

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

**REPORT NUMBER 127 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD**

**March 29, 2005**

To the Governing Council,  
University of Toronto.

Your Board reports that it met on Tuesday, March 29, 2005 at 4:30 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, with the following members present:

Dr. Robert M. Bennett, In the Chair  
Mr. Ari D. Kopolovic, Vice-Chair  
Professor David Farrar, Deputy Provost  
and Vice-Provost, Students  
Ms Anne E. MacDonald,  
Director, Ancillary Services  
Ms Katherine Anne Boyd  
Mr. Christopher M. Collins  
Ms Margaret Hancock  
Ms Shaila R. Kibria  
Professor Bruce Kidd  
Ms Françoise Ko  
Mr. Chris McGrath  
Dr. John P. Nestor  
Ms Teresa Pun  
Mr. Tarek Saghir  
Miss Maureen Somerville  
Ms Rebecca Spagnolo  
Ms Maggy Stepanian  
Ms Preet Virdi

Dr. John Wedge

Non-Voting Assessors:

Ms Susan Addario, Director, Student Affairs  
Mr. Louis R. Charpentier, Secretary,  
Governing Council  
Ms Marilyn Van Norman, Director,  
Student Services  
Professor Ian Orchard, Vice-President and  
Principal, University of Toronto at  
Mississauga  
Professor Ronald D. Venter, Vice-Provost,  
Space and Facilities Planning

Secretariat:

Mr. Neil Dobbs  
Mr. Andrew Drummond

Regrets:

Ms Mubarka Alam  
Mr. Shaun Chen

Dr. Claude S. Davis  
Dr. Joel A. Kirsh

In Attendance:

Ms Oriel Varga, member, the Governing Council  
Mr. Mahadeo Sukhai, member-elect, the Governing Council and President, Graduate Students' Union  
Ms Murphy Browne, President, Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students and former member,  
the Governing Council  
Ms Karen Lewis, Assistant Dean, Administrative Services and Equity, Faculty of Physical Education  
and Health and former member of the Governing Council  
Ms Catherine J. Riggall, Vice-President, Business Affairs  
Ms Sheila Brown, Chief Financial Officer  
Mr. Sameer Al-Abdul-Wahid, Treasurer, Graduate Students' Union  
Mr. Fraser Anderson, Charles Street Student Family Housing  
Ms Melissa Calder, Coordinator, International Students and Programs, University of Toronto at  
Scarborough

**REPORT NUMBER 127 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – March 29, 2005**

In Attendance (Cont'd)

Ms Simone Chiose, Tenant, Charles Street Family Residence  
Ms Gloria Cuneo, Charles Street Student Family Housing  
Mr. Jim Delaney, Assistant Director, Student Affairs  
Ms Sheree Drummond, Assistant Provost  
Mr. Ken Duncliffe, Director of the Centre for Physical Education, Recreation and Athletics,  
University of Toronto at Mississauga  
Mr. Davis Elisha, Executive Assistant, Office of Student Services  
Mr. Russell Field, Co-Chair, Council of Athletics and Recreation  
Mr. Darcy Griffith, Manager, Police and Parking Services, University of Toronto at Scarborough  
Ms Yien Ha, Business Officer Assistant to the Executive Director, Student Affairs, University of  
Toronto at Scarborough  
Ms Liz Hoffman, Assistant Dean, Co-curricular Education, Faculty of Physical Education and Health  
Ms Pearl Karimalis, Charles Street Student Family Housing  
Mr. Jaan Laaniste, Director, Physical Education & Athletics, University of Toronto at Scarborough  
Mr. James Linley, Acting Director, Business Services, University of Toronto at Mississauga  
Ms Sarah Lipton, Co-chair, Council of Athletics and Recreation  
Ms Alexandra Love, Director, Health & Wellness Centre, University of Toronto at Scarborough  
Mr. Alex MacIsaac, Parking Services, St. George Campus  
Mr. Jack Martin, Director, Hospitality and Retail Services, University of Toronto at Scarborough  
Ms Carmela Mazin, Financial Officer, Business Operations, University of Toronto at Scarborough  
Ms Joan McCurdy-Myers, Manager, Career Centre, University of Toronto at Mississauga  
Mr. Tom Nowers, Assistant Principal (Students) and Executive Director, Student Affairs, University  
of Toronto at Scarborough  
Ms Victoria Orr, Charles Street Student Family Housing  
Mr. Mark Overton, Dean of Student Affairs, University of Toronto at Mississauga  
Mr. Lou Ranalli, Manager, Accounting Services, Financial Services Office  
Mr. Paul Readings, 89 Chestnut Residence  
Mr. Terry Rubenstein, Manager, Financial Services and Information Technology, Faculty of Physical  
Education and Health  
Mr. Howard Tam, Vice-President, University Affairs, Students' Administrative Council  
Ms Michelle Verbrugge, Director, Student Housing and Residence Life, University of Toronto at  
Scarborough

