

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL
REPORT NUMBER 146 OF
THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD

March 25, 2008

To the Governing Council,
University of Toronto.

Your Board reports that it met on Tuesday, March 25, 2008 at 4:30 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, with the following members present:

Dr. Claude Davis, In the Chair
Ms B. Elizabeth Vosburgh, Vice-Chair
Professor David Naylor, President
Professor Jonathan Freedman, Vice-Provost,
Student Life
Ms Anne E. MacDonald,
Director, Ancillary Services
Professor Varouj Aivazian
Ms Diana A.R. Alli
Dr. Louise Cowin
Miss Saswati Deb
Dr. Shari Graham Fell
Ms Kaila Folinsbee
Professor William Gough
Professor Bruce Kidd
Mr. Chris McGrath
Mr. Alexandru Rascanu
Mr. Tim Reid
Ms Rebecca Spagnolo
Ms Tian Tian
Dr. Sarita Verma

Non-Voting Assessors:

Professor Vivek Goel, Vice-President and
Provost
Mr. Jim Delaney, Director, Office of the Vice-
Provost, Students
Ms Lucy Fromowitz, Assistant Vice-President,
Student Life
Mr. Tom Nowers, Dean of Student Affairs,
University of Toronto at Scarborough
(UTSC)
Mr. Mark Overton, Dean of Student Affairs,
University of Toronto at Mississauga
(UTM)
Ms Elizabeth Sisam, Assistant Vice-President,
Campus and Facilities Planning
Mr. Ron Swail, Assistant Vice-President,
Facilities and Services

Secretariat:

Mr. Neil Dobbs
Mr. Henry Mulhall (Secretary)

Regrets:

Mr. Arya Ghadimi
Mr. Robin Goodfellow
Mr. Richard Hydal
Ms Estefania Toledo
Mr. Jonathan Tsao

REPORT NUMBER 146 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – March 25, 2008

In Attendance:

Mr. Ryan Campbell, Member-Elect and Past-Member of the Governing Council
 Ms Judith Wolfson, Vice-President, University Relations
 Mr. Ken Brocklehurst, Director of Finance and Information Technology, Hart House
 Ms Hilary Browning, Coordinator of Academic Services, University College
 Ms Alison Burnett, Director, Health and Counselling Centre, UTM
 Ms Christine Capewell, Director, Business Services, UTM
 Ms Mary Choi, Chief Administrative Officer, Woodsworth College
 Mr. Curtis Cole, Director, Academic Advising and Career Centre, UTSC
 Ms Jacinta Crasta, Business Officer and Assistant to the Dean of Student Affairs, UTSC
 Ms Gloria Cuneo, Manager, Charles Street Student Family Housing
 Mr. Ray deSouza, Chief Administrative Officer, UTM
 Ms Sheree Drummond, Assistant Provost
 Mr. Ken Duncliffe, Director, Department of Physical Education, Athletics and Recreation, UTM
 Mr. John Eliades, Graduates Students' Union (GSU)
 Ms Deanne Fisher, Director, Student Life Programs
 Ms Nora Gillespie, Legal Counsel, Office of the Vice-President and Provost
 Mr. Matthew Gordon, Executive Treasurer, New College Residence Council
 Dr. Anthony Gray, Special Advisor to the President
 Professor Rick Halpern, Principal, New College
 Ms Sheila Hewlett, President, Fine Arts Students' Union
 Ms Liz Hoffman, Assistant Dean, Co-curricular Education and Director of Athletics, Faculty of Physical Education and Health (FPEH)
 Mr. Cory Kennedy, Co-Chair, Council of Athletics and Recreation (CAR)
 Mr. Jaan Laaniste, Director, Physical Education and Athletics, UTSC
 Mr. Matthew Lafond, Committee Secretary, Office of the Governing Council
 Ms Anne Lewis, Manager, Student Accounts, Financial Services
 Ms Roseanne Lopers-Sweetman, Director, Strategic Initiatives and Priorities, Office of the Vice-President and Provost
 Ms Alexandra Love, Director, Health and Wellness Centre, UTSC
 Mr. Alex MacIsaac, Manager, Parking and Transportation Services, St. George and UTM Campuses
 Ms Bryn MacPherson White, Director, Office of the President and University Events
 Mr. Jason Marin, President, New College Student Council
 Mr. Jack Martin, Director Retail and Conference Services, UTSC
 Ms Carmela Mazin, Senior Financial Officer, Business Operations, UTSC
 Ms Joan McCurdy-Myers, Director, UTM Career Centre
 Mr. Steven Moate, Senior Legal Counsel
 Ms Josephine Mullally, Dean, 89 Chestnut
 Mr. Jeff Peters, Vice-President, Internal, Association of Part-time University Students (APUS)
 Ms Ruta Pocius, Director, Issues Management and Media Relations
 Ms Alanna D. Prasad, Executive Member, Arts and Science Students' Union (ASSU)
 Ms Caroline Rabbat, Director, Campus Safety and Security, UTSC
 Mr. Robert Ramsay, Chair, Council on Student Services (COSS)
 Mr. Paul Readings, Manager, 89 Chestnut
 Mr. Terry Rubenstein, Chief Financial Officer, FPEH
 Mr. David Scrivener, Vice-President, External, Students' Administrative Council (SAC)
 Ms Masha Sidorova, Co-Chair, Council of Athletics and Recreation (CAR)
 Mr. Garry Spencer, Dean of Residence, Innis College
 Mr. Mark Stinson, Chair, Council of Athletics and Recreation Budget Committee

