

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL
REPORT NUMBER 162 OF
THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD

March 15, 2011

To the Governing Council,
University of Toronto.

Your Board reports that it met on Tuesday, March 15, 2011 at 4:30 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, with the following members present:

Ms B. Elizabeth Vosburgh, In the Chair
Mr. John Switzer, Vice-Chair
Professor Jill Matus, Vice-Provost, Students
Ms Lucy Fromowitz, Assistant Vice-President,
Student Life
Ms Diana A.R. Alli
Dr. Louise Cowin
Mr. Andrew O.P. Drummond
Mr. Arman Hamidian
Professor Ira Jacobs
Mr. Chris McGrath
Ms Natalie Melton
Mr. Samuel Oduneye
Professor Elizabeth M. Smyth
Ms Rita Tsang
Ms Neeharika Tummala

Non-Voting Assessors:

Mr. Louis R. Charpentier, Secretary of the
Governing Council
Mr. Jim Delaney, Director, Office of the Vice-
Provost, Students
Ms Anne MacDonald, Director, Ancillary
Services
Mr. Mark Overton, Dean of Student Affairs,
University of Toronto Mississauga (UTM)
Mr. Desmond Pouyat, Dean of Student Affairs,
University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC)
Ms Elizabeth Sisam, Assistant Vice-President,
Campus and Facilities Planning

Secretariat:

Mr. Henry Mulhall (Secretary)

Regrets:

Ms Joeita Gupta
Miss Meera Rai
Miss Melvin Sert
Miss Priatharsini Sivananthajothy
Mrs. Rachel Trozzolo
Dr. Sarita Verma

In Attendance:

Mr. Greg West, Member of the Governing Council, and Chair, Council on Student Services (COSS)
Mr. Adam Awad, President, Students' Administrative Council (SAC)
Dr. Anthony Gray, Special Advisor to the President
Ms Joan Griffin, Office of the Vice-Provost, Students
Mr. Anwar Kazimi, Committee Secretary, Office of the Governing Council
Ms Angela Regnier, Executive Director, SAC

REPORT NUMBER 162 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – March 15, 2011

ALL ITEMS ARE REPORTED FOR INFORMATION.

The Chair welcomed the various 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 161 (February 1, 2011) 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 consultation on each of the service ancillary operating plans had first occurred at the local level where students were involved. Draft plans had then been reviewed by the Financial Services Department whose report had been considered by the Service Ancillaries Review Group (SARG). The membership of SARG included three members of the University Affairs Board. Ms MacDonald noted that these services were not subsidized from the University's operating budget; rather, they were self-funded and were required to build up adequate reserves to allow for future investments.

On the recommendation of the Vice-Provost, Students,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

The 2011-12 operating plans and budgets for Service Ancillaries, as elaborated in the *Service Ancillaries Report on Operating Plans 2011-2012*, 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 fees for this and the following four operating plans for the various student services across the University's three campuses were subject to the terms and conditions of the University's *Protocol on non-tuition fees*.¹ She noted that the UTSC student services plans under consideration had first been considered and approved by the UTSC Council on Student Services (CSS).

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

¹ *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 162 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – March 15, 2011

Mr. Pouyat advised that the UTSC budget preparation process had been outlined in the documentation that had been provided to members of the Board. Accountability and the importance of ‘value for money’ had been themes of that diligent process, and in the end students had been satisfied that the proposed fee increases were reasonable.

On the recommendation of the Vice-Provost, Students,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the 2011-12 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. Desmond Pouyat, Dean of Student Affairs, be approved; and

THAT the sessional Health & Wellness fee for a full-time student on the UTSC campus be increased to \$52.19 (\$10.44 for a part-time student), which represents a year over year permanent increase of 5.0%; and

THAT the sessional Physical Education and Athletics fee for a full-time student on the UTSC campus be increased to \$107.69 (\$21.54 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 \$153.26 (\$30.65 for a part-time student), which represents a year over year permanent increase of 3.5%.

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 first been considered by the UTM Quality Services to Students Council (QSS) and its working groups. The physical education portion of the plan had also been considered by the UTM Governing Council on Athletics. QSS had approved most of the elements of the plan with the exception of: the physical education component, which is proposing a zero increase in fees; the health services component of the plan, which is proposing an increase in fees at an amount which allowed for a permanent increase under the *Protocol*; and the career centre element of the plan, which was now requesting a permanent and temporary increase to its portion of the student services fee. Mr. Overton noted the introduction of new fees for Faculty of Medicine MD students affiliated with the Mississauga campus. This reflected the opening of the new UTM Medical Academy that would occur in September 2011. In response to a question, he clarified that these MD students would pay the same Medical Society and other student society fees as would their counterparts on the St. George campus.