ALL ITEMS ARE REPORTED FOR INFORMATION

**Chair's Remarks**

The Chair welcomed two new members, Ms Françoise Ko, graduate student governor, and Miss Maureen Somerville, alumni governor, to the Board.

**Resolution to Confirm Previous Decisions**

With the agreement of members, the Chair added to the agenda a motion to confirm decisions taken by the Board on behalf of the Governing Council between July 1, 2004 and March 29, 2005. He informed the Board that, in order to transact business under delegated authority from the Governing Council, the Board had to have a majority of Governing Council members. Since the composition of the Board was a very detailed one, it had come to light only recently that the previous membership of the Board did not include such a majority. In order to rectify the situation, the Executive Committee had appointed Ms Ko and Miss Somerville to serve on the Board from March 29, 2005 until June 30, 2005.

**REPORT NUMBER 127 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – March 29, 2005**

**Resolution to Confirm Previous Decisions (cont'd.)**

To ensure that the Board's actions to date were not called into question, he asked the Board to confirm its decisions. Most of the Board's work before this meeting had taken one of three forms: (a) recommendations to the Governing Council, which had been approved by the Council (the Statement of Commitment Regarding Persons with Disabilities and the Policy on Crisis Preparedness and Response, for example), (b) internal procedural matters (appointment of its Striking Committee, for example), and (c) review of reports for information (including the Report of the Equity Officers, for example). The Board did, however, approve two matters within its jurisdiction: the fee increases for the Students' Administrative Council and the Scarborough Campus Students' Union and minor revisions to the constitution of the Hart House Board of Stewards.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD CONFIRMED

Its decisions at its previous meetings in the 2004-05 governance year.

**Chair's Remarks (cont'd.)**

On another matter, the Chair offered his congratulations on behalf of the Board to the Vice-Chair, Mr. Ari Kopolovic, who had been named to receive one of the prestigious University of Toronto Alumni Association Scholarships, awarded to graduating students for outstanding academic achievement and contributions to the University.

The Chair then noted the large number of guests in the gallery and welcomed them all to the meeting. He informed the Board that many of the individuals present had assisted in the preparation of the numerous operating plans put forward for approval. He thanked them for their efforts on behalf of the University and for their work to improve the student experience. The Chair then reminded all members that their duty was not to manage the University, but to ensure that the University was managed well, and he summarized the extensive processes by which operating plans were reviewed by various governance bodies before they came forward for the Board's consideration.

Lastly, he noted for members' information that a revised agenda had been placed on the table, with minor changes made to two motions.

**1. Report of the Previous Meeting**

Report Number 126 (February 22, 2005) was approved.

**2. Business Arising from the Report**

The Chair noted that the discussion of the student experience at the February 22, 2005 meeting had been a very fruitful one. He informed the Board that Mr. Mahadeo Sukhai, President, Graduate Students' Union, along with the Executive of the GSU, had prepared a thoughtful response to the report presented by the Vice-Provost, Students. That report had been distributed to all members. Professor Farrar thanked the GSU for its thoughtful contributions on the question of the student experience, and informed the Board that he and his colleagues would take it into account when continuing their work to improve the student experience.