In Attendance: (cont'd)

REPORT NUMBER 146 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – March 25, 2008

Ms Mae-Yu Tan, Assistant Secretary of the Governing Council
 Mr. Ron Vanderkraats, Director, Business Services, New College
 Ms Michelle Verbrugghe, Director, Student Housing and Residence Life, UTSC

ALL ITEMS ARE REPORTED FOR INFORMATION.

Chair's Remarks

The Chair welcomed the many individuals from the University's ancillary operations and student services offices who were in attendance to assist in answering members' questions about the various operating plans. He thanked them for their work in support of the University's efforts across its three campuses to provide excellent student services which enhanced the student experience. The Chair reminded members of their responsibility to ensure that the University was managed well, rather than to manage it directly. He noted that the proposals before the Board had originated at the divisional level, where they had already undergone a rigorous governance process to prioritize program initiatives, and the various interested estates had had an opportunity to be represented and to contribute to the planning process. Bodies such as the Hart House Board of Stewards and the Council of Athletics and Recreation (CAR) had begun their planning processes early in the year and had consulted in a transparent manner. This had provided due diligence for the recommendations, and the expertise and work of these bodies ought to be respected as the Board carried out its important responsibility in considering for approval the operating plans which allowed the student life programming of the University to proceed. The Board needed to satisfy itself that these prior processes had been appropriate and thorough, and that relevant questions and issues had been raised and considered.

1. Report of the Previous Meeting

Report Number 145 (January 29, 2008) was approved.

2. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting

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

3. Operating Plans: Service Ancillaries

The Chair noted the presence of Ms Anne MacDonald, Mr. Chris McGrath, Ms Rebecca Spagnolo, and Dr. Louise Cowin who were either voting members or voting assessors to the Board, and who, by virtue of their positions, were able to contribute to the discussion and answer questions. In addition, Mr. Tom Nowers and Mr. Mark Overton were similarly available in their capacity as non-voting assessors to lend their expertise.

At the invitation of the Chair, Professor Goel addressed the Board on behalf of the President. He noted that the incident which had occurred at Simcoe Hall on March 20, 2008, as well as the protest that was ongoing outside Simcoe Hall, were related to the item under consideration, specifically to the proposed increase in the New College Residence fee, one of the service ancillaries. In the view of the University administration, the events of March 20, 2008 had not been consistent with the values of the University. The *Statement of Institutional Purpose* made clear the University's fundamental commitment to freedom of expression, as well as the right of all its members to peaceful assembly. Unfortunately, the events of March 20, 2008 had not been consistent with peaceful assembly. Protesters had entered the premises of

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

REPORT NUMBER 146 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – March 25, 2008

Simcoe Hall, intimidated staff members, and disrupted their work. It had been necessary to send staff home early, and to provide a police escort to ensure that they could exit the building safely. A small group of staff who had remained behind in the Provost's Office had been told by the protesters that they would not be allowed to leave until certain demands had been met. Such actions clearly exceeded the right to demonstrate and were tantamount to holding individuals against their will. The protesters had been warned numerous times that their actions were inappropriate. Members of the University Campus Police had then acted very appropriately in attempting passively to ensure that the staff members could exit the Provost's Office safely. This had not been possible, and some staff members had been injured and dragged to the floor. The administration's concern was not with peaceful assemblies and protests, but rather with activities that had the potential to contravene the *Criminal Code* and the *Code of Student Conduct*. As the President had indicated in his Statement of March 24, 2008,¹ the University would ask the Toronto Police Services to investigate whether violations of the *Criminal Code* had occurred. In addition, the University would examine whether any members of the student community had violated the *Code of Student Conduct*.