On the recommendation of the Vice-Provost, Students,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the 2011-12 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; and

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

REPORT NUMBER 162 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – March 15, 2011

THAT the sessional Health Service fee for a full-time student on the Mississauga campus be increased to \$28.67 (\$5.73 for a part-time student), which represents a year over year increase of 1.8% (resulting from a permanent increase of 1.8%); and

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%; and

THAT the sessional Student Services fee for a full-time undergraduate UTM student on the Mississauga campus be increased to \$131.08 (\$26.22 for a part-time student), which represents a year over year increase of 4.4% (resulting from a three-year temporary increase of 1.7% and a permanent increase of 2.7%); and

THAT the sessional Student Services fee for a full-time graduate student affiliated with the Mississauga campus be increased to \$118.31 (\$23.66 for a part-time student), which represents a year over year increase of 4.5% (resulting from a three-year temporary increase of 1.9% and a permanent increase of 2.6%); and

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 \$4.19 (\$0.84 for a part-time student), which represents a year over year permanent increase of 6.3%; 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 \$65.75, which represents a year over year permanent increase of 32.6%; and

THAT the sessional Student Services fee for a full-time Faculty of Medicine MD student affiliated with the Mississauga campus be established at \$118.31 (\$23.66 for a part-time student);² and

THAT the sessional (fall and winter sessions only) Mississauga Transit U-Pass fee for a full-time Faculty of Medicine MD student affiliated with the Mississauga campus be established at \$65.75; and

THAT the sessional (fall and winter sessions only) UTM Shuttle Summer Service fee for a full-time Faculty of Medicine MD student affiliated with the Mississauga campus be established at \$4.19 (\$0.84 for a part-time student).

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

Professor Matus stated that the *Protocol* on non-tuition fees provided that the operating plans and fees for the St. George campus services should first be considered by COSS, whose advice was to be conveyed to the University Affairs Board. She reported that, generally speaking, COSS had functioned well that year under its able Chair, Mr. Greg West, and that the administration had been pleased with the

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

² As this fee is the same as the student services fee for UTM affiliated graduate students, \$2.15 or 1.9% will be considered a three year temporary component of the fee.

REPORT NUMBER 162 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – March 15, 2011

cooperation that had existed within the Council. She referred members to the memorandum which had been distributed which summarized the decisions of COSS to approve or not to approve the plans of the three St. George campus service units. Under the *Protocol*, for a fee increase to be approved by COSS, both a majority of members voting and a majority of student members voting needed to vote in favour of the increase. In the absence of approval by COSS, the University Affairs Board could approve permanent increases at the lesser of the Consumer Price Index (CPI) or the University of Toronto Index (UTI), and temporary increases at the greater of CPI or UTI, and both could be approved concurrently. In 2011, the student members of COSS had not voted in favour of any of the three operating plans. Consequently, each of the three units was proposing increases which included a permanent component and a temporary component.

(b) Student Life Programs and Services

Ms Fromowitz reported that the budget preparation process, including consultation with student advisory committees in the various departments and the conducting of student surveys, had taken place over the course of a year. She noted that nearly twice as many COSS meetings had been held than in recent years, and that they had been opportunities for useful interaction between the administration and student groups. Though the student members of COSS had not, on principle, approved the proposed fee increases, they had acknowledged the quality of the programs that they funded. A member questioned the purpose of the COSS process, given that the outcome was the same most years when the student members voted not to approve the proposed fee increases. Ms Fromowitz responded that the process itself was meaningful because it required the administration and student groups to conduct discussions about the operating plans and budgets and the services that they supported. In addition, it allowed greater sharing of information about the process by which the plans and budgets were developed, and provided an opportunity for student input regarding new directions under consideration. In response to a series of questions, Ms Fromowitz noted that 92% of the proposed budgets were allocated to salary and space costs, both of which increased annually. The other 8% was directed largely to items that had been identified as priorities by the advisory committees. Spending on services and programs was thoroughly analyzed and assessed to ensure that appropriate outcomes were reached. As an example, changes in service delivery by Health and Wellness over the previous two years had virtually eliminated wait times. Goals were driven by a three-year strategic plan which was developed in consultation with student advisory groups and which was aligned with the University's priorities.

At the invitation of the Chair, Mr. Adam Awad, President of the Students Administrative Council (SAC) addressed the Board and reiterated Ms Fromowitz's comments regarding the value of the COSS process as a mechanism for information sharing between the administration and student groups. Students were able to receive information about the programs and services, and in turn were able to provide feedback regarding student engagement. Student groups recognized the value of the services that were being provided, and agreed that they deserved funding. Their concern was that students were being expected to fund a greater proportion of the costs of those services while the proportion being funded by the University's operating budget was decreasing.

