

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

REPORT NUMBER 99 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD

May 1, 2001

To the Governing Council,
University of Toronto.

Your Board reports that it held a meeting on Tuesday May 1, 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
Ms. Yvette Ali

Dr. Robert Bennett
Professor Marion Bogo

Ms. Jennifer Carson
Dr. Shari Graham Fell

Ms. Naana Afua Jumah
Professor Bruce Kidd

Mr. Vivek Krishnamurthy
Dr. Heather Lane

Ms. Karen Lewis

Mr. Paul McCann

Professor Ian McDonald

Mrs. Susan M. Scace

Non-Voting Members:

Mr. Louis Charpentier, Secretary,
Governing Council

Miss Janice Oliver, Assistant Vice-President
Operations and Services

Ms. Marilyn Van Norman, Director, Student
Services

Secretariat:

Mrs. Beverley Stefureak, Secretary

Ms. Cristina Oke

Regrets:

The Honourable William G. Davis

Ms. Susan Eng

Mr. Ljupco Gjorgjinski

Ms. Margaret Hancock

Mr. Darren R. Levstek

Ms. Szu-Mae Yoon

In Attendance:

Mr. Carlo Andreatia, Occupational Therapy & Physical Therapy Undergraduate
Association

Mr. George Banman, Undergraduate Pharmacy Society

Mr. Mark Britt, Internal Audit Department

Mr. Chris Cronin, Faculty of Information Studies Students' Council

Mr. Jim Delaney, Assistant Director, Student Affairs

Ms. Agata Derkola, Students' Administrative Council

Mr. Adam Giles, *The Medium*

Ms. Kim Heppler, Graduate Architecture, Landscape and Design Student Union

Mr. James Hoch, Graduate Students' Union

Ms. Andrea Howard, New College Residence Council

Ms. Angela Iarocci, Graduate Architecture, Landscape and Design Student Union

Mr. Jim Karahalios, Engineering Society

Ms. Elizabeth Martin, Co-ordinator, AccessAbility Resource Centre, University of
Toronto at Mississauga (UTM)

Mr. Richie Mehta, *The Medium*

Mr. Tom Nowers, Associate Principal, Student Affairs, University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSc)

In Attendance (cont'd)

Ms. Carmel O'Sullivan, President, Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students

Ms. Gurjit Sangha, Nursing Undergraduate Society

Mr. Justin Saunders, Students' Administrative Council

Ms. Janice Smith, Nursing Undergraduate Society

Mr. Jorge Sousa, President, Graduate Students' Union

Mr. Hanif Thakor, President-elect, Scarborough Campus Students' Council

Ms. Cheryl Wessel, Internal Audit Department

ALL ITEMS ARE REPORTED FOR INFORMATION.

The Chair introduced and welcomed to the meeting Ms. Carmel O'Sullivan, the newly elected President of the Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students.

1. Reports of Previous Meetings

The Chair reported that Report Number 98 was not ready to be presented for approval and would be brought to the next meeting. Report Number 97 of March 27, 2001 was approved with no amendments.

2. Business Arising from the Reports of the Previous Meetings

The Chair said that the only business arising of which he was aware was a report on the elections issue. He indicated that Mr. Charpentier would address this later in the meeting. There was no other business arising.

3. Student Societies: Financial Statements 1999-2000 and Summary of Auditors' Reports

The Chair introduced Mark Britt and Cheryl Wessel of the University's Internal Audit Department, who were present to respond to questions on this item.

Professor Orchard introduced the Financial Statements 1999-2000 and Summary of Auditors' Reports for the student societies. Referring to his memorandum of April 16 and attachments, he said that University policy required financial statements audited by a public accountant from each student society that received proceeds of a compulsory non-academic incidental fee. Failing this, the student society was required to obtain an exemption from the University's internal auditor. He noted that Mr. Delaney was the administrator primarily responsible for this area and invited him to comment.

Mr. Delaney noted that his memorandum of April 16, 2001 summarized the matters arising from the Auditors' report. He said that some financial statements were missing but that was common for this time of year. He saw no difficulty in getting those in the near future.

