



**Faculty of Physical Education and Health**  
*University of Toronto*

**Memorandum**

January 30, 2003

TO: Council of Student Services

FROM: Bruce Kidd, Dean

**RE: 2003-2004 Budget  
2003-2008 Budget Plan  
Co-curricular Programs, Services and Facilities in Athletics and  
Recreation**

**Executive Summary:**

The 2003-2004 budget is presented as part of the multi-year budget plan for 2003-2008 requested by the Council of Athletics and Recreation (CAR) last year. The budget and the multi-year plan were presented to CAR on January 29; CAR will officially vote on the budget on February 6.

The priority of the 2003-2008 plan is to address major facility maintenance that has been deferred for many years. The budget plan increases the annual allocation to major maintenance from \$300,000 in 2002-2003 to \$500,000 in 2003-2004 and \$850,000 per year thereafter.

The budget plan also begins the implementation of the recommendations the report of the Intramural Task Force, extends recreational swim hours, and provides a grant of \$10,000 towards the athletic programs and facilities at the Institute of Aerospace Studies in Downsview. It will continue the staffing of the Field House in the Athletic and Physical Education Centre by strength and conditioning specialists and maintain the gender equity fund for students in intercollegiate sports.

Otherwise, the proposed budget maintains programs and services at current levels..

In the first year of the plan, the budget calls for expenditures of \$13,659,323 against revenues of \$13,659,323.

The budget calls for a student fee increase of 4.5% a year for each of the five years of the plan, and comparable annual increases to other membership fees. The proposed student fee increases must be approved by the Council of Student Services (COSS).

In addition, the plan proposes that locker fees be raised to \$75 a year, and that a \$25 administrative fee be charged to those who do not clear out their lockers on time.

If these increases are approved for the five years of the plan, assuming enrolment is no less than 1,000 FTEs below current projections and there is a revenue-neutral outcome for the Faculty to any change in the structure of student fees, the Faculty undertakes not to seek other increases in the compulsory student fee, nor to increase any user fee for existing programs, services and facilities by more than the university's long range projection of CPI plus 1% for the entire five-year period.

## **1. The Multi-Year Plan**

In 2000, at the request of CAR, the Faculty initiated a long-term planning exercise with senior staff and student leaders. The intention was to develop a clear set of program and service priorities and a multi-year operating plan in light of expected enrolment, facility and financial changes. Unfortunately, uncertainty about the future of Varsity Stadium delayed completion of the multi-year plan. Although that uncertainty remains--the Stadium was demolished in the spring of 2002, and plans for its long-awaited replacement remain in limbo—the Budget Committee decided to go ahead with the multi-year planning at this time. The budget plan was prepared on the basis of staff submissions and lengthy discussions by members of the Budget Committee during the fall and early winter of 2002-2003. The Faculty is extremely grateful to the many students, staff, faculty and alumnae/i who contributed to the process.

### **i) Goals and Priorities**

The priorities for the multi-year plan were drawn from the Faculty's mission, established policies, and the previous Provostial planning document, *Raising Our Sights*:

- Ensuring inclusivity, accessibility and participation of students in the Faculty's programs and services
- Enhancing the educational experience of students in the Faculty's program and service areas
- Building the faculty and staff for the 21<sup>st</sup> century, ensuring a great staff and faculty for students of a great University.
- Building and renewing facilities, equipment and technical support for the Faculty
- Strengthening financial resources for the Faculty

## ii) Assumptions and Challenges

The following assumptions, based upon University documents, have shaped planning:

