

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL
REPORT NUMBER 156 OF
THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD

March 16, 2010

To the Governing Council,
University of Toronto.

Your Board reports that it met on Tuesday, March 16, 2010 at 4:30 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, with the following members present:

Ms B. Elizabeth Vosburgh, In the Chair
Professor Jill Matus, Vice-Provost, Students
Ms Lucy Fromowitz, Assistant Vice-President,
Student Life
Ms Diana A.R. Alli
Ms Greta Chiu
Dr. Louise Cowin
Ms Joeita Gupta
Mr. Adam Heller
Professor Bruce Kidd
Mr. Maciek Lipinski-Harten
Mr. Ben Liu
Mr. Chris McGrath
Mr. Olivier Sorin
Mr. John David Stewart

Non-Voting Assessors:

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)

Mr. Louis Charpentier, Secretary of the
Governing Council

Secretariat:

Mr. Henry Mulhall (Secretary)

Regrets:

Ms Erin Fitzgerald
Ms Judith Goldring, Vice-Chair
Professor William Gough
Mr. Allan Grant
Ms Kimberley Stemshorn
Dr. Sarita Verma

In Attendance:

Mr. Jeff Peters, Former Member of the Governing Council, and President, Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students (APUS)
Ms Yolissa Dalamba, Executive Director, APUS
Mr. Anwar Kazimi, Committee Secretary and Chief Returning Officer, Office of the Governing Council
Ms Mae-Yu Tan, Assistant Secretary of the Governing Council

REPORT NUMBER 156 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – March 16, 2010

ALL ITEMS ARE REPORTED FOR INFORMATION

Chair's Remarks

The Chair welcomed the guests 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. She thanked them for their important work in providing services which enhanced the student experience. The Chair reminded members of the Board that it was their responsibility to ensure that the University was managed well, rather than to manage it themselves. She noted that the operating plans and budgets under consideration had originated at the divisional level, where they had undergone a rigorous governance process, and 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. These prior governance processes had provided due diligence for the recommendations, and the expertise and work of these bodies ought to be respected as the Board considered the operating plans for approval. Its role was to satisfy itself that these 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 155 (January 26, 2010) 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

Professor Matus reported that the operating plans for the service ancillaries had undergone an extensive process of review and consultation by the Financial Services Department as well as the Service Ancillaries Review Group (SARG). The membership of SARG included three members of the Board, and for the first time that year, had also included the Vice-Provost, Academic Operations as well as the Executive Director, Planning and Budget.

On the recommendation of the Vice-Provost, Students,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

The 2010-11 operating plans and budgets for Service Ancillaries, as elaborated in the *Service Ancillaries Report on Operating Plans 2010-2011*, 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 Scarborough

Professor Matus reported that the operating plans for the student services at the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC) had received unanimous approval by UTSC's Council on Student Services (CSS) on February 1, 2010. Mr. Nowers thanked, in particular, the student members of CSS for their participation in what was a consultative and transparent process. He noted that this was the thirteenth such budget that had received the support of CSS.

REPORT NUMBER 156 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – March 16, 2010

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

On the recommendation of the Vice-Provost, Students,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the 2010-11 operating plans and budgets for the UTSC Student Services (including Health & Wellness, Physical Education & Athletics, and the Student Services), as presented in the attached documentation from Mr. Tom Nowers, Dean of Student Affairs, be approved;

THAT the sessional Health & Wellness fee for a full-time student on the UTSC campus be increased to \$49.71 (\$9.94 for a part-time student), which represents a year over year permanent increase of 10.7%;

THAT the sessional Physical Education and Athletics fee for a full-time student on the UTSC campus be increased to \$102.57 (\$20.51 for a part-time student), which represents a year over year permanent increase of 5.0%; and

THAT the sessional Student Services fee for a full-time student on the UTSC campus be increased to \$148.03 (\$29.61 for a part-time student), which represents a year over year permanent increase of 9.0%.

