

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO  
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL  
**REPORT NUMBER 113 OF**  
**THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD**

**March 25, 2003**

To the Governing Council,  
University of Toronto.

Your Board reports that it met on Tuesday, March 25, 2003 at 5:00 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, with the following members present:

Dr. John P. Nestor (In the Chair)  
Ms Durré Hanif, Vice-Chair  
Dr. Thomas Simpson, Chair, Governing Council  
Professor David Farrar, Vice Provost, Students  
Ms. Catherine Riggall, Assistant Vice-President, Facilities and Services  
Mr. John Badowski  
Dr. Robert M. Bennett  
Dr. Shari Graham Fell  
Ms. Margaret Hancock  
Mr. Jason Hunter  
Professor Bruce Kidd  
Ms. Françoise Ko  
Ms. Karen Lewis  
Professor Michael Marrus  
Mr. Sean Mullin  
Ms. Cheryl Shook

Ms. Maggy Stepanian  
Ms. Geeta Yadav

**Non-voting Members:**

Ms. Susan Addario, Director, Student Affairs  
Ms. Marilyn Van Norman, Director, Student Services  
Professor Ron Venter, Vice-Provost, Space and Facilities Planning

**Office of the Governing Council:**

Mrs. Beverley Stefureak, Secretary  
Ms. Susan Girard

**Regrets:**

Mr. Colm Murphy  
Ms. Parissa Safai  
Mr. Janakan Satkunasingham  
Dr. John Wedge

**In Attendance:**

Mr. Chris Ramsaroop, Member, The Governing Council  
Mr. Mike Foderick, Member-elect, The Governing Council  
Ms. Judy Chin, Athletics Council President, University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM)  
Mr. Christopher Collins, President, Graduate Students' Union (GSU)  
Mr. Jim Dunsdon, Manager of Student Housing, University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC)  
Ms. Rae Johnson, Co-ordinator, Student Crisis Response Programs  
Mr. Jaan Laaniste, Director of Physical Education, UTSC  
Ms. Alexandra Love, Manager of Health and Wellness, UTSC  
Ms. Carmela Mazin, Budget and Accounting Analyst, UTSC  
Mr. Ashley Morton, President-elect, Students' Administrative Council (SAC)  
Mr. Mark Overton, Dean of Students Affairs, UTM  
Mr. Tom Nowers, Associate Principal, Students, UTSC  
Ms. Emily Sadowski, President, Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students (APUS)

ALL ITEMS ARE REPORTED TO THE GOVERNING COUNCIL FOR INFORMATION.

The Chair noted that several individuals were required to leave before the meeting would end. He requested the Board's agreement to vary the order of the agenda, moving item 5 to be considered before item 4 and moving 4.3 to the beginning of item 4. There were no objections.

**1. Report of the Previous Meeting**

Report Number 112 of January 21, 2003 was approved.

**2. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting**

There was no business arising.

**3. Operating Plans for Student Services – 2003-04 [Council on Student Services, Quality Service to Students Committee, and Council on Student Services processes]**

The Chair reviewed the Board's responsibility with respect to operating plans for student services, and invited Professor Farrar to speak to the highlights of the review process by the Council on Student Services (COSS), the Quality Service to Students' Committee (QSS) at UTM and the Council on Student Services (CSS) at UTSC. Professor Farrar referred to his memorandum of March 17, 2003 which had reported on the advice from these three councils. For the operating plans, budgets and associated non-academic ancillary fees to be approved by the councils on student services, they required the support of the majority of students present at the meeting when the plans were considered. His memorandum reported on the motions at COSS, and the outcome of those motions and these would be presented individually at the appropriate Agenda item

Mr. Collins was invited to speak. He had circulated a letter to the Board expressing the views of the Graduate Students' Union on the operating plans and budgets that would be considered today. The GSU had been participants in advisory committees for all four recognized ancillaries on the St. George campus and had sat on the respective budget committees. He believed the view of GSU would be valuable to the members as they considered the recommendations before them. Mr. Collins reviewed his letter, noting support for the plans put forward by the Office of Student Affairs and the Office of Student Services, but concerns about the plans put forward by the Faculty of Physical Education and Health. The GSU supported the amended budget submitted by the latter and strongly reaffirmed its support for regulation of ancillary fees and the COSS protocol.

**4. Operating Plans for Student Services**

**4.1 St. George Campus**  
**4.1.1 Student Affairs**

Professor Farrar referred members to the operating plans and budget for the Office of Student Affairs that had been under cover of his memorandum of March 14, 2003. He recalled that as he took over the portfolio of Vice-Provost, Students, he had toured the Office of Student Affairs and had been very impressed with all of the services that the Office provided to students.