- Total enrolment on the St. George campus is still growing. In 2002-2003, there were approximately 36,600 full-time undergraduate and graduate students and 9,600 part-time students during the fall and winter terms.
- At U of T a majority of students in all categories is female. In 2002-2003, 57.5% of full-time undergraduates, 51.9% full-time graduate students, 59.1% of part-time undergraduates and 62.8% of part-time graduate students are female.
- Residence expansion will add to the pressure on co-curricular athletics and recreation. Students in residence generally participate in athletics and recreation at a much higher rate than commuting students
- Inflation is estimated to be 2% a year, but some costs will increase at a much higher rate. Salaries and benefits, for example, are expected to increase by 5% each year over the planned period.
- Electronic communications have become more important to the Faculty and the University. Further enhancements to technology and communication to improve customer service through on-line registration and reservations will become more important to the Faculty.
- The growth in participation has put tremendous pressure upon the Faculty's staff and facilities. In many program areas, the Faculty is 'maxed out', and further growth cannot be undertaken and/or accommodated without an increase in staff and the long-awaited renovation and expansion of facilities. The Faculty is often in the position of turning down requests from student and community groups simply because we do not have the resources, activity space or playing fields to meet the demand.
- Community memberships currently generate over \$1.17 million. The community membership fee of \$600 is at market value and priced comparably with competitive clubs in the nearby community. However, there are increasing demands by this membership group to provide more programs in the evenings and weekends, including family programs.
- Staff/Faculty memberships currently generate \$288K. The academic priority to renew and increase faculty may provide new opportunities to sell additional memberships. The athletic and recreation programs and services could be used as part of a recruitment strategy for new faculty.

## 2. Budget Highlights 2003-04

This budget calls for expenditures of \$13,659,323 against revenues (including university operating support) of \$13,659,323.

The priority of the plan is to address major maintenance that has been deferred for many years. The budget plan proposes that the annual allocation to major maintenance be increased from \$300,000 in 2002-2003 to \$500,000 in 2003-2004 and \$850,000 per year thereafter. This will enable the Faculty to begin to address the more than \$10 million in accumulated deferred maintenance and long awaited facility improvements, such as the installation of air conditioning for the Benson Wing.

The budget plan also begins the implementation of the recommendations of the report of the Intramural Task Force.

The budget plan also extends recreational swim hours to relieve some of the overcrowding and 'lane rage' in the morning open recreational swim.

It provides a grant of \$10,000 towards the athletic programs and facilities at the Institute of Aerospace Studies in Downsview. This support is predicated on the condition that the funds be demonstrably directed to a clear athletic purpose and IAS open its athletic facilities to any U of T graduate student whose academic work requires them to be in the area, such as the students in Exercise Sciences located at the nearby Defence Research and Development Canada (Toronto).

The budget plan continues the staffing of the AC Field House by strength and conditioning specialists (initiated in last year's budget) to improve the health, safety and knowledge of participants.

It maintains the gender equity fund for students in intercollegiate sports.

The proposed budget will fund salary increases totaling \$339,000 in 2003-04.

The Faculty will continue to provide free diagnosis and treatment for student patients in the David L. MacIntosh Clinic. The assessment fee charged to non-student patients will rise to \$80 for the first therapy visit and \$50.00/visit for subsequent visits.

Otherwise, the proposed budget maintains programs and services at current levels. Beginning in 2004-2005, non-salary budgets will be increased by 2% a year in order to restore some of the expenditures lost to inflation.

In order to balance the budget over the five-year period, the budget plan recommends the following multi-year fee increases:

- The compulsory student fee will be raised by 4.5% a year for each of the five years of the plan. In 2003-2004, it proposes that the fee for full-time St. George

students be \$187.64; for part-time student on the St. George campus be \$37.52; for full-time students at UTM and UTSC be \$25.08 and for part-time students at UTM and UTSC be \$5.02. These amounts do not fully reflect the revisions to the policy for compulsory non-academic incidental fees approved by University Affairs Board on January 21, 2003. The intent of the approved revisions is that the new fees would be revenue-neutral to the co-curricular budget and our fees may be revised to lower amounts to reflect the changes in this policy

- Joint membership rates for faculty and staff will be increased by 3.5% a year on average.
- Other non-student memberships will be increased by an average of at least 4.5% a year. The minimum increase for 2003-2004 will be \$25. These increases are expected to result in a slight drop in community memberships, so that net increase in income is estimated to be just 3% a year. The exact structure of community fees will be determined by the Membership Committee and brought to CAR for its approval no later than May 2003.
- Facility rental rates will be increased by 10% for Varsity Arena and by 5% at the dry facilities in the AC. The rates for the pool were increased last year, and are currently believed to be at the market maximum.
- Locker fees will be increased to \$75 a year (\$25 a term for students). A new \$25 administrative fee will be charged to those who do not clear out their lockers on time.
- Fees will also be increased in the Faculty's instructional programs and children's camps.