5. Operating Plans: Student Affairs and Services, University of Toronto at Mississauga

Professor Matus reported that the operating plans for student affairs and services at the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM) had been assessed by a variety of working groups that had been open to the student and other members of the Quality Services to Students Council (QSS), as well as the student community more broadly. The plans had then received the unanimous approval of QSS at its meeting of February 11, 2010. A member expressed her support for the fact that no increase had been proposed to the UTM physical education and athletics fee.

On the recommendation of the Vice-Provost, Students,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the 2010-11 operating plans and budgets for the UTM Student Services (including the Health & Counselling Centre, Department of Physical Education, Athletics & Recreation, and items under the Student Services fee), 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 Mississauga campus be increased to \$28.15 (\$5.63 for a part-time student), which represents a year over year increase of 7.8% (resulting from the elimination of a 2007-08 three-year temporary increase and a permanent increase of 10.6%);

REPORT NUMBER 156 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – March 16, 2010

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

THAT the sessional Physical Education and Athletics fee for a full-time student on the Mississauga campus be maintained at \$160.21 (\$32.04 for a part-time student), which represents a year over year increase of 0% (resulting from the elimination of a 2007-08 three-year temporary increase, and a permanent increase of 1.4%);

THAT the sessional Student Services fee for a full-time undergraduate student on the Mississauga campus be increased to \$121.74 (\$24.35 for a part-time student), which represents a year over year increase of 2.9% (resulting from the elimination of a 2007-08 three-year temporary increase to the Career Centre portion of the Student Services fee and a permanent increase of 3.8%);

THAT the sessional Student Services fee for a full-time graduate student affiliated with the Mississauga campus be increased to \$109.34 (\$21.87 for a part-time student), which represents a year over year increase of 5.4% (resulting from the elimination of a 2007-08 three-year temporary increase to the Career Centre portion of the Student Services fee and a permanent increase of 6.3%);

THAT the sessional (fall and winter sessions only) UTM Shuttle Summer Service fee for a full-time graduate student affiliated with the Mississauga campus be increased to \$3.94 (\$0.79 for a part-time student), which represents a year over year permanent increase of 1.8%; and

THAT the sessional (fall and winter sessions only) Mississauga Transit U-Pass fee for a full-time graduate student affiliated with the Mississauga campus be increased to \$49.57, which represents a year over year permanent increase of 2%.

6. Operating Plans: Student Services, St. George Campus

(a) Advice from the Council on Student Services (COSS)

Professor Matus reported that COSS had held more meetings during the 2010 process than in recent years. Members of the Board had received a letter from the Chair of COSS which provided details of the outcome of the COSS meeting of February 26, 2010 at which it had considered the operating plans and fees for the student services on the St. George Campus. None of the operating plans had been approved by COSS.

The Chair invited Mr. Jeff Peters, President of APUS, to address the Board. He praised the UTM athletics services for having proposed a 0% increase in its student fee, and hoped that other student services would follow this example. According to Mr. Peters, campus child care was unaffordable, especially for part-time students who needed it most, and ought to be subsidized by the University. Part-time students also needed evening and drop-in child care options.

At his request, a package of documentation was placed on the table by the Secretary. It provided the text of a motion, passed by COSS at its meeting on February 26, 2010, which called for the abolition of the *Code of Student Conduct*. Mr. Peters asked why this motion had not been included in the documentation provided to the Board. In his view, the *Code* was used to stifle political expression. He reiterated many of the comments that he had made in opposition to the *Code* in his address to the Board on November 3,

REPORT NUMBER 156 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – March 16, 2010

6. Operating Plans: Student Services, St. George Campus (cont'd)

(a) Advice from the Council on Student Services (COSS) (cont'd)

2009.¹ He supported the COSS motion for a moratorium on the use of the *Code*, and for the replacement of the administrative review of the *Code* with a standing committee with parity between students, staff, and faculty, and a mandate to create a student bill of rights and a human rights code for the University.

The Chair noted that the *Code of Student Conduct* was a separate matter from the item of business before the Board, and about which Mr. Peters had made a speaking request, the operating plans for the St. George Campus student services. A consultative review of the *Code* was underway, and the Board would await the advice of the Senior Assessor following this process.