**4. Operating Plans for Student Services (cont'd)**

**4.1 St. George Campus**

**4.1.1 Student Affairs (cont'd)**

Several members echoed those comments, noting that the programs were of high quality and that the Office provided a great deal of support not only to students but to staff in other divisions.

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THE operating plans and budget and the operational direction of the Office of Student Affairs as described in the documents, dated March 5, 2003, and a permanent increase of 3% to the Student Affairs fee, which will raise the fee for a full-time student over the fall/winter term to \$44.16, an increase of \$1.29, and lower the fee for a part-time student to \$8.83 (beginning in May 2003).

**4.1.2 Student Services**

The operating plans and 2003-04 budget for Student Services had been distributed under cover of a memorandum from Professor Farrar dated March 14, 2003. The Office of Student Services was not requesting a fee increase and COSS had unanimously approved their operating plans and budget for the upcoming year. Professor Farrar indicated that he had also toured the Office of Student Services as he assumed the portfolio and was equally impressed with the services provided by that Office. A member agreed, indicating that there was no doubt of the genuine value to students of the services provided on all three campuses. On behalf of the Board, he thanked Ms. Van Norman and the co-coordinators of the services for the tremendous job they were doing.

A member expressed satisfaction in seeing that there were no fee increases requested by Student Services.

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THE operating plans and budget and the operational direction of the Student Services as described in the documents, under cover of the memorandum from Ms. Van Norman dated March 17, 2003. The Student Services will maintain the student ancillary fee at the 2002-2003 level: \$104.55 for full-time students over the fall/winter term, and \$20.91 for part-time students (beginning in May 2003).

**4.2 University of Toronto at Mississauga**

The Chair welcomed Mr. Mark Overton and members of his staff from the University of Toronto at Mississauga.

The operating plans and budget for 2003-04 for Student Services at the University of Toronto at Mississauga had been distributed under cover of a memorandum from Professor Farrar dated March 14, 2003 and a memorandum from Mr. Overton dated March 17, 2003.

**4. Operating Plans for Student Services (cont'd)**

**4.2 University of Toronto at Mississauga (cont'd)**

The Quality Service to Students' Committee (QSS) had approved these operating plans and budget at its meeting of February 12.

A member asked about the students' reaction to this proposal for a large fee increase. Mr. Overton indicated that there had been extensive consultation with QSS. They saw the value to be achieved by services that were better resourced and they were fully supportive.

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THE operating plans and budget and the operational direction of the UTM Student Services, as described in the documents under cover of a memorandum from Mr. Overton dated March 7, 2003; and, for full-time student over the fall/winter term, a permanent fee increase to \$221.35 for student services (an increase of 15.8%) no change in the health service fee (\$35), an increase in the Physical Education fee to \$99.03, (an increase of 3%), and an increase to \$25.75 for the athletic building fee.

**4.3 University of Toronto at Scarborough**

The Chair welcomed Mr. Tom Nowers from the University of Toronto at Scarborough, together with a number of his staff and other guests from UTSC.

Professor Farrar, referring to his memorandum of March 14, 2003 and its attachments, noted that the operating plans and budget for student services at UTSC had been unanimously approved by the Council of Student Services at that campus. This report provided a synopsis of the previous year's activities and objectives for the future.

A member asked if there had been any concern among students about what amounted to a large percentage increase in fees. Mr. Nowers replied that the process whereby this proposal came forward was as a result of ten formal meetings with the Council on Student Services (CSS) and within the context of a five-year financial plan. The students were well informed that the UTSC would be expanding rapidly and that student services were seriously under resourced. Students were very supportive of the trend to have more services offered locally and they were excited about the growth. They seemed to have an appreciation and understanding of the need to improve campus life and of the legacy for future generations of students with good planning now. This proposal had received the unanimous support of the CSS at UTSC. Professor Farrar added that the UTSC representative on COSS had also spoken strongly in support of increases in student services fees.

The Chair asked Mr. Nowers what he saw as the evolution of the relationship between St. George campus and UTSC with respect to services to students. Mr. Nowers replied that this would be the subject of discussion in the upcoming year. He expected that UTSC would never be self sufficient but that there needed to be a determination of an appropriate balance between duplication of services and convenience of access to services.

**4. Operating Plans for Student Services (cont'd)**  
**4.3 University of Toronto at Scarborough (cont'd)**

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THE operating plans and budget and the operational direction of the UTSC Student Services, as described in the documents under cover of a note from Mr. Nowers dated March 6, 2003, and a permanent fee increase of 8.2% for a full-time student in one session. This fee includes an increase to \$37.25 (11%) in the Health and Wellness fee for a full-time student in one session, an increase to \$79.87 (4.5%) in the Physical Education and Athletics fee for a full-time student in one session, and an increase to \$84.30 (10.7%) for Student Services, for a full-time student in one session.

