsors; however, the Board was reluctant to pursue corporate naming possibilities. Any such sponsorship opportunities would have to be considered by the Board, which was the governing body for the Hart House.

A member urged caution in declining potential corporate sponsorships. There might be opportunities for gift giving in return for namings that were fulfilled through recognition plaques.

On the recommendation of the Vice-Provost, Students,

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the 2000-2001 Hart House fee for full-time students on the St. George campus remain at \$119.66 and that the revenue surplus to the budget (that is, the difference between the 1999-2000 Hart House fee of \$119.66 and the 2000-2001 operating budget fee of \$117.95) be externally restricted to an accessibility account to fund the construction of the Hart House elevator.

8. Recognized Campus Groups: Report

Professor Orchard noted that the *Policy on Recognition of Campus Groups* provided that the administration was responsible for the implementation of the *Policy*, including the granting, denying or withdrawing of recognition. Such administrative decisions were to be reported regularly to the University Affairs Board for information.

Members had received the second of two reports for this session with their agenda packages. No recognition had been withdrawn in this session; one application had not met the minimum requirements and recognition had been denied. A total of 182 groups had received recognition during the 1999-2000 year.

A member indicated his support for the annual report to the Board.

9. Residence Expansion -- Update

Professor Orchard drew members' attention to a written update on residence expansion, authored by Professor John W. Browne, Director, Residence Development, which had been included in the agenda packages for the meeting. He recalled that users' committee reports concerning matters within the Board's jurisdiction (e.g. residences) were forwarded both to the Academic Board, on the recommendation of its Planning and Budget Committee, and to the University Affairs Board prior to any final consideration by the Governing Council. He recalled that in February, 1999 the Board had endorsed *Student Housing: A Plan for the Next Phase*, which called for 2500 residence spaces on the University's three campuses, thereby providing up to 25% of the student body with access to a residence space. Following the adoption of this planning document by the Governing Council, Professor Browne had been appointed to oversee the expansion.

Invited by the Chair to address the Board, Professor Browne recalled that the Board had endorsed the directions and priorities outlined in *Expanding Residence Capacity at the University of Toronto* at its November 1, 1999 meeting. This document had built upon *Student Housing: A Plan for the Next Phase* and had designated a general direction and particular sites for new residences. The update currently before members provided a status report, described the planning process and identified the next steps to be taken. Attached were: a set of principles to guide the development of student housing, drafted by an ad hoc committee to help inform discussions in the various users' committee and the Planning Office; a response to *Expanding Residence Capacity at the University of Toronto*, developed by the Office of Student Affairs in consultation with a working group composed of people who worked closely with students in residence; and a sample of room data sheets, which provided a template for residence requirements. The latter document was to be used by users' committees in putting together their recommendations; it had proven to be of particular assistance in providing clear direction to the project architects.

Professor Browne noted that the Varsity/Bloor/Devonshire Precinct project, on which members would be briefed later in the meeting, was a major component of the plan. He noted that provision for family housing continued to remain a difficult problem, largely because of financing. This was an issue that would require considerable attention in the next academic year.

In conclusion, Professor Browne noted that four users' committee reports were in the penultimate stage and one was complete. All reports required that funding issues be settled so that the business case for each new residence could be prepared and assessed. Upon completion of this final determination, each would be brought forward to governance for consideration.

A member addressed the need for residences to utilize energy-efficient facilities and to be equipped with ergonomic furniture. Professor Browne agreed, however, in some instance the use of energy-efficient facilities had proven to be a false economy. Facilities were considered carefully with a view to any secondary effects. He undertook to pass on the member's suggestion to the relevant users' committees.

A member expressed his frustration with the lack of plans for family housing. The Graduate Students' Union had undertaken a study that had made a case for the development of sites 5 and 7 for family housing. Professor Browne clarified that each single residence space required approximately 400 square feet; a family residence required approximately 1000-1100 square feet. The additional space required was making it difficult to arrive at a plan where a family-housing ancillary could be run on a cost-recovery basis -- as was required of all residences by policy -- while also proving to be affordable to students. The member responded that the issue of cost-recovery for family housing should be revisited. It was important that the University recognize the needs of this constituency. Ms Van Norman underscored the need for increased family housing, noting that the waiting list had grown by 100 families in the past year.

10. Varsity/Devonshire/Bloor Precinct: Oral Presentation

The Chair noted that the evolution of the Varsity/Devonshire/Bloor precinct had implications for each of the Governing Council's three boards. Prior to consideration of the capital project by the Governing Council, the Academic Board, on the advice of its Planning and Budget Committee, would be asked to approve in principle the capital project including such elements as site, space plan, overall costs and sources of funds. The role of the University Affairs Board would be to offer advice on the residence project, anticipated residence fees, parking, and the quality of student life within the project. Subject to the approval of the Academic and University Affairs Boards, the Business Board would be asked to establish appropriations and to authorize the execution of the capital project within the approved costs, thus ensuring that the University was getting the best value for its investment. The Business Board would also be asked to review the financial plan for the project to ensure that it was sound.