The Chair invited Mr. Britt to speak. Mr. Britt indicated he had nothing to add.

A member asked for clarification of a qualified opinion from the auditors and whether that indicated corrective steps or action would be taken. Mr. Delaney said this would depend on the nature of the reason underlying the qualified opinion. Usually the

qualification was not serious and related to the way revenue was handled. If the qualification were serious, corrective steps would be pursued.

4. Compulsory Non-Academic Incidental Fees: Student Society Requests for New Fees and Increases or Continuation of Existing Fees (including University of Toronto at Scarborough, Proposed Student Centre)

Professor Orchard referred to his memorandum of April 23, 2001 and the attached documents. New fees, increases to existing fees, or continuation of special levies requested by student societies were subject to approval by the University Affairs Board. He noted that approval was sought for one new fee and increases or continuation of ten existing ones.

At the request of the Chair, Mr. Delaney introduced the student members present who would help him respond to questions.

A member asked if the increased fee requested by the Graduate Students' Union for Supplementary Health Coverage would result in increased coverage. Mr. Sousa responded that the increase was due to increasing costs and changes within the insurance industry. Coverage for 2001-02 would maintain most of what was currently enjoyed except for some prescription drugs which would now be excluded.

A member asked for clarification of the Board's role in approving these fees. The Chair responded that approval by the University Affairs Board was the final test of accountability. The Board's role was to assure future generations of students who would be subject to these fees that policy relating to the collection of these fees had been followed.

Continuing, Mr. Delaney indicated there was a trust relationship between the University and the students paying these fees. Governance approval was necessary before the University could proceed to collect these fees in trust. This scrutiny was part of fulfilling the Board's responsibility to assess requests and ensure that the student societies had followed procedures set out in their constitutions and in the University policy relating to compulsory non-academic incidental fees. Further, it was the Board's role, as indicated by the previous item, to hold the student societies accountable for the manner in which the fees were managed.

A member questioned how the proposed new Graduate Architecture, Landscape and Design Student Union fee, which seemed high, compared to other graduate fees. Mr. Delaney responded that it was lower than the discontinued fee for undergraduates in the same Faculty. Ms. Heppler added that when the amount was determined the students had looked to the \$100 to \$120 undergraduate fees as a precedent. In addition, she noted that this student society received no support from the Faculty and only a small levy from the Graduate Students' Union.

A member questioned whether the increased Students' Administrative Council fee designated for the Dental Plan meant there would be an increase in benefits. He understood that the second part of the proposed increase was inflationary. Mr. Saunders confirmed that the second portion of the proposal, although turned down by referendum, was the amount allowed for inflation. He said there were no new dental benefits, but that a referendum to increase fees for the Dental Plan had been approved and SAC proposed to proceed with this because of increased costs.

Referring to the proposed increase in fees for *The Medium*, a member asked if there was a minimum voter turnout required. Mr. Delaney said that the University expected no

minimum. Some societies established a minimum voter turnout in their constitutions. *The Medium* required a minimum number of society members voting but was silent on

4. Compulsory Non-Academic Incidental Fees: Student Society Requests for New Fees and Increases or Continuation of Existing Fees (including University of Toronto at Scarborough, Proposed Student Centre) (cont'd)

non-members. This was a fee proposed for part-time students and the question was put to that constituency who were not currently members of the society. A majority of those who voted supported the fee. Mr. Mehta and Mr. Giles acknowledged a low voter turnout but noted that a similar low turnout of part-time student voters occurred in other referenda. Since part-time and full-time students shared the benefit from the publication, it was thought fair that both pay fees to support it. In conclusion, it was noted that the proposed fee had the full support of the Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students.

A member questioned the proposal to discontinue the levy for the Career Development Office in the Faculty of Law. Mr. Delaney said that the Students' Law Society was unaware that its levy ended this year until it was too late to hold a referendum. The Faculty of Law had agreed to begin funding the Career Development Office beginning in the fall 2003 and they had moved that forward to fall 2002 to ensure continuous operation of the Office.