Professor Goel noted that these unfortunate events had purportedly begun as a protest against the proposed increases to the New College Residence fees, but had then developed into a protest in support of a number of disparate causes. The recommendation to increase the New College Residence fees had been made following a lengthy process of review and consultation. Students had been engaged at every stage of the process, and were involved in the final approval stage as members of the University Affairs Board. In addition, members of the senior administration had met with New College student leaders on March 25, 2008 in order to hear their concerns regarding the proposed fee increase. The Provost and the Principal of New College had made a commitment to review the legitimate concerns that had been expressed concerning the impact of the fee increase on upper year students and on the distribution of students in the residence population. The administration wished and expected to continue to engage with students in such a constructive manner.

Professor Freedman added that the operating plans and budgets for all the service ancillaries had proceeded through an elaborate process of consultation and approval, including that carried out by the Services Ancillaries Review Group (SARG), before being presented to the Board for final approval.

The Chair invited Mr. David Scrivener, Vice-President, External of the Students' Administrative Council (SAC) to address the Board. He stated that the Board was being asked to approve a drastic fee increase for the New College Residence. Many residences had long-term plans to address their accumulated deficits, but only New College had opted to take such a drastic step. If the fees were approved, it would cost \$10,361 to live in residence at New College for the upcoming academic year, equivalent to renting a shared room in an apartment for \$800 per month. The proposed 20% increase compared unfavorably to the maximum rent increase of 1.4% allowed by the Ontario Landlord and Tenant Board for 2008. Insufficient government funding was forcing post-secondary institutions to shift the cost of education away from society and onto individual students. Democratically elected student representatives had demanded more affordable and accessible education, including student housing, and he urged the Board not to approve the service ancillary plans and budgets.

The Chair invited Mr. Matthew Gordon, Executive Treasurer of the New College Residence Council to address the Board. He noted that he was also a member of the New College Student Council as well as

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

the New College Council. In his view, the proposal for a sudden and drastic 20% fee increase was extremely unreasonable. Other options to address the operating deficit had not been adequately

¹http://www.president.utoronto.ca/aboutthepresident/speeches/President_s_Statement_on_the_Events_at_Simcoe_Hall_on_March_20th_2008.htm

REPORT NUMBER 146 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – March 25, 2008

considered for political reasons, in order to make a point with the University's senior administration by means of a drastic increase. The Principal of New College had committed to an increase in 2009-10 that would not exceed the rate of inflation, so there was no reason that the 20% increase in 2008-09 could not have been phased in over a number of years. The *Final Report of the New College Residence Review Committee* had recommended the introduction of variable room rates, but this option had not been adequately considered. The major problem with the introduction of such a drastic fee increase, which would amount to \$1200 per academic year, would be its impact on the composition of the residence population. The current 60:40 ratio of upper year to first year students would not be maintained. Fewer upper year students would be available as role models for first year students with a negative effect on the student experience. The proposed fee increase was not the best option to address the operating deficit, and the Board was urged not to approve the operating plans and budgets.

The Chair invited Ms Alanna Prasad, an Executive Member of the Arts and Science Union (ASSU) to address the Board. She stated that she was also speaking as a New College student and as a member of the Council of the Faculty of Arts and Science. She wished to respond to the *President's Statement on the Events at Simcoe Hall on March 20, 2008* which, in her view, had misrepresented the facts about what had occurred that day. No effort had been made to contact representatives of ASSU, SAC or the Ontario Public Research Interest Group (OPIRG) in order to receive comments or clarifications regarding the incident. Serious and wrongful accusations had been made regarding the involvement of student unions. Valid issues had, in fact, been raised at the protest. ASSU would be formulating a response to the *President's Statement*, which in her view was an insult to everything that ASSU represented. She urged members of the Board to take into consideration her comments regarding the *President's Statement*, and not to approve the item under consideration.