In response to Mr. Peters question regarding the documentation received by the Board, Professor Matus noted that the letter to the Board detailing the outcome of the COSS process had been provided by the COSS Chair, a student. It appropriately provided advice to the Board concerning the St. George campus student service operating plans.

A member stated her view that it was within the purview of COSS to discuss the student experience, and to provide advice to the Board in that regard. Its views were particularly important since it was one of the few governance bodies with a student majority. She referred to the documentation that had been placed on the table at the request of Mr. Peters regarding the *Code of Student Conduct*. She supported the COSS motion for the abolition of the *Code*, she objected to the review process that was underway, and she supported its replacement with a standing committee where students would have parity with faculty and staff. In her view the documentation provided evidence that the *Code* had long been misused, and that there existed widespread opposition among students, faculty, staff, and unions to its use, in particular, to criminalize dissent. She maintained that Professor Matus had stated at the meeting of the Board on November 3, 2009 that the *Code* would be abolished if the review process found evidence of sufficient opposition to it.

Professor Matus clarified that she had stated, rather, that if widespread dissatisfaction with the *Code* became apparent during the consultation process, it would be taken under advisement. She had added that if there were sufficient expressions of interest in a full review of the *Code*, that could be an outcome.²

(b) Student Life Programs and Services

Professor Matus reported that the operating plans originally proposed for the student life programs and services on the St. George Campus had failed to receive approval at COSS, and so revised plans had been put forward which included lesser fee increases within the limits provided by the *Protocol*.³

A member asked how failure to receive COSS approval affected the budget. Ms Fromowitz responded that it introduced a level of instability in that it became necessary to make use of temporary (three year)

¹ See *Report Number 154 of the University Affairs Board* (November 3, 2009) p. 6: <http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/AssetFactory.aspx?did=6589>.

² See *Report Number 154 of the University Affairs Board* (November 3, 2009), p. 6: <http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/AssetFactory.aspx?did=6589>.

³ *Memorandum of Agreement between The University of Toronto, The Students' Administrative Council, The Graduate Students' Union and The Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students for a Long-Term Protocol on the Increase or Introduction of Compulsory Non-tuition Related Fees.*

REPORT NUMBER 156 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – March 16, 2010**6. Operating Plans: Student Services, St. George Campus (cont'd)****(b) Student Life Programs and Services (cont'd)**

increases, and as these expired, rebalancing was required. A member noted that the Graduate Students' Union (GSU) representatives on COSS had strongly supported the original operating plans proposed for the student life programs and services. Another member noted that the representatives of APUS and the Students' Administrative Council (SAC) had opposed the original plans. She referred members to the letter to the Board from the Vice-President, University Affairs of SAC which provided the rationale for the opposition of the SAC members of COSS to the three operating plans proposed for the student services on the St. George Campus. She agreed with its position that the central administration should provide greater support for these student services which were largely funded by student fees.

On the recommendation of the Vice-Provost, Students,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the 2010-11 operating plans and budget for Student Life Programs and Services, as presented in the documentation from Ms Lucy Fromowitz, Assistant Vice President, Student Life, be approved; and

THAT the sessional fee for a full-time student on the St. George campus be increased to \$113.83 (\$22.77 for a part-time student), which represents a year over year permanent increase of \$5.77 (\$1.16 for a part-time student) or 5.3% (resulting from the elimination of a 2007-08 three year temporary increase, and a permanent increase of 1.5%, and a three year temporary increase of 4.1%).

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

Professor Matus reported that the originally proposed operating plans for the Faculty of Physical Education and Health's co-curricular programs, services, and facilities had received the unanimous support of the Council of Athletics and Recreation (CAR). However, they had not been approved by COSS, and so a revised proposal, within the *Protocol's* limits, had been provided for the Board's consideration.

