

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

**REPORT NUMBER 98 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD**

**April 18, 2001**

To the Governing Council,  
University of Toronto.

Your Board reports that it held a special meeting on Wednesday April 18, 2001, at 5:00 p.m. in the Governing Council Chamber at which the following were present:

Mr. Brian C. Burchell (In the Chair)  
Mr. Fayez Quereshy, Vice-Chair  
Professor Ian Orchard, Vice-Provost  
Students

Ms. Susan Addario, Director,  
Student Affairs

Mr. Muhammad Basil Ahmad

Dr. Robert Bennett

Ms. Jennifer Carson

Ms. Susan Eng

Dr. Shari Graham Fell

Mr. Ljupco Gjorgjinski

Ms. Margaret Hancock

Professor Bruce Kidd

Mr. Vivek Krishnamurthy

Mr. Darren R. Levstek

Ms. Karen Lewis

Mr. Paul McCann

Non-Voting Members:

Ms. Marilyn Van Norman, Director, Student  
Services

Secretariat:

Mrs. Beverley Stefureak, Secretary

Ms. Margaret McKone

Regrets:

Ms. Yvette Ali

Professor Marion Bogo

The Honourable William G. Davis

Ms. Naana Afua Jumah

Dr. Heather Lane

Professor Ian McDonald

Mrs. Susan M. Scace

Ms. Szu-Mae Yoon

In Attendance:

Mr. Jim Delaney, Assistant Director, Student Affairs

Ms. Katherine Hensel, Chair, Margaret Fletcher Daycare Centre Board of Directors and  
member of the Student Affairs Advisory Committee 2000-01

Ms. Manon LePaven, President, Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students

Mr. Jorge Sousa, President, Graduate Students' Union

**ALL ITEMS ARE REPORTED FOR INFORMATION.**

The Chair explained that this Special Meeting had been requested by the Vice-Provost, Students on behalf of the Council on Student Services (COSS). Because of a conflict with important campus activities, the Council had been unable to review the plans now before the Board within the time frame necessary to get them to the regularly scheduled meeting in March.

**1. Operating Plans**

Professor Orchard referred to his memorandum of April 9, 2001 outlining in general terms the process that had been undertaken to approve the operating plans for the St. George campus Student Affairs and Student Services offices and providing advice to the

**1. Operating Plans** (cont'd)

University Affairs Board on co-curricular activities. He noted that the plans covered a number of areas on which there were separate reports and which would be considered under separate motions. However, he believed it important that the Board be made aware of the scrutiny these plans had undergone. As well, it was his responsibility to report on the review by COSS.

Plans were generally put together by each of the areas of student services. In Physical Education and Athletics, the Dean had both academic and co-curricular responsibility, and co-coordinated the plan. Hart House, Student Affairs and Student Services reported through Professor Orchard's office. As a result of restructuring several years ago, Student Affairs and Student Services had been separated. He recalled the distribution in September of terms of reference that described the distinction between the two units and noted that the operating plans presented today reiterated that distinction and explained the responsibilities of each.

Professor Orchard referred the Board to the meeting package which listed the members of the student advisory committees. He noted that each of the plans had been developed with extensive consultation and he had thought it worthwhile for the Board to know how wide the participation had been. He congratulated the various areas for the significant student representation throughout the development and writing of the operating plans at the unit level.

The Protocol for the approval of compulsory non-academic fees provided for COSS to make recommendations to the University Affairs Board through the senior assessor on operating plans and budgets. Professor Orchard reported that the plans had undergone detailed discussion through several meetings at COSS. The Council's motions were reported in his memorandum of April 9, 2001 and the advice from the administration was given on page 5.

**1.1 Physical Education and Health**

Professor Orchard referred to his memorandum of April 11, 2001 and the appended executive summary and operating plans/budget for 2001-02 for co-curricular programs, Services and Facilities in Athletics and Recreation. He said the Faculty had come forward with a well-developed plan, after extensive consultation with students. He viewed the co-curricular programs as contributing greatly to the quality of student life at the University and was pleased to recommend approval, as had COSS.

Professor Orchard invited Dean Kidd to comment. Dean Kidd began by saying that the proposed budget sought to maintain important programs and facilities at their current levels without program cuts, layoffs or increased users' fees. The Faculty's goal in this budget year was to undertake major multi-year planning exercises. Two task forces were already underway and an objective was to improve performance measures aided by a card swipe access system. The Faculty was in the final stages of preparing detailed programming and operating plans for the new Varsity Centre, including plans for a facility to replace the Stadium.

Dean Kidd hoped the budget would address three concerns of students: to reduce the optional summer fee to 1999 levels; to retain a full array of student employment activities; and to maintain free access to the David L. McIntosh Sports Medicine Clinic whether an injury occurred in the University's programs or elsewhere.