A member from Scarborough thought it was important to note for the record the well-managed campaign leading up to the referendum for the new Student Centre at the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSc). On behalf of the Board, he thanked management and students for their tireless efforts in bringing this to a successful conclusion. The Vice-Chair added that he had visited UTSc during the campaign and had been impressed with the wide publicity that the new Student Centre had been given prior to the referendum. He added his congratulations for a job well done.

In response to a question about the route by which the part-time fee for *The Medium* had come to the University Affairs Board, Mr. Delaney said that in all cases, on behalf of the student society, he assessed a number of criteria before bringing forward a proposal. He looked for an indication of student support, he ensured that the process outlined in the society's constitution had been followed and he satisfied himself that any significant issues that had arisen were dealt with appropriately and successfully. No additional criteria had been applied to the proposal for *The Medium* fee.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THE proposed new fee for the Graduate Architecture, Landscape and Design Student Union; the requests to increase fees or continue special levies for the Engineering Society, the Graduate Students' Union, the Faculty of Information Studies Student Council, *The Medium*, New College Residence Council, Nursing Undergraduate Society, Occupational Therapy and Physical Therapy Undergraduate Association, Undergraduate Pharmaceutical Society, Scarborough Campus Students' Council and the Students' Administrative Council; and, the termination of student society fees for Landscape Architecture Student Society and the Students' Law Society, as outlined in Professor Ian Orchard's memorandum of April 23, 2001 (attached as Appendix "A").

The Chair noted that the motion had been carried unanimously and thanked the guests who had attended to assist with responding to questions.

5. Accessibility Reports: University of Toronto at Mississauga and University of Toronto at Scarborough

Miss Oliver referred to the reports which had been circulated to the Board. She introduced Ms. Elizabeth Martin, Co-ordinator, AccessAbility Resource Centre, University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM). The reports from UTM and UTSc were provided in response to a request that the Board be informed on how audits were conducted on those campuses and how accessible those campuses were for students. She thought both reports were informative and well written. A group was currently completing a report on the St. George campus for presentation to the next meeting of the University Affairs Board.

A member asked about the principles of universal design to which the UTM report referred. In the member's view, they seemed vague and the member was unsure how they could be fulfilled. Ms. Martin indicated that these were a summary of principles available in great detail from a University of North Carolina publication. She could refer the member to the publication or, alternatively, the member could review it on the website of the University of North Carolina.

In response to a question from the Chair, Miss Oliver indicated that audit reports from all three campuses would normally come to the University Affairs Board at its February meeting.

6. Report of the Administrative Assessors

Professor Orchard had no issues to report at this meeting. A member queried when the annual report on student financial aid would come to governance. Professor Orchard indicated it had been presented in December to the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs and in February to the Business Board. He offered to send the member a copy of the report.

Ms. Addario had no issues on which to report but invited one of the Co-Chairs of the Special Committee to Review the *Code of Student Conduct* to provide an update to the Board. Dr. Lane reported briefly that the Committee was meeting weekly, considering nine major points which had arisen out of written and personal input to the Committee. The task had been difficult and the issues complex. Drafting of the report would begin shortly and she expected the final report to be ready for the Board's review by the middle of June.

Miss Oliver said she had no items to report.

The Chair asked Mr. Charpentier to provide the Board with an update on elections. Mr. Charpentier reported that the University Registrar was preparing advice on the question of special students which would go to the Elections Committee. He hoped the Elections Committee could meet on May 14 and that a report would be forthcoming to the next meeting of the University Affairs Board.

A member asked about a notice of motion which had been forwarded to the Chair following the last meeting regarding physical accessibility and retrofit of University facilities. The Chair said that this issue was not within the terms of reference of this Board and, therefore, it had not been included on the Agenda. He noted, too, that the same issue had been put before the Planning and Budget Committee.

7. Next Meeting – June 5, 2001, 5:00 – 7:00 p.m

The Chair noted the next meeting of the Board was scheduled for Tuesday, June 5 from 5:00 to 7:00 p.m.

8. Other Business

There was no other business.

The meeting adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

Secretary

May 22, 2001

Chair