### **3. The alternative**

During the long process of presentations and discussions, the Budget Committee did consider other options, especially the alternatives the Faculty would be forced to pursue if it could only obtain the annual CPI/UTI fee increases permitted by the Protocol. These invariably involved program cuts and new and increased user fees. The alternative that the Budget Committee considered at its meeting of January 21, 2003 provided none of the enhancements of the recommended budget and contained these measures:

#### New/increased user fees:

- a new \$50 first visit fee to all students using the Sports Medicine Clinic
- a \$10/term towel fee
- user fees for students in intramural competitions with board officials
- a user fee will be developed for Varsity athletes

### Program cuts:

- a reduction in Open Recreation time in the Strength Conditioning Centre by 1-2 hours per day
- the elimination of 3-4 drop-in fitness classes
- closure of the AC during the December holiday each year
- a significant reduction in student employment opportunities
- No action could be taken on the recommendations of the Intramural Task Force
- Limitations on the Faculty's ability to implement the recommendations of the Ethnocultural and Sexual Diversity task forces
- No additional recreational swim times

In addition, non-salary expenses could only be adjusted by 1%, beginning in 2005-2006. Since this is less than the expected rate of inflation, it would likely lead to further fee increases and cuts.

Under the alternative plan, by 2008 the student fee would only be \$2.50/term higher than the fee under the proposed plan. The full financial implications of this package are shown in Appendix B.

The Budget Committee felt that it has no mandate to impose such cuts. On the contrary, surveys, turnstile attendance and program registration all indicate record demand. The Budget Committee also argued that user fees are regressive, and impose barriers upon those required to pay.

For these reasons, the Budget Committee strongly supported the recommended package of improvements and fees. It is responsible, comprehensive and fair. The modest proposed increase in the compulsory student fees and other membership fees are by far the fairest means of assessing responsibility for increased costs. Unlike user fees, increases in the compulsory student fees attract tax deductibility and are eligible for OSAP/UTAPS and the graduate student guarantee.

If the proposed budget and universal fee increase are denied, the Faculty will be forced to implement the alternative budget as described above and in Appendix B.

#### **4. The student fee at UTM / UTSC**

Students at UTM and UTSC pay an ancillary fee to the Faculty. First levied in the 1970s, the fee was structured to assess students on the suburban campuses their share of the costs of the intercollegiate program that the then Department of Athletics and Recreation conducted on behalf of all three campuses. In 1978, when the fee for a full-time St. George student was \$17.50, the fee for a full-time student at the suburban campuses was \$2. Since then, while the Department/Faculty has added to the services offered to students at UTM and UTSC, the ratio of the UTM/UTSC and St. George fees has remained unchanged. Students at UTM and UTSC continue to participate in intercollegiate athletics.

The planned expansion of the suburban campuses has led many on all three campuses to contemplate a change in the historic inter-relationship between their co-curricular programs. For this reason, the heads of the three divisions agree that both the inter-relationship and the fee need to be revisited, and to this end, some sort of consultative process needs to be initiated. The Faculty is strongly committed to these discussions, with a view of ensuring a mix of opportunities and fees that is fair to all U of T students.

## **5. The achievements and challenges of 2002-2003**

The mission of the Faculty of Physical Education and Health is to 'develop, advance and disseminate knowledge about physical activity, health and their interactions through education, research, leadership and the provision of opportunity.' The goal is to create a vibrant 'teaching health centre', with synergies among research, education, and outstanding physical activity programs contributing to the 'healthy student body'.

The Faculty is unique among the academic divisions in that it seeks to engage every student (and faculty and staff member) in a healthy, educational co-curricular program of physical activity, in the context of the University's demanding programs of undergraduate, graduate and professional education.

The achievements of the current year represent the commitment and contributions of student leaders, faculty, staff, alumnae and alumni.

The Faculty is committed to creating and maintaining an inclusive and welcoming environment for all. The Equity Issues Committee maintains a watching brief over all questions relating to access and equity. During the year, CAR accepted and approved a report by the Faculty's Ethnocultural Community Coordinator. Task forces on sexual diversity, barrier-free accessibility and family care and family programming are underway.

The demand for the Faculty's co-curricular programs, services and facilities continues to outstrip capacity.

More than 7000 registrants took part in the Instruction classes in sports, aquatics, movement and dance. Participation in dance and movement has grown to the point where some students can only be accommodated in the corridors and others are turned away.