REPORT NUMBER 162 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – March 15, 2011**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, Students,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the 2011-12 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 \$118.74 (\$23.75 for a part-time student), which represents a year over year increase of \$4.91 (\$0.98 for a part-time student) or 4.3% (resulting from the elimination of a 2008-09 three year temporary increase, a permanent increase of 2%, and a temporary increase of 3.1%).

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

Professor Matus noted that, prior to their consideration by COSS, these operating plans had been considered and approved by the Council of Athletics and Recreation (CAR), which included a considerable number of students among its membership.

On the recommendation of the Vice-Provost, Students,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the 2011-12 operating plans and budget for the 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 Sport, be approved; and

THAT the sessional fee for a full-time student on the St. George campus be increased to \$140.64 (\$28.13 for a part-time student), which represents a year over year increase of \$4.59 (\$0.92 for a part-time student) or 3.37% (resulting from the elimination of a 2008-09 three year temporary increase, a permanent increase of 2.0%, and a temporary increase of 7.1%); and

THAT the sessional fee for a full-time student at UTM or UTSC be increased to \$16.31 (\$3.26 for a part-time student), which represents a year over year increase of \$0.53 (\$0.11 for a part-time student) or 3.37% (resulting from the elimination of a 2008-09 three year temporary increase, a permanent increase of 2.0%, and a temporary increase of 7.1%).

(d) Hart House

Professor Matus stated that Hart House's operating plans and budget had been considered both by COSS, as well as by the House's Board of Stewards, which included a considerable number of students. Dr. Cowin noted that the Board of Stewards had, in the fall of 2010, approved a new vision statement for

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

REPORT NUMBER 162 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – March 15, 2011**(d) Hart House (cont'd)**

Hart House. She added that the House is entirely dependent upon student fees and external and other revenue, and its annual fee increases had averaged approximately 3.5% in recent years. Approximately 59% of its revenue was derived from fees while 41% came from business operations. Much of the proposed 3.6% increase was necessitated by increased salary and benefit costs. In addition, utility costs would exceed \$1 million for the first time in the coming year. Efforts were being made to control costs, and to increase revenue from external sources including fundraising. The Justina M. Barnicke Gallery had recently been renovated with the costs entirely covered by external funding including generous support from the Barnicke family.

On the recommendation of the Vice-Provost, Students,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the 2011-12 operating plans and budget for Hart House, as presented in the documentation from Dr. Louise Cowin, Warden, be approved; and

THAT the sessional fee for a full-time student on the St. George campus be increased to \$71.63 (\$14.34 for a part-time student), which represents a year over year increase of \$2.52 (\$0.51 for a part time student) or 3.6% (resulting from the elimination of a 2008-09 three year temporary increase, a permanent increase of 2.0%, and a temporary increase of 3.6%); and

THAT the sessional fee for a full-time student at UTM or UTSC be increased to \$2.20 (\$0.45 for a part-time student), which represents a year over year increase of \$0.08 (\$0.02 for a part time student) or 3.6% (resulting from the elimination of a 2008-09 three year temporary increase, a permanent increase of 2.0%, and a temporary increase of 3.6%).

7. Report of the Elections Committee

Members received for information Report Number 63 (February 3, 2011) of the Elections Committee.

8. Report of the Senior Assessor

Professor Matus thanked the assessors to the Board, as well as the members of their staffs, for their efforts in developing the operating plans and budgets that had been approved by the Board. She then reported on three matters.

(a) Framework on Off-Campus Safety

The Business Board, which was responsible for matters related to the occupational health and safety of staff as well as the safety of members of the broader University community, had, at its March 7, 2011 meeting, recommended for approval to Governing Council a new *Framework on Off-Campus Safety*. In addition, the Provost was establishing a series of guidelines under the *Framework* to address a number of situations related to off-campus activities. The *Framework* and Guidelines were needed for a number of reasons. The existing *Policy on Safety in Field Research* required updating, and there were a variety of guidelines and practices across the University that would benefit from consolidation under an institutional umbrella to facilitate the consistent application of the general principles in the proposed

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

REPORT NUMBER 162 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – March 15, 2011

Framework. In addition, the need for directives on matters related to travel and safety abroad had been identified by the Ombudsperson and others. There were also increasing types of off-campus activities which required similar attention. The *Framework* is based upon the following three key principles: safety must be taken into account during planning; the University and its members had a shared responsibility for safety matters; and the assessment of the level of risk and the measures proposed to address such risks was to be a key part of determining whether an activity should proceed. Initially, there would be four sets of guidelines governing safety in field research, safety abroad, travel, and the sponsorship of off-campus activities of campus organizations. The *Framework* had been developed following extensive consultation with administrators and students over the course of several years, and Professor Matus commended Mr. Delaney and his staff for the efforts in this regard.