On the recommendation of the Vice-Provost, Students,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the 2010-11 operating plans and budget for Faculty of Physical Education & Health: Co-Curricular Programs, Services and Facilities, as presented in the documentation from Ms Anita Comella, Assistant Dean, Co-Curricular Physical Activity and Health, be approved;

THAT the sessional fee for a full-time student on the St. George campus be increased to \$136.05 (\$27.21 for a part-time student), which represents a year over year permanent increase of \$3.26 (\$0.65 for a part-time student) or 2.45% (resulting from the elimination of a 2007-08 three year temporary increase, and a permanent increase of 1.5%, and a three year temporary increase of 7.1%); and

REPORT NUMBER 156 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – March 16, 2010**6. Operating Plans: Student Services, St. George Campus (cont'd)****(c) Faculty of Physical Education and Health Co-Curricular Programs, Services and Facilities (cont'd)**

THAT the sessional fee for a full-time student at UTM or UTSC be increased to \$15.78 (\$3.16 for a part-time student), which represents a year over year permanent increase of \$0.38 (\$0.08 for a part-time student) or 2.45% (resulting from the elimination of a 2007-08 three year temporary increase, and a permanent increase of 1.5%, and a three year temporary increase of 7.1%)

(d) Hart House

Professor Matus reported that the operating plans and budget originally proposed by Hart House had failed to receive approval by COSS, and so a revised proposal within the limits set by the *Protocol* was before the Board. A member noted that the Graduate Students' Union (GSU) representatives on COSS had strongly supported the original proposal which, in their view, would have better allowed Hart House to maintain the quality of its services. A member responded by stating that COSS had not objected to the quality of Hart House's services, but rather to their being funded largely by student fees.

On the recommendation of the Vice-Provost, Students,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the 2010-11 operating plans and budget for Hart House, as presented in the documentation from Dr. Louise Cowin, Warden, be approved;

THAT the sessional fee for a full-time student on the St. George campus be increased to \$69.11 (\$13.83 for a part-time student), which represents a year over year permanent increase of \$2.35 (\$0.48 for a part time student) or 3.5% (resulting from the elimination of a 2007-08 three year temporary increase, and a permanent increase of 1.5%, and a three year temporary increase of 3.5%); and

THAT the sessional fee for a full-time student at UTM or UTSC be increased to \$2.12 (\$0.43 for a part-time student), which represents a year over year permanent increase of \$0.07 (\$0.01 for a part time student) or 3.4% (resulting from the elimination of a 2007-08 three year temporary increase, and a permanent increase of 1.5%, and a three year temporary increase of 3.5%).

7. Reports of the Elections Committee

Members received for information the following reports of the Elections Committee:

- (a) Report Number 58: February 10, 2010
- (b) Report Number 59: March 8, 2010

The Chair invited Ms Yolissa Dalamba, Executive Director of APUS to address the Board. She expressed concern that two disabled students had felt the need to submit appeals to the Election Overseers regarding the accommodation arrangements that had been provided for them during the Governing Council election process. Among her concerns were the following. The appeal process, in her view, had been grueling and

7. Reports of the Elections Committee (cont'd)

REPORT NUMBER 156 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – March 16, 2010

violating. The appellants should not have been required to justify the number of hours for which they required the assistance of an attendant for campaigning purposes, and should not have been required to reveal private health information. It was troubling that the hourly pay rate for attendants had been reduced over that of previous years. The University should make every accommodation necessary to ensure that disabled and part-time students were able to participate in elections on an equitable basis with other candidates. She commended the two appellants for their participation in the elections process, and urged the Election Overseers to reconsider their decisions.

A member who was also a member of the Elections Committee responded by clarifying a number of points made by the guest speaker. As reported on page 4 of *Report Number 59 of the Elections Committee*, the Chief Returning Officer, Mr. Kazimi, had undertaken to reconsider the hourly rate that would be reimbursed to the two candidates for the services of an attendant. Subsequent to the March 8, 2010 meeting, the rate had been increased from \$15.00 to \$20.00 per hour. In the member's view, it was reasonable to have a cap of 28 hours per week for which candidates would be reimbursed for the services of an attendant. This would accommodate approximately 5.5 hours of campaigning for 5 workdays per week, or alternatively approximately 4 hours per day for campaigning that occurred 7 days per week. Finally, he noted that the two appellants had not been required to reveal private health information in public during the meeting of the Elections Committee. They had been given the option to have their appeals heard *in camera*, but had chosen rather to have the proceedings occur in open session.