**REPORT NUMBER 127 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – March 29, 2005****2. Business Arising from the Report (cont'd.)**

The Chair then noted that the report presented on February 22, 2005 was a first report for information. Steps to improve the student experience could involve budget allocations, which would be brought forward for approval at the appropriate time as part of the budget process. Reviews of policies and any revisions that arose out of the academic plan would also be conducted in accordance with normal processes and would be brought for approval to the appropriate Board or Committee.

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

**3. Operating Plans: Service Ancillaries**

The Chair welcomed to the meeting the leaders of the service ancillaries, who were present to answer questions during the consideration of the various ancillaries' operating plans.

Professor Farrar summarized the range of units that comprised the service ancillaries, noting that residences, food and beverage services, conference services, parking, and Hart House were all required to prepare plans and submit them to an extensive review and consultation process, each of which involved local planning as well as review by the central Financial Services Department. Finally, the Service Ancillaries Review Group (SARG) met to review all the plans in detail, following which they went to the President and Vice-Presidents for approval. Ancillary units, according to policy, had four major directives: 1) no subsidy from the University's operating budget was permitted; 2) ancillaries needed to build funds for capital renewal into their budgets; 3) if the first two conditions were met, ancillaries were required to create and maintain an operating reserve; 4) lastly, if all three previous conditions were met, they were required to make a net revenue contribution to their division's operating budget. In 2002, the policy had been revised to allow operating subsidies for certain residence ancillaries, for an eight-year maximum, to help meet the cost of new buildings. In these cases, capital renewal could also be deferred for six years. Although there was a more detailed operating plan for each of the ancillaries, the Board was asked to approve a summary of the operating budget, capital budget, and schedule of fees for each of the ancillaries.

Professor Farrar then noted several highlights that were common to most of the ancillaries. Increasing enrolment was altering the expectations of the ancillaries, as were insufficient minimum down payments on residences. The advent of the double cohort had required significant extra attention from staff and the hiring of new staff to accommodate demand. Because the academic year stretched into May, the use of some ancillaries to generate external revenue during the four summer months were affected. Lastly, a tourism slump in Toronto as a result of the SARS outbreak and the blackout in 2003 had affected the ancillaries' operations.

A member asked why Hart House was included in the service ancillaries group. Professor Farrar clarified that a portion of Hart House's plan was included herein because of its status as a service ancillary, but that the Hart House operating plan (item 6 (e), below) did not conflict with the elements included for this item.

A member asked if the University anticipated that it would be able maintain reasonable levels of residence occupancy, given the rate increases and the opening of new residence buildings. Professor Farrar responded that the University did not anticipate any reduction in demand sufficient to alter the operating plans. He noted that occupancy was near 100% in residences, including the 89 Chestnut residence. The member then asked if the significant percentage increases to parking rates at the Scarborough and Mississauga campuses were sustainable. Professor Farrar responded that the increases represented a step increase, and were not planned to increase that substantially again in future years.

**REPORT NUMBER 127 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – March 29, 2005****3. Operating Plans: Service Ancillaries (cont'd.)**

Professor Orchard noted that although the increases planned for parking rates were substantial, the total cost envisioned was still approximately half of that for the St. George campus. Historically, Professor Orchard said, 30% of UTM students required parking, and with recent enrolment growth, a new parking structure would be required. He felt that the operating plan presented was sustainable. Mr. Griffith noted that he anticipated that future increases to UTSC parking rates would be approximately 3%, and revenues generated would pay for retrofits of existing lots and parking expansion.