Participation in Intramural sports is also limited by the shortage of facilities. The indoor soccer league has 36 teams and 30 teams are on the waiting list. While the 41 men's ice hockey teams all complain about insufficient games and the lack of ice time for practices, another 28 teams could not be accommodated at all. Intramural Ultimate Frisbee has grown from 8 to 16 teams and 12 more teams were on the

waiting list. Not surprisingly, the enrolment in Intramural Programs has leveled off at about 8,000 participants.

The Faculty's commitment to the continuum of opportunities ensures that Open Recreation time is scheduled in all the facilities. There is a total of 478 hours a week block-reserved for open recreation including the squash courts. This does not include the strength fitness centre or indoor running track, which are available during the operational hours of the Athletic Centre. On the other hand, requests from student clubs for bookings cannot be honoured because of a lack of space.

The David L. MacIntosh Sport Medicine Clinic in the Athletic Centre provides services to all students and members, including recreational participants, students on Varsity teams, international-calibre athletes, and members of the community. Of the projected 18,000 patient visits during the year, approximately 13,000 patient visits were by students. The MacIntosh Clinic provides free service to all U of T students. Non-student patients, including staff and faculty, pay a fee per visit. The Clinic is unique in its multi-disciplinary approach to care and education.

More than 750 students participate in intercollegiate sports, enjoying high level competition in Ontario University Athletics, Canadian Interuniversity Sports, and other competitions. In 2001-2002, the Faculty fielded 22 women's and 22 men's teams, the broadest program of its kind in North America. In addition to athletic challenges, the intercollegiate program provides important opportunities for pan-Canadian student exchanges. On one fall weekend last year, for example, 17 different universities had teams playing at U of T, while U of T teams were visiting six universities. Continuing a long and proud tradition of academic as well as athletic accomplishment, last year 160 intercollegiate athletes earned the prestigious T-Holders Academic Excellence Award for achieving First Class Honours standing in their academic program. And just recently, two Varsity athletes from Trinity College (Zinta Zommers, figure skating, and Thomas Ringer, track and field) won Rhodes Scholarships; since 1991, six of the 12 U of T Rhodes recipients have been participants in the intercollegiate program.

The Faculty continues to implement the recommendations of the Gender Equity Task Force (1994) and the Task Force on Intercollegiate Athletics (1997). Full-time coaches devote 50% of their time to other program areas, to ensure that their expertise is shared across the student body. Many contribute to START (supervised training and recreational time) clinics and teach in the instructional program.

Camp U of T had an occupancy rate of 91% with a total of almost 2800 participants. The children of U of T students are privileged in the admission process. The Camp has an excellent reputation for having quality programs and quality staff. Evaluations show a high level of parent and child satisfaction. Camp U of T provides invaluable leadership training as well. About 90% of Camp staff are U of T students, drawn from the Faculty's degree programs and other faculties and colleges.

The Faculty has continued to build and strengthen the Leadership Development Program (LDP), providing 1,144 student leadership opportunities. The Faculty is the largest student employer on campus, engaging approximately 600 students in various leadership and administrative tasks. A reality for many students is that they must work to pay for their education and living expenses. The fact that they can find work close to classes helps reduce the stress of juggling school, work, and daily living, including recreation. To this end, the Faculty contributes more than \$3.2 million in wages and benefits for student employees.

In 2002-2003, the LDP strengthened the Student Leadership Training Series for its own student leaders and those from other divisions across the St. George campus. The 12-module certificate course covers topics from CPR and First Aid to Risk Management and Valuing Diversity. The LDP not only ensures that student employees are well qualified, but gives them valuable knowledge and skills that can be transferred to other challenges.

During the first 8 months of fiscal 2002-2003, the Faculty raised \$639,879 in gifts and new pledges not including matching contributions for endowments and enhancements to co-curricular programs. In addition \$62,550 was raised for merit-based financial awards.

Other significant facility enhancements completed in 2002-2003 include new strength fitness equipment and a new multi-functional training system.

## **6. An under-funded area**

The co-curricular programs, services and facilities in athletics and recreation contribute significantly to the 'health of the student body', faculty and staff health and morale, University recruitment, and through the stirring performances of students in intercollegiate and international competition, the image of the University across Canada and around the world.