(b) Student Financial Aid

Professor Matus had presented to the Business Board, at its meeting on March 7, 2011, her annual report on Student Financial Support. It highlighted both the Ontario Student Access Guarantee, which stated that no qualified Ontario student should be prevented from attending Ontario's public colleges and universities due to a lack of financial support programs, as well as the University's *Policy on Student Financial Support* which stated that "no student offered admission to a program at the University of Toronto should be unable to enter or complete the program due to lack of financial means." The annual report provided information on need-based aid by academic division, OSAP debt-load for students graduating from undergraduate direct entry programs, and funding for graduate students in doctoral stream programs. In addition to addressing the requirements of the *Policy*, the 2011 report provided a more comprehensive picture of the financial support provided to students. In 2009-10, the University had provided a total of \$137 million in student assistance as defined for financial purposes and reported in Schedule 4 of its 2009-10 financial statements. The major components were UTAPS (University of Toronto Advance Planning for Students), grants funded through endowments, work study programs, merit and international scholarships, University of Toronto fellowships, and other divisionally funded assistance and scholarships. In 2010, the University had provided \$58.3 million of need-based aid compared to \$56.3 million in the previous year.

(c) Review of the Noah Meltz Program

The report and recommendations arising from the review of the Noah Meltz program had been included as an appendix to the Report on Student Financial Support. Among the highlights were the following. The review committee had recommended an enhancement of aid to cover three rather than two courses per calendar year. Since an Arts and Science degree now required the completion of 20 credits, the committee had acknowledged that it would expedite students' progress toward degree completion if an additional course were covered by the program. The income threshold for the program, which had previously been adjusted from time to time, would be linked to a nationally recognized standard that was adjusted annually, the Statistics Canada Low Income Cutoff Levels. Students who had lost their eligibility for OSAP resulting from failure to sustain academic progress, or mistakes made in declaring their income, would no longer be ruled ineligible to continue their education on a part-time basis, and would continue to be considered for Meltz grants. Students who had a documented permanent disability could qualify for OSAP at what was usually a part time course load of 40 per cent. This then made them eligible for additional sources of valuable government support. Finally, the committee felt that, given the range of options and programs available to part-time students, a web-based tool should be developed to provide assistance in finding the best source of support to meet individual needs. Professor Matus referred members to the full Report on Student Financial Support for further details regarding the review process.

8. Report of the Senior Assessor (cont'd)**(d) Proposed Reassignment of 230 College Street to the Student Commons Project**

REPORT NUMBER 162 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – March 15, 2011

Ms Sisam reported that the Governing Council would, at its meeting on April 7, 2011, consider a recommendation for three site reassignments on the St. George Campus. It was being proposed that Site 12, at 100 Devonshire Place, be assigned to the Varsity Centre for High Performance Sport, and that Site 7, at 1 Spadina Crescent, be assigned to the John H. Daniels Faculty of Architecture, Landscape and Design. The building currently housing the Daniels Faculty at 230 College Street would then be made available, allowing it to be assigned to the Student Commons. During the extensive consultation process that had occurred, it had become apparent that the 230 College Street building would meet many of the needs identified by students for this project. It was located close to other student activities and services in the Koffler Centre, and was accessible by late night public transit. The existing building, when renovated, would provide more space than could have been provided in a purpose-built new building, and the project would be implemented sooner and completed at a lower overall cost. Once the site reassignments were approved by the Governing Council, a detailed project planning report would be developed that would require final governance approval before the project was undertaken.

Invited to address the Board, Ms Regnier, the Executive Director of SAC, outlined the chronology of events that had led to unanimous approval of the proposed site of the Student Commons by the SAC Board of Directors. Between April and November 2010, SAC had engaged in discussions internally and with the University administration concerning the advantages of the 230 College Street location. SAC had obtained a legal opinion that the 2008 referendum for the Student Commons student levy allowed for the location of the project in an existing building rather than a newly constructed building. SAC had then undertaken an extensive consultation process with relevant stakeholders. The report of this consultation process had then been submitted to the Board of Directors which had unanimously approved the choice of 230 College Street.

9. Date of the Next Meeting

The Chair informed members that the next regular meeting of the Board was scheduled for Tuesday, April 12, 2011 at 4:30 p.m.

10. Other Business

The Chair noted that Mr. Chris McGrath, the Assistant Dean of Student Affairs at UTM, would be stepping down from the Board as he was leaving the University to take up the position of Dean of Students at Seneca College effective April 18, 2011. She congratulated him on his new position, and thanked him for his long and dedicated service to the Board, as well as to both its Striking Committee and the Service Ancillaries Review Group.

There was no other business.

The meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

March 18, 2011