The Chair then invited guests to speak. Mr. Sameer Al-Abdul-Wahid, Treasurer, Graduate Students' Union, noted his objections to the increases in parking rates at UTM, which he felt were excessive. In his opinion, the University should attempt to persuade the local transit authority that its service to the UTM campus was insufficient. Students faced an undue hardship from having to pay such high amounts for parking. Secondly, he objected to a planned 6% increase in fees for the UTM graduate residence; the rent would be excessive to students, and asked the Board to consider a plan whereby residence construction should be funded by the University, rather than by students who could ill-afford such significant increases.

The Chair then invited Ms Simone Chiose, representing the tenants of Charles Street Family Residence, to speak. Ms Chiose requested that the Board not approve the rent increase for the Charles Street Residence, noting that use of the food bank and the 'free store' was already very high and that the residence units themselves were small, with problems with both pests and security. The construction of the new day care at the site, with its 52 places, had caused considerable disruption and would not provide sufficient benefit to meet the demand in the residence for child care. She informed the Board that approximately 65% of the students at the Charles Street Residence were international students, who had the least ability to deal with rent increases of any constituency.

Mr. Al-Abdul-Wahid concluded the presentation by urging the Board to approve plans that did not diminish student access to affordable services, and he asked the administration not to engage in plans that would affect graduate students so negatively.

In response to the concerns raised, Professor Orchard noted that UTM was undergoing an expansion from approximately 6000 students to approximately 11,500 in a very short time. The UTM campus was in an attractive but environmentally sensitive spot, and the Erindale College Council had voted unanimously that the preservation of green space should be a key element of campus planning. New buildings, therefore, had been constructed on parking lots to avoid loss of green space. The expansion of parking was urgent, and therefore, the administration was recommending plans to construct an above-ground parkade (rather than a surface lot, which would remove green space, or an underground lot, whose costs were prohibitive). The processes to arrive at this decision were inclusive and consultative. He concurred that the increases were significant, but noted again that the total cost of parking after implementing the increases would still be only half of the cost of parking at the St. George campus. The plan would meet the conditions of controlled growth and development (signified by the slogan "Grow Smart, Grow Green") for the UTM campus. On the issue of the residence, Professor Orchard informed the Board that undergraduate residence fees were subsidizing those of graduate students, and that the rent increase for graduate students was a means to re-establish equity in pricing.

Professor Farrar, in response to comments raised about the Charles Street Residence, informed the Board that the administration did not subsidize ancillaries, and that students should seek financial aid by other means if they required it. He felt that the planned 2.5% rent increase was reasonable, and that the rents would remain well below current market rates, even on a square-foot basis. The upgrades planned for the

**REPORT NUMBER 127 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – March 29, 2005****3. Operating Plans: Service Ancillaries (cont'd.)**

Charles Street Residence were substantial. Ms Macdonald reported that, when the University purchased the residence buildings several years earlier, it had received a tenant 'wish list' for what was required, including pest control, new windows, better access to child care, and so on. Child care, she noted, was a very important element of planning for the family residences, and although it would not meet all the demand, the new facility would be of enormous assistance to students with children, and would operate with a significant subsidy to ensure that very affordable child care was available. Two additional maintenance staff had been hired. Ms Macdonald noted that in 2004, the Board had referred the original plan for the residence back because it had introduced differential increases in rent; that issue was no longer relevant. She then noted that, in recognition of a difficult year (with the construction noise, for example), the total increase had been reduced. She acknowledged that there remained some problems with the residence, but noted that they were being addressed systematically to the extent possible from the current rental income.

A member said that, in her opinion, it was inappropriate to discuss the level of rents in residence as a function of the market, but rather, rents should be set in such a way to be affordable to students. The justification of rent levels as being only a portion of the market rate for similar accommodation masked the difficulty that students had in paying their rent.

Another member said that students at UTM were supportive of the preservation of green space at that campus, but they opposed the construction of new parking facilities because of the increased pollution brought to campus by the additional cars that could be accommodated. She said that the University should do its part to increase students' desire to take the bus to university, and should lobby the Peel Region for direct bus routes from locations such as Oakville and Brampton, and within Mississauga. She asked that the administration sponsor a town hall, because opposition to the plan to construct a parkade had been expressed by the Students' Administrative Council (SAC), the Erindale Part-Time Undergraduate Students (EPUS), and the United Steelworkers of America (USWA), among others.