A member stated that he was strongly opposed to the proposed fee increases. The views of students had not been considered in the consultation process. He was troubled by the manner in which students and their issues had been treated at the Simcoe Hall demonstration on March 20, 2008 and in the President's subsequent *Statement* on the incident. The principle of self-funding for ancillary operations was a concern for him personally and for many students. Annual deficits occurred when the University did not provide financial support to the ancillary operations from its operating budget. The proposed parking rate increases were 5% or greater, while increases to residence fees ranged from 5-15%. The proposed New College Residence fee increase actually amounted to a 20% increase rather than the 10% figure cited in the cover memo provided in the meeting documentation. The New College Student Council and New College Residence Council had opposed the proposed increase throughout the consultation process. SAC had attempted to investigate the issue, but, despite its requests, had not received information from the New College administration. Student membership on the University Affairs Board (8 of its usual 23 voting members) was not representative of the number of students on the University's three campuses. Demonstrators at the March 20, 2008 event had attempted to raise awareness that governments were spending money on wars rather than on post-secondary education or the alleviation of poverty. In his view, the reference to "thuggish tactics by mobs" in the *President's Statement* was inappropriate language for a university president. Campus police officers had not been threatened, hit, or shoved during the demonstration. Rather, it was his opinion that they had been aggressive, had mocked students, had picked them up and thrown them at other students, had stood on them, ripped their clothing, and injured them. The member asked what other options had been considered aside from the proposed increases in parking and residence fees? Had allocations from the University budget to the ancillary budgets, or the involvement of governments and non-profit corporations, been considered?

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

A member noted that increases in residence fees would reduce accessibility to this important component of campus life and the student experience, and asked whether bursary and scholarship support was available for those students who needed to live on campus. Mr. McGrath reported that, as residence fees had increased in recent years at UTM, some limited scholarship and bursary support for students with a

REPORT NUMBER 146 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – March 25, 2008

strong commitment to campus life had also been incorporated into the UTM Student Housing and Residence Life operating plans.

A member stated that inadequate per-student government funding for post-secondary education was the context that lay behind both the Board's debate as well as the demonstrations that had occurred during the previous week. The most appropriate place for protests was Queen's Park, especially given that a Provincial Budget was being released that day. He reminded the Board that the principle of self-funding for ancillary operations had been approved by the Governing Council in the early 1990s in response to significant funding cuts to post-secondary education. It had been decided at that time that the priority was to preserve the University's core academic operations. Since then, ancillary and student service operations had struggled to maintain services without support from the University's operating budget. Despite the fact that Ontario's per-student funding for post-secondary education was the lowest in Canada, impressive efforts had been made at the University to maintain and enhance accessibility. With respect to the proposed fee increase for the New College Residence, he was not in a position to judge the merits of the alternatives that had been raised. However, he believed that an extensive review and consultation process had occurred, and that the recommendation before the Board represented the consensus of the New College community. There was also merit to the argument that those who received the benefits of living in residence should cover the costs of those services.

Among the matters that arose in discussion were the following. A member asked how the residence fee increases under consideration compared to others across the three campuses. A member commented that increased fees could have the effect of pricing particular residences out of the market. Further, inadequate funding of universities by the provincial government did not justify the downloading of costs onto vulnerable student members of the University community. A member commented that if prices and revenue were kept too low, the quality of facilities would suffer. There needed to be an appropriate balance in order to be able to maintain and restore facilities that enhanced the student experience. A member stated that it would be useful to know what percentage of the student body lived in residence in order to assess arguments that allocations should be provided to residences from the University's operating budget.

Ms MacDonald stated that it was important to remember that student residences provided much more than just housing, and it was therefore problematic to compare their prices with those for off-campus rental housing. Residences provided services and programs, all of which had costs that needed to be covered by residence fees.