Dean Kidd noted that the budget asked for a fee increase, which was being applied universally. Additional revenue was needed to meet salary increases and most of the

**1.1 Physical Education and Health** (cont'd)

increase would go to that. Everywhere else estimated spending had been held constant in a responsible way. Fees were income tax deductible and eligible for UTAPS and OSAP. The increased universal fee would avoid imposing new user fees, maintained the programs, achieved the goals of the student representatives, avoided cutbacks and used the fairest method of assessment to cover increased costs.

The Chair recognized Mr. Sousa. Mr. Sousa began by stating that the GSU strongly supported in principle and policy the operating plans of each of the student services. He wished, however, to bring to the attention of the Board that the GSU did not support the co-curricular budget because, despite lobbying and several meetings with the Dean, in its view the budget did not address GSU's policy and position on intercollegiate athletics.

Several years ago, the GSU requested that the University phase-out the use of Student Services fees to fund intercollegiate athletics. Although graduate students recognized the benefit of intercollegiate athletics to the participants, the spectators and the greater University community, they did not believe that students should be paying for 700 athletes of which approximately 10% were graduate students, to participate in high performance athletics. The GSU believed that the University should be taking a greater role in funding intercollegiate athletics.

A member asked for an estimate of how much overlap there was in the Faculty between costs that were assigned to academic Faculty costs and those that were assigned to the ancillary. Dean Kidd responded that, where expenditures could not be specifically identified as one or the other, e.g. in some administrative spending, judgments are made about what percentage should be allocated to which area. He was able to assure the Board that revenue generated by co-curricular programs went only into co-curricular budgets. To the degree possible, separate envelopes were maintained and every effort was made to maintain openness and fairness.

Members from various constituencies spoke in praise of the benefit provided by the athletics and recreation programs not only to students, staff and faculty of the University, but also to the greater Toronto community.

A member thought that more funding should be provided to Athletics and Recreation from central University funds. He saw the sports activities as a way to combat student apathy and considered it important that there be more prominent advertising of athletics facilities and greater efforts to recruit top athletes to the University.

Dean Kidd responded that this was a complex challenge shared by all urban universities where there were many entertainment choices and the mass media was partnered with professional sports. The Faculty had worked committedly to communicate the message that varsity sports were more exciting than other choices but there were limitations to the spending that could be done in support of public relations. Emphasis had been on providing program options and he was pleased to report that the University of Toronto provided more options than any other university in North America and did so with fewer resources. Here, one-third of the budget was spent on inter-collegiate sports and two-thirds on others. In most other universities, the reverse was true. He closed by noting that the Faculty would like to work with students to find a better way to advertise effectively.

A member reminded the Board that students had fought hard to have things like the Clinic remain untouched because that was so important. He noted, too, that there were 9,000 graduate students involved in intramural athletics and just this month Graduate

**1.1 Physical Education and Health (cont'd)**

House was accepted as a full member. He thought it very important that Athletics and Recreation defined its base to reach as many students as possible.

A member returned to the issue of increased University funding to co-curricular activities, noting that only 3% of its funding came from the University central funds. Given its importance to the University community, and what he saw as an artificial division between co-curricular and academic activities of the Faculty, consideration should be given to requesting an infusion of funds for expansion of the co-curricular program.

Professor Orchard said that Dean Kidd had approached the Provost on many occasions seeking support for the Faculty. The need was recognized but the Provost was unable to respond at a time when divisions were asked to take cutbacks and when the emphasis was on improving financial support to students.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

**YOUR BOARD APPROVED**

THE 2001-02 Operating Plans and Budget for the Faculty of Physical Education and Health: Co-curricular Programs, Services and Facilities in Athletics, as described in the March 8, 2001 memorandum from the Dean of the Faculty, Professor Bruce Kidd; and,

THAT the fee for a full-time student increase from \$173.16 to \$179.56 (an increase of \$6.40) and the fee for a part-time student increase from \$51.94 to \$53.86 (an increase of \$1.92), beginning in the 2001 fall session.

The Chair reported that the motion had been carried unanimously.

**1.2 Hart House**

Professor Orchard introduced the Hart House Operating Plans for 2001-02 which were attached to his memorandum of April 11, 2001. He said that the plans and the budget had been reviewed by the Service Ancillaries Review Group (SARG) and had received conditional approval as noted in the excerpt from the meeting of SARG on February 19. SARG concerns had been addressed by the Warden in her letter to the Acting Chief Financial Officer. Both documents were attached as the final pages to the Hart House package.

Professor Orchard commented that Hart House was a tremendous asset to the University. It made a wonderful contribution to the student experience through its development of leadership skills and its club and other activities. It provided benefits to students, staff and alumni.