A member noted that for residences to meet all needs on a daily basis was very difficult. Ancillary operations, he noted, operated without a subsidy, and the University would put its residences' ability to exist in a precarious position if the funds provided to them were too low. Residence rates, he argued, should not be used to subsidize tenants, but the University should rely upon more direct methods of supporting students. It was impossible to ignore local market conditions, which not only set rental rates outside the University, but also set construction and operating costs, which had to be recovered through rental in order to pay for the facility. The University was not, he emphasized, in the business of providing social-assistance housing.

A member asked why some ancillaries were in a debt position while others were in a surplus, and whether the with surpluses would be transferred to the division's operating budget. In particular, he asked if the New College food and beverage ancillary provided revenue to the operating budget.

Ms Macdonald responded that those with an anticipated surplus had planned their financial situation in order to provide for future capital renewal. Professor Farrar reminded members of the four principles of ancillary operations and noted that some ancillaries might make a profit from summer activities that would help fund school-year operations.

A member asked about the reference to a \$13 million one-time-only subsidy for the 89 Chestnut Residence. Ms Riggall clarified that, if the one-time-only subsidy was made, the present value of all subsidies to the 89 Chestnut Residence would be \$13,550 per bed, lower than the subsidy per bed for the new Woodsworth College Residence – the only other residence that did not operate along with other

**REPORT NUMBER 127 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – March 29, 2005**

**3. Operating Plans: Service Ancillaries (cont'd.)**

established residences. It would allow the residence to break even annually in year five of its plan and cumulatively in year eight. She also noted that it was the only residence to have 100% debt financing.

On the recommendation of the Deputy Provost and Vice-Provost, Students,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

(a) the 2005-06 operating plans and budgets for the Service Ancillaries, as summarized in Schedule II to the *Services Ancillaries Report on Operating Plans for the Year 2005-06*, dated March 11, 2005, (b) the service ancillary capital budgets as summarized in Schedule V to that Report, and (c) the rates and fees in Schedule VI to that Report.

**4. Operating Plans: Student Services, University of Toronto at Mississauga**

Professor Orchard briefly summarized the process by which the operating plans for the Student Services at the University of Toronto at Mississauga were brought forward. He noted in particular his pride in the hard work of his staff and congratulated them on the preparation of an excellent plan.

On the recommendation of the Vice-President and Principal,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

the 2005-06 operating plans for the Student Services at the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM), including their annual budgets and the following fees:

The sessional fee for full-time students on the UTM campus of \$260.39 and the sessional fee for part-time students on the UTM campus of \$52.08, which represent an increase of 2.0%, and which include:

the Health Services fee of \$18.15 for full-time students and \$3.63 for part-time students; the Centre for Physical Education, Recreation and Athletics fee of \$68.04 for full-time students and \$13.61 for part-time students; the levy for construction of the new Wellness Centre of \$75 for full-time students and \$15.00 for part-time students (unchanged), and the Student Services fee of \$99.20 for full-time students and \$19.84 for part-time students.

**5. Operating Plans: Student Services, University of Toronto at Scarborough**

Mr. Nowers briefly summarized the operating plans for UTSC's Student Services, noting that because of an unexpected shortfall in enrolment and overhead costs for the new Student Centre, the plans included a large one-time-only increase in fees. He noted his pride in the students at UTSC, who had chosen to endorse the increase in order to maintain services. He informed the Board that the Athletic sector of the budget had been able to mitigate the total increase through its contribution.