Professor Goel stated that this was not the appropriate forum to debate the merits of the *President's Statement* of March 24, 2008, but he wished to clarify for the record that all of the observations made in the *Statement* were based on and corroborated by multiple eyewitnesses to the events of March 20, 2008. There was much inaccurate information being posted electronically in the "blogosphere" by those who had not been present. He responded to a number of the questions raised by members. Approximately 84% of the University's students did not live in residence, and so any subsidy from the operating budget would benefit only the 16% who were able to take advantage of this privileged component of the student experience. The University had a very strong commitment to accessibility, and under its financial aid commitments would seek to ensure that students were able to enter residence or continue living there if

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

that was their only option. Even with the proposed fee increase, the New College Residence rates would not be the highest on the St. George campus, and so would not be priced out of the internal University market. He clarified that funding was provided from the University's academic operating budget to new residence operations to support them until they achieved a steady state of operations. New College had received such assistance when it had built its new residence in 2003, but it had accumulated a substantial deficit when it had kept its residence fees lower than those in the approved business plan. The proposed

REPORT NUMBER 146 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – March 25, 2008

fee increase would bring the fees up to the necessary levels. He also wished to clarify that the 20% increase in the New College Residence fees cited by members included 7% that was attributable to the meal plan as well as 3% attributable to inflation.

Professor Freedman added that the current residence rates at New College were the second lowest at the University, and would rise to the approximate median level if the increase was approved. It was expected that the residence would continue to operate at capacity, and the more significant issue would be the impact of the fee increase on the mix within the residence population. The University had a very strong commitment to preserving access, but residence life constituted an extra benefit enjoyed only by a small proportion of the student body. If funds were to be taken from the University's operating budget to subsidize the New College Residence, it would necessitate cuts to the core academic enterprise. He clarified that the New College fee increase would not be used to eliminate the accumulated deficit, but rather was intended to address the operating deficit.

The Chair invited Professor Rick Halpern, the Principal of New College to address the Board. He stated that New College was well aware of the needs of low-income students, and it had a strong commitment to increasing access to post-secondary education. He distinguished this, however, from access to university residence which was a privilege enjoyed by a small percentage of the student population. The proposed fee increase applied only to those who chose to live in residence, and did not apply to the general ancillary fee paid by all New College students. The decision to increase the residence fees had not been taken lightly, but rather had followed a long process of consultation. A Residence Review Committee, which had included student members, had been established in the fall of 2007 and had issued a Final Report in January 2008. The proposed fees would be at the approximate level of those at Woodsworth and Victoria Colleges, and considerably below those for the Chestnut Residence. They would also bring the fee levels to what they would have been if the original business plan for the residence ancillary had been implemented. The fee increases were not part of the long-term plan to reduce the approximately \$6 million accumulated deficit. However, they were part of a large package of reforms designed to return the ancillary operation to a state of financial health over a number of years. These reforms also included adjustments to the mortgage arrangements as well as plans for alternate uses of space within residence buildings. There was a wide consensus for change, including the implementation of these reforms, within the New College community.

On the recommendation of the Vice-Provost, Student Life,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

the 2008-09 operating plans and budgets for Service Ancillaries, as elaborated in the *Service Ancillaries Report on Operating Plans 2008-2009*, as summarized in Schedule I; the service ancillary capital budgets as summarized in Schedule V; and the rates and fees in Schedule VI.

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

Professor Freedman noted that these operating plans had been approved by the appropriate bodies at UTM, and that consequently he was recommending their approval by the Board. A member asked how many UTM students made use of the Health Services. Mr. Overton replied that the entire student population was eligible to do so. He was not aware of the percentage of that population that made use of the Health Services, as it was customary to measure the number of services provided to students, rather than the number of students who made use of those services.

REPORT NUMBER 146 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – March 25, 2008

On the recommendation of the Vice-Provost, Student Life,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the 2008-09 operating plans and budgets for the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM) Student Services (including Health Services, Physical Education, Recreation and Athletics, and the Student Services), as presented in the attached documentation from Mr. Mark Overton, Dean of Student Affairs, be approved;

THAT the sessional Health Service fee for a full-time student on the UTM campus be increased to \$24.16 (\$4.83 for a part-time student), which represents a year over year permanent increase of 22.5%;

THAT the sessional Physical Education, Recreation and Athletics fee for a full-time student on the UTM campus be increased to \$155.54 (\$31.11 for a part-time student), which represents a year over year permanent increase of 3.0%;

THAT the sessional Student Services fee for a full-time student on the UTM campus be increased to \$117.31 (\$23.46 for a part-time student), which represents a year over year permanent increase of 13.4%;

THAT the sessional (fall and winter sessions only) Student Shuttle Summer Service fee for a graduate student affiliated with UTM be increased to \$3.87 (\$0.77 for a part-time student), which represents a year over year permanent increase of 1.0%; and

THAT the sessional (fall and winter sessions only) Mississauga Transit U-Pass fee for a full-time graduate student affiliated with the University of Toronto Mississauga be maintained at \$44.50.