Professor Orchard reported that Hart House had undertaken a survey of students to look at usage of and satisfaction with the facility. The results would be used in the next five-year plan. He noted that recently the Hart House Theatre had been incorporated into Hart House, following development of an incorporation plan and approval by the Board of Stewards. The Operating Plan and Budget had been approved by COSS.

Warden Hancock added that the Hart House Five-Year Plan had been circulated with the meeting package for March 27 and she hoped that members had had the opportunity to

**1.3 Hart House (cont'd)**

review it. A member asked about plans for installing an elevator. Ms. Hancock noted that this had been addressed in her letter to the Acting Chief Financial Officer. Elevator installation would occur in three phases. This was part of a plan to make the whole House accessible and the first phase would start in June with the renovation of the area from the Arbor Room to the athletics area. The next phase would provide access to the washrooms on the second and third floor, following which the shaft for the elevator would be installed. However, phase two could not go ahead until financing was in place. Fund-raising had been given top priority; about \$600,000 was available now.

The Chair asked if this renovation represented a naming opportunity. Ms. Hancock replied that there was reluctance to name anything because the mission of the House was to honour all individual students regardless of contribution.

A member expressed concern about the spiraling cost that might be encountered if this project did not proceed quickly. Ms. Hancock replied that there was also the issue of proceeding with the renovations sequentially to ensure that operations could continue throughout.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

**YOUR BOARD APPROVED**

THE 2001-02 Operating Plans and Budget for Hart House, as summarized in Service Ancillary Operating Plan and Budget from the Warden of Hart House, Margaret Hancock; and,  
THAT the fee for a full-time student increase from \$119.66 to \$120.24 (an increase of \$.58) and that the fee for a part-time student increase from \$35.90 to \$36.07 (an increase of \$.17), beginning in the 2001 fall session.

The Chair reported that the motion had been carried unanimously.

**1.3 Student Affairs – St. George Campus**

Professor Orchard introduced the Annual Report and Operating Plan 2001-02 of Student Affairs which explained the organization of the unit, highlighted achievements in the past year and outlined objectives for the upcoming year. He thought Student Affairs provided great service to the students of the University and that this was evident in the Annual Report.

Professor Orchard reported that the Student Affairs Advisory Committee, which had representatives from many student groups including the Graduate Students' Union, the Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students and the Students' Administrative Council, reviewed the operating plans and budget of Student Affairs through five meetings. That group had given its approval. When the matter was taken to COSS, discussion focused on one aspect of the Plan, which had not been raised as an issue at the Advisory Committee though it had been discussed extensively for a year. That matter was the issue of the \$76,000 subsidy for the UTM shuttle bus. Notice had been given a year ago that this subsidy would be removed because it was unfair to St. George students who did not live in Mississauga. This issue had been discussed fully and the Student Affairs Advisory Committee had agreed to its discontinuation. However, it was again

discussed at the COSS meeting where the motion for approval failed because the majority of the student members were not in support.

### **1.3 Student Affairs – St. George Campus (cont'd)**

Professor Orchard indicated that to offset the loss of the subsidy, fares had been significantly increased for non-UTM students who had been using the service as a commuting alternative to public transport. The impact of the change would be monitored carefully in the next year and work with UTM would continue to ensure that their students would not be disadvantaged.

Despite the failed motion at COSS, the administration believed this was a positive plan and a good budget, maintaining excellent service to students with no fee increase. Accordingly, Professor Orchard was pleased to recommend that it be approved.

Ms. Addario added that the department had opted for a discursive report this year to describe the distinction between Student Affairs and Student Services and for ease of reading and understanding. She hoped the description of the activities of the Office of Student Affairs was useful. She informed members of discussions with the east and west campuses, noting that both were supportive of the operating plan.

Invited to comment, Ms. Hensel stated that the process for the approval of the operating plan was very thorough and that approval had occurred only after consultation with all relevant groups. Concerns brought to the attention of the Advisory Committee were discussed in detail. Issues were circulated electronically to ensure inclusion of members who may have been absent during the discussion. No response or comments from absent members had been received. The Advisory Committee was unanimous in its support of the operating plan. The shuttle bus had not been raised as an issue of concern there.

A member asked about the status of childcare on campus. Ms. Addario said there were four facilities currently available: Margaret Fletcher, Campus Co-op Daycare, Nancy's, and Kids' Space. A Users' Committee report three years ago had recommended amalgamation of all four. Events had overtaken the recommendation and a new Users' Committee had been established to pull together quickly recommendations based on information gathered since the last report. It was expected this would go to the Planning and Budget Committee in May. Campus Co-op Daycare had been given notice in January that it would need to relocate in eighteen months. Since then, discussions had reopened on sites and possible locations. Spaces would increase to about 185, depending on licensing restrictions. Notwithstanding the increase, there would still be shortage of spaces.