**REPORT NUMBER 127 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – March 29, 2005**

**5. Operating Plans: Student Services, University of Toronto at Scarborough (cont'd.)**

On the recommendation of the Deputy Provost and Vice-Provost, Students,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

the 2005-06 operating plans for the Student Services at the University of Toronto at Scarborough, including their annual budgets and the following fees:

The sessional fee for full-time students on the UTSC campus of \$228.65 and the sessional fee for part-time students on the UTSC campus of \$45.73 which represent an increase of 11.0%, and which include:

the Student Services fee of \$105.61 for full-time students and \$21.12 for part-time students,  
the Health and Wellness fee of \$39.14 for full-time students and \$7.83 for part-time students, and  
the Physical Education and Athletics fee of \$83.90 for full-time students and \$16.78 for part-time students.

**6. Operating Plans: Student Services, St. George Campus**

**a. Advice from the Council on Student Services (COSS)**

Professor Farrar informed members that the Council on Student Services (COSS), which was responsible for providing advice to the Board on student services fees at the St. George campus, had not been constituted properly, with three members who did not belong to the constituencies from which they had been appointed. Because the outcome would probably have been unchanged, he proposed that the plans proceed to the Board as if COSS had been properly constituted. He further informed the Board that, when COSS rejects the applications for fee increases, the option existed to bring increases in line with the lesser of either the Consumer Price Index (CPI) or the University of Toronto Index (UTI) for that year.

Professor Farrar then informed the Board that a request to increase the fees for the Co-Curricular programs in the Faculty of Physical Education and Health by 2.8% had been rejected. A request for an increase to Student Services of 2.0% and 0% for Health Services had been approved. A request from Hart House for a net increase of 2.0%, consisting of a permanent increase of 3.5% (resulting from the expiration of a temporary increase of 1.5%) had been rejected. Lastly, Student Affairs had requested an increase of 3.6%, which had been rejected. In place of the rejected increases, as allowed under the COSS protocol, Physical Education and Health had returned with a request for a 2.0% increase, Hart House had returned with a request for a permanent increase of 2.0% and a temporary increase of 1.5%, and Student Affairs was requesting a 2.0% increase.

A member asked Professor Farrar to comment on the reasons for COSS' rejection of the three requests. Professor Farrar stated that, in his opinion, the students on the Council felt that the administration was insufficiently active in lobbying for increased governmental funding to provide for student services. He further informed the Board that, as a result of the decision, two of the three services had prepared revised budgets with smaller increases and changes to plans that resulted from them, while Hart House had altered its plan to incorporate a temporary increase to maintain its budget.

**REPORT NUMBER 127 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – March 29, 2005****6. Operating Plans: Student Services, St. George Campus (cont'd.)****a. Advice from the Council on Student Services (COSS) (cont'd.)**

A member asked why, if in some cases the UTI was below 0%, any fee increases were allowed at all. Mr. Delaney replied that it had been the practice in the past to disregard UTI if it were below 0%, and that CPI was used in such instances.

The Chair invited Ms Murphy Browne, President, Association of Part-Time Undergraduate Students (APUS), and former member, the Governing Council, to speak. She informed the Board that she was bitterly disappointed, concerned, and alarmed that APUS' representatives on COSS had been declared ineligible to serve, especially since the issues surrounding their membership had only been brought up in the period immediately prior to the key COSS meeting at which the recommendations would be made to the Board. She stated that the two students deemed ineligible to serve as APUS representatives had been duly elected according to APUS bylaw, and that the University should not have the authority to interfere with the rights of autonomous groups. Furthermore, she noted, the two students voted according to the will of APUS as determined by its last assembly.

The Chair invited Mr. Howard Tam, Vice-President, University Affairs, Students' Administrative Council (SAC) to speak to the Board. Mr. Tam stated that the University's position on the validity of the students' membership represented only one interpretation, and that SAC held a different view. He disagreed with the administration's presentation of the role of COSS as an advisory body, noting that Ontario government policy required that universities have means by which students would be involved with the assessment of relevant fees. Whenever COSS disagreed with the plans presented by services, proposals tended to be resubmitted with temporary increases. In addition, the 'all-or-nothing' nature of the plans presented meant that constructive change was difficult to achieve. Furthermore, he noted, the COSS Secretariat should have examined the status of students serving on the Council prior to the time it did. In addition, Mr. Tam stated that, since the development of the COSS protocol, the definitions of what constituted part-time and full-time status had changed, and, arguably, the definitions in use at the time of the protocol's development should still be operational. Lastly, he noted, the votes would have been the same regardless of COSS' membership.