The Chair welcomed Dr. Jack Dimond, Secretary Emeritus of the Governing Council, and coordinator of the project.

Dr. Dimond presented members with a model of the proposed development plans for the area now designated as the Varsity/Devonshire/Bloor precinct. He recalled the decision of the Governing Council one year previously not to pursue a large-scale commercial development project on this site but instead to pursue a different plan. The development to date had been guided by two sources: the athletic centre task force, which had specified various site requirements, and the residence expansion program, which called for a substantial increase in residence spaces on campus so that 25% of the University's full-time students could be housed on campus. The model represented a work in progress and a great deal of work remained before a formal report and recommendation could be made to the Governing Council.

Dr. Dimond then highlighted the proposed aspects of the development project.

(a) Athletics Facilities

- the athletic field would be maintained in its north-south orientation and would be equipped with an all-weather surface;
- an 8-lane track would border the athletic field;
- the 20,000 seats currently in the stadium would be torn down and replaced by 5000 seats on east side of the site. These would be partly cantilevered over the roof of the existing Varsity arena, thus providing space for a concourse that would house common facilities for users of the stadium and arena;
- substantial renovations, in line with recommendations of the athletic centre task force, would be made to Varsity Arena; and
- a second hockey rink, turned in an east-west orientation, would be constructed immediately south of the existing arena. This would allow the University to decommission the existing open-air rink located on Robert Street. Dr. Dimond noted that this site was partially owned by Trinity College and, therefore, the cooperation of the College would be required for its development.

(b) Residences

- a capacity of 1660 residence spaces was projected for the precinct, which included not only the Varsity Stadium/Arena, but also the lands on the west side of Devonshire Place north of the Trinity tennis courts and the south-east corner of Bloor Street and St. George;
- the majority of residences being contemplated were suite style (i.e. four bedrooms grouped into a single suite with a kitchen/living area and one or more bathrooms);

10. Varsity/Devonshire/Bloor Precinct: Oral Presentation (cont'd)**(b) Residences** (cont'd)

- about 380 of these residence spaces were earmarked for Woodsworth College, which had proposed the site at Bloor and St. George Street (Site 26) as the location for its new residence. Dr. Dimond anticipated that this might be the first site to be developed;
- a residence was contemplated for the west side of Devonshire Place (Site 12) which currently housed a parking lot and two day care facilities. The development of Site 12 would require that the University find alternative space for the facilities and would, therefore, take some time to develop;
- an area of new green space, comparable in size to the quadrangle within Massey College, would be created west of Devonshire between the above two new buildings;
- the field within the Varsity Stadium site would be moved south and east to create building sites along the perimeter of the site and would be slightly below grade;
- a 6-story building, with generous openings for views throughout the site, would border the perimeter to the south and west sides of the new stadium. At the north-west corner of the site there would be a 'point' tower of thirteen additional stories above the six stories that would house approximately 380 residence spaces and at the north-east corner a similar tower would house approximately 320 students;
- in addition, each tower would have approximately 15 two-bedroom apartments for housing new faculty;
- the two towers, including the building on which they would sit, would be 19 stories in height, 3 stories higher than the OISE/UT building on the north side of Bloor Street;
- a small building site on the south-west corner of the Varsity Stadium site would be able to accommodate 100 residence spaces. Running north from this building along the east side of Devonshire Place would be a narrow building with 100 additional spaces. This building would include, at grade, several views through to and a means of easy access to the playing field area; and
- the final residence element under study was a 130-bed dormitory-style building on the south face of the proposed new second rink. Since this would be entirely on Trinity College property, it was being presented as an option for Trinity College to consider.

(c) Other Development Potential

- the administration was studying the possibility of an underground multiplex movie theatre to be located beneath the north end of the playing field. Such an initiative would be more likely if it could assist in financing the overall precinct development;
- at-grade spaces along the Bloor Street frontage of the precinct, as well as some second floor spaces, would house retail or student service space. As each residence plan was developed, student service spaces would be contemplated; and
- landscaping would be a significant component of the project, including a lot of attention to the various streetscapes and plans to reinvigorate Philosophers Walk.

In conclusion, Dr. Dimond underscored that the project was preliminary and that he and his colleagues were continuing to get feedback from on- and off-campus groups. Discussions with the City's Planning Office, particularly concerning the development of the Bloor Street frontage between Avenue Road and St. George Street, were an integral step in the process. He anticipated that a more complete report would be available in the early fall.

10. Varsity/Devonshire/Bloor Precinct: Oral Presentation (cont'd)

Discussion ensued during which the following points were made.

(a) Parking. The Chair asked if there was provision for increased parking in the precinct to accommodate increased numbers of users and residents. Dr. Dimond responded that the City of Toronto's by-law provided for an overall number of parking spaces on the St. George campus (2000 spaces). This project would not displace many of the University's existing parking lots. As well, while there would be an increased number of residences, these would be to accommodate existing students. Consequently there were no plans at present to add a parking lot. He clarified that an underground parking lot might be contemplated in the event that significant commercial development was added on the Bloor Street frontage.