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

Professor Freedman noted that, in a similar fashion, these operating plans had been approved by the appropriate bodies at UTSC, and, so once again he was recommending their approval by the Board.

On the recommendation of the Vice-Provost, Student Life,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

That the 2008-09 operating plans and budgets for the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC) Student Services, as presented in the attached documentation from Mr. Tom Nowers, Dean of Student Affairs be approved;

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

That the sessional Student Services fee for a full-time student on the UTSC campus be decreased to \$125.21 (\$25.04 for a part-time student), which represents a year over year permanent decrease of 1.2%;

That the sessional Health and Wellness fee for a full-time student on the UTSC campus be increased to \$42.77 (\$8.55 for a part-time student), which represents a year over year permanent increase of 3.0%; and

REPORT NUMBER 146 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – March 25, 2008

That the sessional Physical Education and Athletics fee for a full-time student on the UTSC campus be increased to \$93.03 (\$18.61 for a part-time student), which represents a year over year permanent increase of 3.0%.

6. Operating Plans: Student Services, St. George Campus**(a) Advice from the Council on Student Services**

The Chair noted that the memorandum outlining the advice provided by the Council on Student Services (COSS) had been provided to members on the table. It had not been available for distribution to members one week prior to the meeting, as was the ordinary practise, because the final meeting of COSS had been held on March 24, 2008.

Professor Freedman reported that there had been good discussions at all the COSS meetings, and he thanked the Chair, Mr. Robert Ramsay, for his contributions to the process. COSS had voted on the three operating plans in question at its final meeting the previous evening, and he would outline the results as the Board proceeded through its agenda.

The Chair invited Mr. David Scrivener, Vice-President, External of SAC to address the Board. He wished to emphasize the importance of the COSS process in allowing student input on the various operating plans, and urged the Board to respect the decisions made by COSS. UTSU was opposed to ancillary fees being used as a “back door” by which to raise tuition fees. COSS had voted to oppose the operating plans for the Student Life Programs and Services, as well as Hart House, and he urged the Board to do likewise.

The Chair invited Mr. John Eliades, a Graduate Students’ Union (GSU) Executive-at-large, to address the Board. He stated that he had been a GSU representative on COSS for 2007-08. It had met only three times between late January and late March, and the GSU believed that its short time frame was inadequate to receive the necessary student input. The GSU supported the recommendations of the COSS Chair to review and improve these processes. Though COSS had approved the plans for the Faculty of Physical Education and Health Co-Curricular Programs, Services and Facilities, the GSU had voted against them as it opposed all fee increases. The University had made good progress with respect to guaranteed funding for graduate students, but some graduate students in professional programs did not have funding or access to teaching assistant positions. Ancillary fee increases would only add to the burden of the proposed tuition fee increases of 4.25% for domestic students and 6.6% for international students. The GSU also opposed the use of ancillary fees to subsidize the capital costs for the expansion of University facilities. It had opposed the Varsity Centre project in 2002 if it meant an increase in ancillary fees. The budgets for new facilities should include coverage of the operating costs within the existing fee structure. The GSU would be monitoring the proposed project for the Centre for High Performance Sport to ensure that this was the case.

6. Operating Plans: Student Services, St. George Campus (cont’d)**(a) Advice from the Council on Student Services (cont’d)**

The Chair invited Ms Sheila Hewlett, President of the Fine Arts Students’ Union, to address the Board. She noted that student organizations did lobby provincial governments to increase funding for post-secondary education. However, when universities increased fees, this made it less likely that such lobbying would be successful. She was concerned that student voices were not being heard with respect to the operating plans and fees which were under consideration. It was inaccurate to state that there had been no opposition to the increased fees for the New College Residence. Students had supported the *Final Report of the New College Residence Review Committee* but had not supported the residence fee increase.