**5. Operating Plans for the Faculty of Physical Education and Health – Co-curricular Programs**

Professor Farrar referred members to his memorandum of March 14, 2003 with attached memoranda from Professor Kidd, the budget that had been proposed to COSS and the revised budget that was presented for approval. He invited Professor Kidd to comment on the operating plans which had also been attached.

Professor Kidd informed the Board that, because COSS had not approved the request for a fee increase, the Faculty had been forced to present a revised budget which included user fees. Every effort was being made to reduce the impact of the user fees. He expected that they would severely limit accessibility, but the revenue from them was needed to continue operations at an acceptable level. This situation was a serious setback to the ambitions of the University to strengthen education beyond the classroom. This revised budget would necessitate the reduction of hours of service and program opportunities and significantly limit initiatives. The Faculty was already working in an environment of fiscal restraint that disadvantaged students and this budget would exacerbate that problem. Professor Kidd provided examples of programs that could not continue, some of which had provided the opportunity for the participation of students who had never before been part of intramurals. Because of the limits imposed by this budget, Sunday hours could not be extended, use by student clubs would need to be curtailed, and there would be a reduction in fitness classes and in the hours available for the student fitness centre. The fallout from all of that would be a loss of student jobs.

In closing, Professor Kidd said that the Faculty would strive to maintain a level of accessibility but he was very disappointed that students would be disadvantaged by this budget. This was a budget imposed by COSS. To that extent, the COSS protocol hamstrung both the Faculty and the UAB in making choices that were to the benefit of all students. He agreed wholeheartedly that fees should be as low as possible and the Faculty had aimed to maintain that principle. This, however, was a counter-productive budget that evolved out of an unfair and unaccountable process.

Mr. Ashley Morton had requested permission to speak and was invited to do so. Mr. Morton began by stating his frustration at a situation which was not right and which he and the Board were powerless to correct. He had been one of the students who, along with other members of the Council of Athletics and Recreation, had worked out the budget proposed to COSS.

## **5. Operating Plans for the Faculty of Physical Education and Health – Co-curricular Programs (cont'd)**

All members, including students, of CAR were democratically elected and were representative of students from all over campus. For example, he was not a student in the Faculty of Physical Education and, though he participated in intramurals for one year, he was not actively involved in the activities of the Faculty. Nevertheless, he and other students on CAR saw the positive benefits of the first budget and he was able to report that there had been full student support for that option. He saw serious problems with the second budget, particularly in terms of accessibility to the facilities and programs. The first budget had proposed an increase of 4.5% which was only 2% above the rate of inflation for the year. Under it, the Faculty would have had a consistent increase over the next five years; it would have assured accessibility; and fees would have been part of what could be covered by UTAPS and OSAP. Instead, the Faculty had been forced to apply user fees and, in that environment, he believed that some intramural teams would simply disappear. He expressed great disappointment in the student governments and he hoped to be part of correcting this in the future. In closing, he noted that the real blame was with the Government of Ontario for creating a fiscal environment where this kind of situation could exist.

On motion duly moved and seconded

**YOUR BOARD APPROVED**

THE operating plans, budget and general operating direction of the Faculty's co-curricular programs, as outlined in the materials from Dean Bruce Kidd dated March 6, 2003, and an increase of 2% in student fees, resulting in a full-time fee across the fall/winter session of \$183.16.

## **6. Annual Report: Student Crisis Response Programs**

The Chair noted that the Board received the annual report of the Student Crisis Response Programs as part of its responsibility for monitoring student services. He welcomed Ms. Rae Johnson to the meeting and invited her to comment on her report.

Ms. Johnson reviewed her report, highlighting the issues, themes and where she expected the program to go. She spoke about how the needs of a student in crisis were often not discrete but rather overlapped several areas. The programs interrelated with other service areas to provide the best support possible to a student in crisis. A critical incident response relied on a network of teams to provide a coordinated response. The Student Crisis Response Programs had the potential to interact with just about any other program or department, and often did so.

Ms. Johnson particularly highlighted two programs, the Network to Enhance Student Support through Information Exchange (NESSIE) and the Peer Support Program. The former increased awareness in the community about issues related to students in crisis and informed staff, students and faculty about the existence of the services provided by the program. The latter provided opportunities for students to become more involved and was an effective mechanism for direct input on student concerns and issues.

## **6. Annual Report: Student Crisis Response Programs (cont'd)**

In closing, Ms. Johnson said that in responding to issues of mental health, the Programs strived to develop a strategy which allowed for consistent and effective responses to critical incidents.

Several members commended Ms. Johnson on a successful year in supporting divisions and staff, for example registrars, and in so doing allowing them to focus on their primary task which was providing administrative support to students in academic matters. Professor Farrar added his thanks for the tremendous support provided by the Programs. He was reassured by the knowledge that, when a critical issue arose as a result of the mental health of a student, a crisis response team was on hand to offer professional and effective help.