(b) Day Care. A member asked if there would be any day care facilities located in the precinct. Dr. Dimond responded that discussions were underway with the Margaret Fletcher Day Care Centre regarding a new location for the Centre. He recalled that the Centre was located on site 12, which had been designated as a site for a new residence. He agreed that it would be practical to offer day care facilities within or nearby to any new family residence. At this time, no family housing residences were contemplated for this precinct. The member noted that it would be a good idea to provide day care in the precinct given the plans to add 1660 residence places.

(c) Family Housing. A member expressed frustration that the project contemplated faculty housing while no family housing was being considered. He questioned the priority for faculty housing given the existing provision of such housing in University-owned houses adjacent to the campus. Moreover, students had been placed in hotels during the current year because of an increase in demand for student housing. Dr. Dimond responded that in designing the precinct, the administration had sought to balance a number of competing objectives. He emphasized that there was need for increased faculty housing because of the University's plans to increase its faculty complement and because of the cost of living in Toronto. The provision of faculty housing would allow the University to help attract new faculty to the University at this time of faculty growth. In future, when the demand for faculty housing decreased, this housing could be adapted to provide student housing.

The Chair thanked members for their comments, noting that the matter would be discussed by the Board again in the fall. As well, there might be further opportunity for Board members to offer their advice in the event that a summer meeting was necessary.

11. Reports of the Administrative Assessors**(a) Student Financial Support**

Professor Orchard noted that the University's *Policy on Student Financial Support* required that he monitor and report annually to governance, through the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs, on the results of regular student surveys directed at assessing the accessibility of the University's programs. He had submitted his first report in April 1999 and a second interim report to the Committee earlier in the month. This evaluation of accessibility included a regular, professional survey of students by the Hitachi Research Centre at the University of Toronto at Mississauga. In 1999, the Centre had surveyed students in undergraduate programs and in the programs with deregulated fees (Dentistry, Law, MBA, Medicine and Pharmacy). The current year's survey also assessed accessibility for students in undergraduate programs and professional faculties. The surveys compared the demographic characteristics of (a) students in

11. Reports of the Administrative Assessors (cont'd)

(a) Student Financial Support (cont'd)

the upper years of their programs, who were not affected by the major increases in tuition fees, and (b) students in first year, who were facing those fee increases. With respect to ethno-cultural background, the 1999 survey found that the proportion of students who identified themselves as being from non-European background had, notwithstanding higher tuition fees, increased from 37% in the upper years to 46% in first year. The preliminary results from the recently completed survey found that the proportion had increased further to approximately 49%. With respect to family income, the proportion of students from families with incomes under \$30,000 had increased from 15% in the upper years in 1999, to 18% in first year in 1999, to approximately 24% currently in first year. The survey also monitored the current debt load being carried by students, and it found no significant change. All indicators showed that the combination of higher tuition fees, along with more financial assistance to needy students, was not reducing accessibility. On the contrary, more students from non-European and from low-income families were attending the University. Professor Orchard stressed that the University was taking its commitment to financial assistance very seriously; spending to provide financial-aid counselling was approximately \$300,000 per year. The program delivered by those counsellors was one that Professor Orchard thought to be the leading one in Canada, and one which was succeeding in its objective of maintaining and increasing accessibility to the University.

A member suggested that it was not possible to draw any conclusions based on the data presented given that tuition fees had been deregulated only two years previously. A member added that only those students who applied to the University of Toronto were surveyed. Data concerning those students who did not apply because of financial circumstances and/or the threat of incurring debts was not therefore available.

(b) Review of DisAbility Service for Students

Ms Addario recalled that she had reported at the previous meeting that she and the Vice-Provost, Students had commissioned a review of the DisAbility Service for Students. The terms of reference for the review had been appended to the Annual Report and Operating Plan 2000-2001 for the Office of Student Affairs, a copy of which members had received with their previous agenda packages. Ms Addario was pleased to report that reviewers had since been appointed and that a report outlining findings and recommendations was expected by the end of June.

12. Date of the Next Meeting

The Chair reminded members that there might be need for a summer meeting. Next year's schedule had not yet been finalized. It would be distributed shortly to continuing and new members.

13. Other Business

(a) Installation of Elevator at the First Nations House

In response to a member's inquiry, Professor Orchard reported that the design and ordering of an elevator at the First Nations House in the North Borden Building would take place this summer. The member responded that this was a very welcome initiative, particularly because of the higher-than-average rate of diabetes in Aboriginal persons which made climbing stairs very difficult.

13. Other Business (cont'd)

(b) Family Housing

A member advocated that the Board make a statement to the administration concerning the need to prioritize family housing. Professor Orchard undertook to relay the member's concern to the Provost.

A member of the Governing Council who wished to comment further on Dr. Dimond's presentation was ruled out of order by the Chair.

The meeting adjourned at 7:30 p.m.

Secretary

June 14, 2000

Chair