REPORT NUMBER 146 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – March 25, 2008

If student voices were not heard, it was inevitable that protests like that of March 20, 2008 would occur. The account by students of what had occurred that day differed from that contained in the *President's Statement* of March 24, 2008. Both accounts ought to be considered. In her view, student voices were not being heard in a real way on the University Affairs Board.

(b) Student Life Programs and Services

The Chair noted that a revised cover sheet for this item, as well as the next two on the agenda, had been placed on the table for members. The recommendations and motions which they contained had been finalized by the administration following the final meeting of COSS held the previous day, March 24, 2008.

Professor Freedman noted that, beginning in 2008-09, the fees previously described as “Student Affairs,” “Student Services,” and “Health Service” would be combined into a single fee described as the “Student Life Programs and Services” fee.

A member asked if there were specific issues that had been raised when the operating plans had been defeated at COSS. Ms Fromowitz replied that there had been support at COSS for the general direction taken by the operating plans, as well as for the establishment of an advisory committee. Those opposed to the plans had maintained that fee increases would have a negative effect on access to post-secondary education. Concerns had also been raised that full consultation had not occurred during the recent reorganization of the student life programs and services. Professor Freedman added that productive discussions had occurred at the COSS meetings, but that the position of some student organizations, such as the GSU, was that they would not support any fee increase. The administration had responded that, in the absence of fee increases, services would have to be reduced as their costs increased. A member commented that the primary problem was the lack of adequate funding for post-secondary education. Student organizations and the University administration seemed to be in agreement with respect to the principles behind student life initiatives, but unfortunately disagreed on how these should be financed. A member asked how the proposed increase to the Student Life Services and Programs fee compared to previous years. Ms Fromowitz responded that the recommendation was that this newly combined fee increase by a total of 2.8% in 2008-09. In 2007-08, the three individual fees (Student Affairs, Health Services, and Student Services) had increased by 2%, 2%, and 2.5% respectively. A member noted that some students had expressed concern that there was a lack of clarity regarding the next steps to be taken in the restructuring of the student life programs and services, and she asked for further information in this regard. Ms Fromowitz responded that the operating plans and budgets provided detailed information regarding the allocation of the fees by service. The proposed 2.8% increase reflected the increased costs of those services. Approximately 70% of those costs consisted of salaries and benefits, while occupancy costs and operating costs accounted for about 10% and 20% respectively.

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

On the recommendation of the Vice-Provost, Student Life,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

That the 2008-09 operating plans and budget for Student Life Services and Programs, as presented in the attached documentation from Ms Lucy Fromowitz, Assistant Vice-President, Student Life, be approved; and

REPORT NUMBER 146 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – March 25, 2008

That the sessional Student Life Services and Programs fee for a full-time student on the St. George campus be increased to \$102.91 (\$20.58 for a part-time student), which represents a year over year permanent increase of 2.0% and a temporary three year increase of 0.8%.

(c) Hart House

Professor Freedman noted that the Hart House operating plans had been defeated at COSS, but he recommended that the Board approve the motions contained in the revised agenda. A member commented that Hart House was trying to achieve a great deal in support of the University's leading priority, the enhancement of the student experience. It needed resources to do so, and he supported the proposed operating plans. A member commended Hart House for its commitment to its recent strategic review process, and for its long-term plan to address a challenging budgetary situation in the context of the principle of self-funding for ancillary services.

On the recommendation of the Vice-Provost, Student Life,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

That the 2008-09 operating plans and budget for Hart House, as presented in the attached documentation from Dr. Louise Cowin, Warden, be approved;

That the sessional Hart House fee for a full-time student on the St. George campus be increased to \$66.30 (\$13.26 for a part-time student), which represents a year over year increase of 2.0% (resulting from the elimination of a 2005-06 three year temporary increase, a permanent increase of 2.0%, and a temporary three year increase of 1.4%); and

That the sessional Hart House fee for a full-time student at UTM or UTSC be increased to \$2.04 (\$0.42 for a part-time student), which represents a year over year increase of 2.0% (resulting from the elimination of a 2004-05 three year temporary increase, a permanent increase of 2.0%, and a temporary three year increase of 1.4%).

(d) Faculty of Physical Education and Health Co-Curricular Programs, Services and Facilities

Professor Freedman noted that the operating plans and proposed increase to the Athletics and Recreation fee had not been approved by COSS, but he recommended that the Board approve the motions on the revised agenda. In response to a question, Professor Kidd clarified that the proposed fee increase represented the combination of a cost of living (CPI) increase with the automatic elimination of two temporary increases from previous years.