Mr. Tam then informed the Board of another concern: some members felt intimidated by University representatives, which indicated that the entire COSS process was dysfunctional. The implementation of the protocol had not resulted in the cooperative attitude envisioned by the governmental regulations, but had instead resulted in confrontational meetings characterized by mutual suspicion and distrust.

A member noted that referring to the processes for the development of operating plans as 'all-or-nothing' was inaccurate and did not adequately represent the nature of the development of the plans in question, in particular for those plans falling under the mandate of the Service Ancillaries Review Group.

**REPORT NUMBER 127 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – March 29, 2005**

**6. Operating Plans: Student Services, St. George Campus (cont'd.)**

**b. Operating Plans for the Student Services (St. George Campus) and the Health Services (St. George Campus)**

Professor Farrar introduced the Student Services and Health Services Operating Plans.

On the recommendation of the Deputy Provost and Vice-Provost, Students,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

the 2005-06 operating plans for the Student Services and the Health Services at the St. George Campus, including their annual budgets and the following fees:

The Student Services sessional fee on the St. George Campus of \$54.39 for full-time students and \$10.88 for part-time students, which represent an increase of 2.0%; and

The Health Service and Psychiatric Service sessional fee on the St. George Campus of \$17.13 for full-time students and \$3.42 for part-time students, unchanged from 2004-05.

**c. Operating Plans for Student Affairs (St. George Campus)**

Professor Farrar introduced the Student Affairs Operating Plans. A member asked about the background to the elimination of the alcohol monitoring fee. Ms Addario responded that the fee was a vestige of an old agreement to provide support for server training and alcohol education. The Student Affairs Advisory Committee had determined that it was not an appropriate transfer to ancillaries, and that the alcohol education mandate should be transferred elsewhere. Adequate notice had been provided that the subsidy would be removed.

On the recommendation of the Deputy Provost and Vice-Provost, Students,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

the 2005-06 operating plans for Student Affairs on the St. George Campus, including the annual budget and the following fee increases:

The sessional fee on the St. George Campus: to \$22.97 for full-time students and \$4.59 for part-time students, which represent an increase of 2.0%.

**REPORT NUMBER 127 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – March 29, 2005**

**6. Operating Plans: Student Services, St. George Campus (cont'd.)**

**d. Operating Plans for the Faculty of Physical Education and Health: Co-Curricular Programs, Services and Facilities**

Professor Farrar summarized the operating plan for the co-curricular programs in the Faculty of Physical Education and Health. A member commended those responsible for reducing the increase to 2.0% from the original proposal's 2.8% increase.

On the recommendation of the Deputy Provost and Vice-Provost, Students,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

the 2005-06 operating plan for the co-curricular programs, services and facilities in the Faculty of Physical Education and Health, including the annual budget and the following fees:

The sessional fee on the St. George campus of \$99.64 for full-time students and \$19.93 for part-time students, which represent a three-year temporary increase of 2.0%; and

The sessional fee for UTM and UTSC students of \$12.48 for full-time students and \$2.50 for part-time students, which represent a temporary three-year increase of 2.0%.

**e. Operating Plans for Hart House**

Professor Farrar summarized the operating plan for Hart House. He noted that the net increase proposed remained at 2.0%, which the House Board of Stewards felt was appropriate.

On the recommendation of the Deputy Provost and Vice-Provost, Students,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

the 2005-06 operating plan for Hart House, including the annual budget and the following fees:

The sessional fee on the St. George campus of \$61.52 for full-time students and \$12.30 for part-time students, and

The sessional fee for UTM and UTSC students of \$1.88 for full-time students and \$0.38 for part-time students,

which represent a net increase of 2.0% over the 2004-05 fee due to a 1.5% decrease caused by the termination of a temporary increase approved in 2002, plus a permanent increase of 2.0% and a three-year temporary increase of 1.5%.