A member, who self-identified herself as one of the appellants, acknowledged that the hourly rate of pay had been increased following the meeting, and thanked the Chief Returning Officer for this adjustment. She referred members to two articles in the *Varsity* (March 2, 2009 and March 11, 2010) that had been included in the package distributed by Mr. Peters, and which outlined her continuing efforts to ensure that adequate accommodation was provided during Governing Council elections. She had hoped that her advocacy during the 2009 election would have accomplished this goal, but had felt compelled during the current election process to appeal the cap on the number of hours for which candidates would be reimbursed for the services of an attendant. In her opinion, this cap was arbitrary, and it disadvantaged disabled candidates in competing with non-disabled candidates who could campaign for as many hours per week as they wished. She asked how the maximum level of reimbursement of 28 hours per week had been determined. Mr. Kazimi responded that he had taken many factors into consideration in making his decision. These had included the expert advice that he had received through consultation, his previous experience as the University's Work-Study coordinator, knowledge gained through his academic training, as well as the fact that the appellants, as part-time students, also had academic obligations to fulfill during the campaign period.⁴

7. Reports of the Elections Committee (cont'd)

⁴ Secretary's Note: Mr. Kazimi's research had indicated that there was no set pay rate for support workers. However, rates of pay for home support workers offered through CUPE (the Canadian Union of Public Employees) ranged between \$13.00 and \$14.00 per hour. He had also noted that the Ontario Human Rights Commission's (OHRC) *Policy and Guidelines on Disability and the Duty to Accommodate* stated that accommodation might be adopted for a purpose or goal that was rationally connected to the function being performed. Consequently, he had sought to balance the request for accommodation and its reasonableness to the task at hand. He had determined that the maximum number of hours of support per week be capped at 28 hours based on this task, namely election campaigning. The candidates had sought support for a minimum of 12 hours per day, for a total of 84 hours per week. It was correct that the level of accommodation provided had varied from 2009 to 2010. The timing of the request for accommodation in 2009 had necessitated an *ad hoc* response for the temporary period of need. The OHRC *Guidelines* allowed for *ad hoc* accommodation if time was an issue, and recommended that more cohesive accommodation be put in place for future requests. The Office of the Governing Council had sought to do so during the 2010 elections process.

REPORT NUMBER 156 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – March 16, 2010

Mr. Charpentier reassured the Board that the Chief Returning Officer had acted with care and diligence in making a determination of the appropriate accommodation to be provided to the appellants. He had consulted with expert officers of the University, including the Employment Equity and Accessibility of Ontarians with Disabilities (AODA) Advisor, and his decision had been upheld by the Elections Committee. In addition, the Elections Committee sought input each year from the University community regarding the elections process, and made recommendations for refinements to be implemented in the subsequent year.

8. Report of the Senior Assessor**(a) COSS, QSS, and CSS Processes**

Professor Matus reported that the consultative nature of the 2010 COSS process had been effective in making connections with student organizations, in soliciting their input, and in facilitating communication. She commended Ms Fromowitz, Dr. Cowin, and Ms Anita Comella⁵ for their efforts in this regard. The close working relationship between student organizations and the administration during the QSS and CSS processes at UTM and UTSC was evident in the support received for the operating plans on those campuses. While the three St. George campus operating plans had not been approved by COSS, a greater number of student members had voted for the proposed increases in the Student Life and Hart House budgets than had been the case in recent years. To Professor Matus this suggested a greater willingness on the part of students to share the costs of the various student services, and to make the University a better place. Representative student bodies at UTM, UTSC, and other universities had recognized the difficult financial situations faced by their institutions, and had volunteered to support new initiatives with additional fees.