Registrations and surveys indicate that student demand for athletic and recreational programming is greater than ever before.

But many programs and services are 'maxed out', the facilities declining and equipment out-of-date and in need of repair. The Faculty cannot currently meet the needs of U of T students seeking co-curricular opportunities in athletics and recreation. With the demolition of Varsity Stadium, U of T can provide only 77% of the athletic facilities recommended by the Council of Ontario Universities formula for co-curricular athletic facilities. Unless new facilities are constructed, increased enrolment will reduce that percentage further: by 2007-2008, by which time enrolment on the St. George campus will grow to 41,000, U of T will provide only 66% of the recommended requirements.

The proposed budget plan starts to address these shortcomings, providing increasing allocations to major maintenance. This is an important step, and reduces the possibility that the University will have to close other facilities the way it did Varsity Stadium last year.

The failure to address major maintenance has direct impact on all users and simply adds to costs in the long run. Equipment failure and worn-out building fabric such as the field house mondo surface and the Varsity Arena ice plant reduce user satisfaction and enjoyment. The long-awaited renovation to the Athletic Centre would enable the integration of information services, the equipment counter and the towel service to significantly improve service and maximize staff resources. The repeated shelving of this plan for budgetary reasons postpones the realization of improvements in service and program delivery and the resulting savings. Long-deferred major maintenance includes the creation of a barrier-free facility by the addition of a second elevator, the conversion of under-utilized spaces into new activity spaces and the air conditioning of the Benson Wing (built in 1959).

As previous budget documents have stated, the Faculty desperately needs new sources of revenue to fund program and service improvements long called for by students, other members, and the recommendations of Faculty and University task forces. It seeks new capital funds to finance facility renewal.

Through this budget, students and members will shoulder a fair share of responsibility for maintaining the facilities and maintaining programs at current levels. But other funds are needed if adequate facilities are to be created and long called for program improvements are to be made to meet student need and demand.

In the first place, long-term financial stability will only come from adequate federal and provincial funding for higher education, including financial recognition of co-curricular athletics and recreation and other student services. Ontario's persistent under-funding of its public education system, including its colleges and universities, is an extremely foolish and harmful strategy, which serves only to cheat its citizens and put them and their economy and communities at a disadvantage to those in comparable societies in the world. The Faculty strongly supports the University's campaign for fair funding for all colleges and universities. It is essential that the Ontario Government restore capital funding for co-curricular athletic facilities. As CAR has long advocated, the Ontario Government should also revise the formula for 'full average funding' to include the costs of co-curricular learning and healthy physical activity. Ontario is one of the few provinces in Canada not to contribute to co-curricular athletics and physical activity. Such funding is supported by the recommendations of the Romanow Commission on Health and the new Canadian Sport Policy signed by the federal, provincial and territorial governments on April 6, 2002.

Secondly, as soon as circumstances warrant, the University should restore funding to co-curricular athletics and recreation from the operating budget. Up until the cuts of the early 1990s, the University made a significant contribution to the overall costs of co-curricular athletics and recreation. Very few of the major public research universities in Canada and the United States do not contribute substantially to this important aspect of 'learning beyond the classroom'. Provost Shirley Neuman has launched the Green Paper process to reconsider the major policies and priorities of the University as it faces the challenges of the decade ahead. The Green Paper exercise provides a welcome opportunity to revisit the nature of University support of athletics and recreation.

Thirdly, the University should move as quickly as possible to realize the plans for revitalized athletic facilities on the Varsity site recommended by CAR. In previous years, the Faculty earned a good deal of income, an average of \$250,000 a year, from sports teams and organizations that rented Varsity Stadium and Varsity Arena. These events also greatly strengthened the links between the University and important elements of the community at large. The hoped-for decision to move ahead with a revitalized Varsity facility thus has profound revenue implications for the vitality of student opportunities.

Co-curricular athletics and recreation thrive at U of T, but they do so under difficult financial circumstances and with inadequate facilities. Canada's best public research and teaching university should do better.

The multi-year budget recommended in this plan will ensure that these important programs enjoy a stable footing. Perhaps the welcome respite that it will bring from the bitter budget battles of recent years will enable the Faculty to realize the hoped-for new facilities and revenues, so that it can offer more U of T students the opportunities that they seek and deserve.