

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

REPORT NUMBER 134 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD

March 21, 2006

To the Governing Council,
University of Toronto.

Your Board reports that it met on Tuesday, March 21, 2006 at 4:30 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, with the following members present:

Dr. Robert M. Bennett, In the Chair
Dr. Claude Davis, Vice-Chair
Professor David Farrar, Deputy Provost
and Vice-Provost, Students
Ms. Anne E. Macdonald,
Director, Ancillary Services
Mr. Husain Aboghodieh
Mr. Shaun Chen
Mr. Christopher M. Collins
Miss Coralie D'Souza
Mr. Brian Davis
Ms. Margaret Hancock
Dr. Joel A. Kirsh
Professor Larry Leith
Professor Ian R. McDonald
Mr. Chris McGrath
Ms. Marvi Ricker
Ms. Rebecca Spagnolo
Mr. Mahadeo Sukhai

Dr. John Wedge

Non-Voting Assessors:

Ms. Susan Addario, Director, Student Affairs
Mr. Jim Delaney, Assistant Director, Student
Affairs
Mr. Tom Nowers, Assistant Principal, Students
and Executive Director, Student Affairs,
University of Toronto at Scarborough
Ms. Elizabeth Sisam, Assistant Vice-President,
Space and Facilities Planning
Mr. Ron Swail, Assistant Vice-President,
Facilities and Services

Secretariat:

Mr. Andrew Drummond, Secretary
Ms. Margaret McKone

Regrets:

Dr. John P. Nestor
Mr. Sam Rahimi
Mr. Faraz Rahim Siddiqui

Ms. Marilyn van Norman, Director, Student
Services

In Attendance:

Professor Ian Orchard, Member, the Governing Council, and Vice-President and Principal, University
of Toronto at Mississauga
Professor Sylvia Bashevkin, Principal, University College
Ms. Christine Capewell, Director, Business Services, University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM)
Ms. Mary Choi, Chief Administrative Officer, Woodsworth College
Professor David Clandfield, Principal, New College
Mr. Ray deSouza, Chief Administrative Officer University of Toronto at Mississauga
Mr. Davis Elisha, Executive Assistant, Office of Student Services
Mr. David Graham, Chief Administrative Officer, Innis College
Mr. Darcy Griffith, Manager, Police and Parking Services, University of Toronto at Scarborough
(UTSC)
Ms. Yien Ha, Business Officer and Assistant to the Executive Director, Student Affairs, UTSC
Ms. Liz Hoffman, Assistant Dean, Co-curricular Education, Faculty of Physical Education and Health
Mr. Walied Khogali, Vice-President UTM, Students' Administrative Council
Mr. Jaan Laaniste, Director, Physical Education & Athletics, UTSC

REPORT NUMBER 134 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – March 21, 2006

Ms. Karen Lewis, Assistant Dean, Administrative Services and Equity, Faculty of Physical Education and Health
Mr. Jim Linley, Chief Administrative Officer, University College
Ms. Sarah Lipton, Co-chair, Council of Athletics and Recreation
Ms. Alexandra Love, Director, Health & Wellness Centre, UTSC
Mr. Lou Ranalli, Manager, Accounting Services
Mr. Jack Martin, Director, Conference Services and Food & Beverage Services
Ms. Carmela Mazin, Financial Officer, Business Operations, UTSC
Mr. Dennis Montini, Director, Business Services, New College
Mr. Adam Pomper, Co-Chair, Council of Athletics and Recreation
Mr. Terry Rubenstein, Manager, Financial Services and Information Technology, Faculty of Physical Education and Health
Mr. Chris Sparks, New College
Mr. Garry Spencer, Dean of Residence, Innis College
Ms. Michelle Verbrugge, Director, Student Housing and Residence Life, UTSC

ALL ITEMS ARE REPORTED FOR INFORMATION.

REPORT NUMBER 134 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – March 21, 2006

After calling the meeting to order, the Chair drew members' attention to the large number of individuals from the University's ancillary operations and student services in attendance to assist the Board in its deliberations on the various operating plans presented for approval. He noted the hard work done by these individuals to offer the best possible service to all members of the University community, often in very difficult circumstances brought about by constraints in budget or staffing. The Chair thanked all those present for their diligence and effort to enrich the co-curricular experience at the University of Toronto.