6. Operating Plans: Student Services, St. George Campus (cont'd)**(d) Faculty of Physical Education and Health Co-Curricular Programs, Services and Facilities (cont'd)**

The Chair invited Mr. Jeff Peters, Vice-President, Internal of the Association of Part-time University Students (APUS) to address the Board, and noted that he had granted this speaking request despite the fact that it had been received very late. Mr. Peters stated the view that he had not been late for the meeting, but rather had been barred from the building, and had waited outside for almost two hours to be admitted to address the Board. In his opinion, this indicated what the University thought of its student leaders. APUS was opposed to the Athletics and Recreation budget. It was losing its office space to the site for the proposed Centre for High Performance Sport. APUS had presented a petition opposed to the

REPORT NUMBER 146 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – March 25, 2008

Athletics and Recreation budget, and it urged the Board not to vote against the voice of students. He wished also to state that an equity poster that had recently been distributed by the University had failed to include people of colour, those living in poverty, and those living with disabilities, that is, some of the most oppressed members of society. Professor Freedman expressed his regret that Mr. Peters had been waiting outside, and clarified that the operating plans and budget under consideration concerned the Faculty of Physical Education and Health's Co-Curricular Programs, Services and Facilities, and did not involve the proposed Centre for High Performance Sport.

On the recommendation of the Vice-Provost, Student Life,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

That the 2008-09 operating plans and budget for the Faculty of Physical Education and Health: Co-curricular Programs and Services, as presented in the attached documentation from Professor Bruce Kidd, Dean, be approved;

That the sessional Athletics & Recreation fee for a full-time student on the St. George campus be increased to \$ 125.81 (\$25.16 for a part-time student), which represents a year over year permanent increase of 1.9% (resulting from the elimination of a 2005-06 three year temporary increase, the elimination of a 2007-08 one year temporary increase, and a permanent increase of 11.8%); and

That the sessional Athletics & Recreation fee for a full-time student at UTM or UTSC be increased to \$14.63 (\$2.93 for a part-time student), which represents a year over year permanent increase of 2.0% (resulting from the elimination of a 2005-06 three year temporary increase, and a permanent increase of 3.8%).

7. College of Electors: Constitution – Revisions

The Chair noted that the revisions being proposed for this Constitution were minor ones, and the proposal was therefore before the Board for its approval rather than for recommendation to the Governing Council.

Ms Mae-Yu Tan, the Secretary of the Chair of the College of Electors reported that the 2009 Chancellor Search would be initiated in the fall of 2008. The proposed changes to the Constitution of the College of Electors were intended to help refine the search process. While the Chancellor Search Committee in 2006 had felt that the search had been more structured and transparent than previous searches, two areas had been identified for further consideration. First, it was being recommended that the Search Committee be given authority to generate names of nominees to add to the pool of nominations received. This duty

7. College of Electors: Constitution – Revisions (cont'd)

would be consistent with the responsibilities of a search committee. Second, it was being recommended that the Search Committee determine the willingness of the recommended candidate to stand as Chancellor prior to submitting its Report to the College of Electors, rather than prior to submission of the nomination form. It was intended that this more respectful approach would minimize potentially difficult situations resulting from a nominee not being elected. These revisions had been unanimously approved by the College of Electors at its meeting of March 10, 2008.

On the recommendation of the Vice-Provost, Student Life,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

REPORT NUMBER 146 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – March 25, 2008

THAT the revised [Constitution of the College of Electors](#), a copy of which is attached to the memorandum from the Secretary of the Governing Council dated March 11, 2008, be approved, replacing the Constitution as amended on February 10, 2005.

8. Report of the Senior Assessor

Professor Freedman noted that the Council on Student Services (COSS) process for 2007-08 had been carried out in a respectful manner. He observed that it might, as a member of the Board had suggested, be useful for COSS to begin its process earlier in the academic year, and to schedule a greater number of meetings than in recent years.

9. Date of the Next Meeting

The Chair informed members that the next regular meeting of the Board was scheduled for Tuesday, April 29, 2008 at 4:30 p.m.

10. Other Business

There was no other business.

The meeting adjourned at 6:20 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

April 9, 2008