Following the passage of the motion, Professor Orchard noted with thanks the hard work that went into the preparation of all the operating plans presented for approval at the meeting.

**7. Report of the Senior Assessor**

**REPORT NUMBER 127 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – March 29, 2005**

Professor Farrar referred members to his written report. In addition, he thanked all the staff members for their hard work in preparing the operating plans for Board approval.

**8. Reports of the Elections Committee**

Members received for information Reports 38 (February 10, 2005) and 39 (March 17, 2005) of the Elections Committee. There was no discussion.

**9. Dates of Next Meetings**

The Chair informed members that the next two meetings were scheduled for April 26, 2005 and May 31, 2005, both at 4:30 p.m.

**10. Other Business**

The Chair referred members to a news story (which had been placed on the table) concerning the efforts of the Student Crisis Response Team and AccessAbility Services to assist a visually-impaired student who was the victim of a fire in her dormitory room. He noted that dedicated members of staff rarely received the recognition they deserved for the actions taken on a daily basis to assist students.

On another topic, a member suggested that the administration had acted improperly in informing the three members who were found to be ineligible to serve on COSS (see agenda item 6(a), above). She suggested that the process of verification of membership should take place earlier, and informed all members that all COSS members' intentions to serve were based in good faith. She felt it was inappropriate for the COSS Secretariat to have contacted the three by electronic means, and that the Chair should have been more directly involved. The lateness of the actions taken by the COSS Secretariat were, she felt, an attempt to intimidate students into voting in favour of inappropriate increases.

A member asked the administration to separate the issues surrounding COSS into two categories, namely, technical and legal. In the short term, the administration should come forward with means by which the technical aspects of COSS could be repaired, but in the longer term, it should focus on answering the questions of why COSS seemed to oppose proposed operating plans regularly, and whether COSS was, indeed, the correct structure to satisfy student consultation. Another member noted that other Ontario universities seemed not to have the level of adversarial confrontation in determining student service fees, and wondered why the University of Toronto seemed to be uniquely adversarial.

Ms Addario noted that the lateness of the discovery of the three ineligible students was not an attempt to intimidate or otherwise influence the COSS membership, but happened to be the time when it was discovered. She stressed that the administration had determined to proceed with operating plans as if they were approved appropriately, because the three votes, even with new membership, would not have made a difference. She noted that the COSS Secretariat had, in the past, relied upon the various student associations to supply appropriate memberships, but that in the future it would proceed with verification checks in the same manner as the Office of the Governing Council at the beginning of each session.

A member said that, in her opinion, the meeting should have been delayed in order to accommodate new membership. Professor Farrar stated his view that Ms Addario's assessment was correct, and an alternative solution would likely have been seen as undue intimidation on the part of the administration. Furthermore, he noted, the outcome would not likely have been different.

**10. Other Business (cont'd.)**

**REPORT NUMBER 127 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – March 29, 2005**

A member noted that the administration and APUS differed on what constituted part-time status. Another member felt that the administration had undermined the reputations of the various student organizations involved.

Mr. Charpentier informed the Board that his advice to the COSS Secretariat was that it should check the status of all COSS members twice annually, consistent with the practice used in the Office of the Governing Council. He informed the Board that the definition of part-time and full-time status was the responsibility of the Governing Council, and although student organizations might define themselves differently, COSS, as an entity created under the auspices of the Governing Council, had to respect its definitions.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

The meeting moved *in camera*.

**11. Governing Council Elections - Interim Chief Returning Officer: Appointment**

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT Ms Cristina Oke be appointed Interim Chief Returning Officer, effective immediately and continuing until June 30, 2005 or until a new Chief Returning Officer is appointed.

The meeting adjourned at 6:25 p.m.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Secretary

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chair

April 13, 2005