A continuing concern for many student groups, and one which had been highlighted in the letter to the Board from SAC, was the extent to which the University supported central student services from the operating budget. Professor Matus maintained that this issue was best considered in the overall context of the serious financial constraints faced by the University. The economic downturn had had a significant impact on many universities worldwide, and support from the provincial government continued effectively to decline. Government grants per student (BIUs) had not kept pace with inflation, and were based on outdated formulas which no longer reflected the cost structures of the programs they were intended to fund. As a result, the University effectively received less funding per student than it had in 1992. At the same time, the costs to operate the University had escalated at rates that exceeded inflation. Salaries and benefits accounted for about 70% of the operating budget, and increases had been driven by factors such as international competition for faculty, collective agreements, and general market conditions for wage increases. In response, the University had been relentless in lobbying governments for enhanced support, and in working to increase revenues through advancement and fundraising efforts. As part of the University's next fundraising campaign, potential donors would be made aware of the possibility of supporting student services.

Professor Matus noted that while the University had been obliged to increase tuition and ancillary fees, it had also continued to provide generous need-based student aid, administered both centrally and through the academic divisions. The budget report for 2011 specified \$90 million for need-based aid consisting of funds derived from both the operating budget and endowment income. (However, that figure did not reflect all sources of student support, for example, graduate fellowships.) With the cancellation of the endowment payout during 2009-10, divisions had used operating reserves and expendable funds to meet the shortfall.

8. Report of the Senior Assessor (cont'd)

⁵ Assistant Dean, Co-curricular Physical Activity and Sport, Faculty of Physical Education and Health.

REPORT NUMBER 156 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – March 16, 2010

However, for 2010-11, endowment revenue for student aid was expected to return to near its normal level of \$30 million, and approximately \$4.5 million would be set aside from carry forward funds and new expendable donations to ensure that all student aid need was met.

(b) Annual Report on Student Financial Support

Professor Matus provided for the information of the Board some of the highlights of the *Report on Student Financial Support* that had been produced by her office and presented to the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs at its meeting on March 2, 2010. This annual report provided data on need-based student aid by academic division, and on funding for graduate students in doctoral-stream programs. The *Policy on Student Financial Support* stated that no student offered admission to a program at the University should be unable to enter or complete the program due to a lack of financial means. Professor Matus was pleased to report that the University continued to meet its commitment under the *Policy*, and was in full compliance with the requirements of the Student Access Guarantee for Working Families (SAG) that had been implemented by the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities in 2006-07. Historically, per student expenditures under the SAG at the University had exceeded the average amount at other Ontario universities by 100 per cent. While all Ontario universities were required by the SAG to cover the gap between OSAP-assessed need and OSAP funding, many required students to apply for the additional aid, while the University provided it automatically to all eligible students. It also provided this aid to students from other Canadian provinces, and to aboriginal students receiving band funding. Need-based student aid provided by the University had increased from about \$1.5 million in 1992-93 to about \$53.4 million in 2008-09. The increase from 2007-08 to 2008-09 alone had amounted to approximately 11% or \$5 million. Under the Noah Meltz program for part time students, \$400,000 had been distributed, and, in 2008-2009, exclusive of graduate fellowships, the University had provided approximately \$4.1 million to international students in the form of merit- and need-based grants.

(c) Code of Student Conduct

Professor Matus concluded by reporting that consultations were ongoing regarding the update of the *Code*. There had been a call for submissions from the University community, as well as meetings with interested groups including students, faculty, staff, and administrators. Among these were the Principals of the St. George Colleges, and representatives from SAC, the Faculty of Law, UTSC, UTM, and the student members of the Governing Council. A meeting was also planned with representatives from the GSU. Professor Matus encouraged other groups or individuals who wished to comment on the *Code* to contact her office. As she had indicated at previous meetings of the Board and the Governing Council, she would report on the results of these consultations once they had been completed.

A member stated that the University's financial aid guarantee did not apply to part-time students, and that the aid provided by the Noah Meltz program was insufficient to meet the needs of part-time students. She added her understanding that this had originally been intended as a temporary program until such time as the financial aid guarantee was extended to part-time students. A member responded by noting that in his experience as a part-time student at Woodsworth College, extensive financial aid had been available to part-time students.

9. Date of the Next Meeting

The Chair informed members that the next regular meeting of the Board was scheduled for Tuesday, April 20, 2010 at 4:30 p.m.

10. Other Business

There was no other business.

REPORT NUMBER 156 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – March 16, 2010

The meeting adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

March 23, 2010