A member asked for further information on what might have been the underlying reason for the fact that this Operating Plan had not been approved at the COSS meeting. The COSS view was brought to the Board through the senior assessor and the Chair asked Professor Orchard to reply. Professor Orchard stated that he could not add anything to what he had stated earlier. The shuttle bus had not been raised as an issue at any previous meeting. It then had been raised at the final meeting. His thoughts were that some members at that time may still have been confused about the implications of the subsidy removal. For example, there was evidence that some members thought the increased fare would apply to UTM students when clearly this was not the case.

Ms. Addario added that the shuttle bus initially had been put in place by UTM to meet the needs of UTM students who were required to attend classes downtown. About three years ago, it had been discovered that about 30% of the passengers were not in programs at UTM and were using the service as an inexpensive alternative to public transportation. It seemed reasonable at that time for St. George to assist with the increasing cost of providing more buses to accommodate more students. Last year, this subsidy amounted to \$76,000 for the benefit of a few commuting St. George students from Mississauga, out of Student Affairs funding that should equally be for the benefit of all St. George

**1.3 Student Affairs – St. George Campus (cont'd)**

students. This was not a student service and following discussions with UTM it had been agreed that the subsidy would be discontinued, but that UTM would be given one year to work out a budget model.

She concluded by noting that the buses were now running half empty; that the expectation was that the number of buses would drop; and, that there would be a readjustment to accommodate those students for whom the service had been initiated and who had not increased in number significantly since the service commenced.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

**YOUR BOARD APPROVED**

THE 2001-02 Operating Plans and Budget for the Office of Student Affairs, as described in the March 7, 2001 submission from the Director of Student Affairs, Ms. Addario; and,

THAT the part of the Student Service Fee which supports Student Affairs be unchanged at \$42.30 for a full-time student and \$12.69 for a part-time student, beginning in the 2001 fall session.

The Chair reported that the motion had been carried with 1 abstention.

**1.4 Student Services – St. George Campus**

Professor Orchard introduced the Operating Plans and Budget for Student Services. He noted that the Office of Student Services at the University of Toronto was considered by many to be the best in North America. The Office provided tremendous services to students and had proposed an excellent plan and a matching set of services for the coming year. He was pleased to support the Plan and allow the Office to do its work well in ensuring a pleasant experience for our students. The Operating Plans and Budget had been approved by COSS.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

**YOUR BOARD APPROVED**

THE 2001-02 Operating Plans and Budget for Student Services, as summarized in the submission from the Director of Student Services, Ms. Van Norman; and,

THAT the part of the Student Service Fee which supports Student Services be unchanged at \$103.00 for a full-time student and \$30.90 for a part-time student, beginning in the 2001 fall session.

The Chair reported that the motion had been carried unanimously.

**1.5 Health Services and Student Psychiatric Service**

Professor Orchard said that Health Services and Student Psychiatric Services were funded slightly differently than the offices of Student Services and Student Affairs and, so, were presented separately. He noted that the Operating Plans and Budgets for these two services had been unanimously supported by COSS. Both areas provided excellent service to students and were of significant importance to the quality of student life.



**1.5 Health Services and Student Psychiatric Service (cont'd)**

A member thought that the funding for health services should be increased. She believed there was a serious access problem for students because of an overworked service. She saw these as equally important to Athletics and thought there should be an equal increase in fees.

Ms. Van Norman noted that the service was OHIP funded so an increased fee would not solve the problem of the line-ups. The issue was space-related and was under consideration. If the clinic could be expanded, more doctors would be available. In response to a follow-up question, Ms. Van Norman indicated efforts were underway to identify space in the Koffler Centre. If it were concluded that this preferred location was not possible, the feasibility of expanding outside the Koffler Centre would be looked at.

In response to a question, Ms. Addario said there was a sense that many students who use the psychiatric services were also problem students or potential disciplinary cases. On the contrary, she noted that many students who use the service used it for assistance in developing coping strategies. Many used the disability services office for the same reasons. A great number of these students managed very well and successfully completed their programs. Only a small number were dysfunctional and fewer still showed up in the discipline statistics.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

**YOUR BOARD APPROVED**

THE 2001-02 Operating Plans and Budget for the Health Services and Student Psychiatric Service as summarized in the submission from the Director of Student Services, Ms. Van Norman; and,

THAT the Health Service Fee remain unchanged at \$34.25 for a full-time student and \$10.28 for a part-time student, beginning in the 2001 fall session.

The Chair reported that the motion had been carried unanimously.

**2. Next Meeting – May 1, 2001, 5:00 – 7:00 p.m.**

The Chair reminded members that the next meeting was scheduled for May 1, 2001

---

Secretary

---

Chair

April 30, 2001