## **7. Report of the Assessors**

Professor Farrar had circulated his report in writing with the agenda package. The Chair invited him to comment on the report and to add any items of interest to the Board that might have occurred within the past week. Professor Farrar had no additional comments but briefly spoke about portions of his written report.

The Chair informed members that the acquisition of the Colony Hotel (89 Chestnut Residence) had occurred under a special procedure approved by the Executive Committee put in place to meet the unusual timelines. The proposal had been considered at a special meeting of the Business Board and recommended directly to Governing Council, with the provision that approval was subject to a review of the proposed operating plans and budget for the residence by the University Affairs Board at a future date. In response to a question, Professor Farrar and Ms. Riggall indicated that work was currently underway on the budget and the plans would likely be recommended to the June meeting.

A member asked about staffing and how many jobs had been lost by staff of the Colony. Professor Farrar said that about 100 of the staff members would be needed to operate the residence. Those who had been hired were pleased because the position with the University would be full-time, while their former employment with the hotel had been part-time.

Ms. Sadowski was invited to speak. She noted that Professor Farrar's report indicated that there would be no recommendation coming forward at this time with respect to the Canadian Federation of Students' fee. She believed this was a serious omission. Student representatives had met with the Office of Student Affairs last week and agreed to ongoing dialogue. In her view, the letter from Mr. Delaney to student leaders was a draft because he had compiled complaints but he had not investigated, and the CFS and SAC had not had the opportunity to address the concerns. She alleged that many of the complaints were untrue. SAC and APUS were prepared to refute the complaints but had had no opportunity to do so. APUS believed that they had held a legitimate referendum and the results had been ignored by the University. CFS had accepted the referendum and APUS was, therefore, expected to pay the fees. If the University continued to ignore the request for a collection of the fees, APUS was thinking of seeking legal advice.

## 7. Report of the Assessors (cont'd)

Professor Farrar said that the situation around the CFS referenda was serious and not one that he took lightly. The outcome of the referenda was that students at this University were members of CFS and there was no argument with that. The issue was whether the University could collect the fees given that the process by which the referenda had occurred did not meet the policy requirements set by the Governing Council. Mr. Delaney had reviewed this very carefully and Professor Farrar had the utmost confidence in the outcome of that review. Mr. Delaney had been in his position for a long time and knew and performed his job well. It was uncommon for Student Affairs to receive complaints about a referendum process and, in this case, the number of complaints had been extremely large. Discussions were ongoing with CFS to determine alternatives whereby SAC, APUS and SCSU could meet the policy requirements for the collection of this fee. Since this was a procedural issue that needed to be resolved before a proposal was brought to governance, he could not bring forward a recommendation.

Ms. Addario confirmed that a meeting had taken place with leaders in SCSU, APUS and SAC the previous week and that there were ongoing discussions planned over the next few weeks. Mr. Delaney had based his decision on a great deal of information related to the perception that the Joint Referendum Committee had not behaved in a fair and unbiased way. He had further concluded, based on extensive material, that, the Joint Referendum Committee (JRC) had not acted in an independent and transparent manner. As a result, he was not able to recommend that the request for an increase come to this Board. Mr. Delaney's assessment was a discharge of administrative responsibility under University policy; it was required following every referendum or proposal for a fee increase, and it was not, in any way, a comment on membership in CFS.

A member noted that this situation had created a serious problem for SAC, APUS and SCSU. CFS viewed the referendum as satisfactory and considered students at the University of Toronto as members for whom a fee would be forthcoming. If the fee was not collected from students, the three student governments would, nevertheless, be financially liable.

Professor Farrar pointed out that the administration was bound by the policy approved by Governing Council. A member added that it was the fiduciary responsibility of the Board to ensure that recommendations did not contravene policy. If the Board were not to respect policy, each member could be held personally liable for costs incurred as a result of any legal challenge.

A member asked if it was true that the complaints had not been investigated.

Ms. Addario said that in many cases there was no way for the complaints to be investigated. Mr. Delaney had provided his conclusions to the three student governments and had requested their comments. These had not yet been received. The overriding concern had been the perceived failure of the JRC to operate in a fair and impartial manner, and complaints had been received in this regard from both the "yes" and "no" sides. This concern, in itself, was sufficient for the administration not to recommend a fee increase at this time.



**8. Date of Next Meeting: Tuesday, April 29**

The Chair reminded members that the next regular meeting of the Board was scheduled for Tuesday, April 29, 2003 at 5:00 p.m. in the Council Chamber.

**9. Other Business**

There was no other business.

The meeting adjourned at 6:55 p.m.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Secretary

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chair

April 9, 2003