The Chair then reminded members of their responsibility to ensure that the University was well managed, but not to manage it directly. He noted that the proposals before the Board had each undergone detailed consideration prior to their arrival at the Board, and that all estates had had the opportunity to be represented in the planning and development processes of the operating plans; bodies such as the Hart House Board of Stewards, the Council on Athletics and Recreation, the Quality Student Services (QSS) Council at the University of Toronto at Mississauga, the Councils on Student Services at the St. George campus and the University of Toronto at Scarborough, and the Services Ancillary Review Group had all started their planning processes at the beginning of the current fiscal year and had consulted in a transparent manner. Although the Board had every appropriate right to question the plans and their purposes, Board members should do so with a detailed understanding of the material before them and should not treat their responsibilities lightly.

1. Report of the Previous Meeting

Report Number 133 (February 14, 2006) was approved.

2. Business Arising from the Report

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

3. Operating Plans: Service Ancillaries

The Chair welcomed the following individuals to the meeting, noting that they would be able to answer members' detailed questions:

Professor Ian Orchard, Member, the Governing Council, and Vice-President and Principal, University of Toronto at Mississauga
Professor Sylvia Bashevkin, Principal, University College;
Ms. Christine Capewell, Business Services, University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM);
Ms. Mary Choi, Chief Administrative Officer, Woodsworth College;
Professor David Clandfield, Principal, New College;
Mr. Ray deSouza, Chief Administrative Officer University of Toronto at Mississauga,;
Mr. David Graham, Chief Administrative Officer, Innis College;
Mr. Darcy Griffith, Manager, Police and Parking Services, University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC);
Mr. Jim Linley, Chief Administrative Officer, University College;
Mr. Lou Ranalli, Manager, Accounting Services;
Mr. Jack Martin, Director, Conference Services and Food & Beverage Services;
Ms. Carmela Mazin, Financial Officer, Business Operations, UTSC;
Mr. Dennis Montini, Director, Business Services, New College;
Mr. Chris Sparks, New College;
Mr. Garry Spencer, Dean of Residence, Innis College; and
Ms. Michelle Verbrugghe, Director, Student Housing and Residence Life, UTSC.

REPORT NUMBER 134 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – March 21, 2006**3. Operating Plans: Service Ancillaries (cont'd.)**

The Chair further noted the presence of Ms. Anne Macdonald, Mr. Tom Nowers, Mr. Chris McGrath, Ms. Rebecca Spagnolo, and Ms. Margaret Hancock, all of whom were either members of or assessors to the Board and who would be able by virtue of their positions to contribute to the discussion.

Professor Farrar noted that the service ancillaries comprised residences, food and beverage services, parking, and portions of Hart House. He noted that a number of common themes arose during the discussion of the 2006-07 operating plans, namely, increased enrolment at the Scarborough and Mississauga campuses, the mix of first- and upper-year students in residences, and the overlap of the academic year and the service ancillaries' year. Ms. Macdonald added that each ancillary, having gone through its local review process as well as that of the Service Ancillary Review Group, had been extensively reviewed. She noted that common themes during discussion were the issue of residences and how pricing had to be competitive given the current housing market, which currently had a high vacancy rate; what strategies could be used to reduce energy consumption given sharp increases in utilities costs; numerous changes in food services provision; and the variety of different environments in parking services.

A member asked for information on the 'food sustainability project,' which was mentioned in the cover letter for this item. Ms. Macdonald responded that, in response to an initiative begun by Professor Clandfield, food service operators were working together to ensure that food would be purchased as much as possible through local suppliers operating in sustainable ways.

A member asked about the apparent lack of demand for parking on the St. George campus, contrasting that lack of demand with apparently strong demand at the Mississauga campus. Ms. Macdonald noted that two lots on the St. George campus – the Rotman lot and the OISE/UT lot – had excess capacity, but that the other lots were at or near capacity. The member asked if prices at those two lots might be reduced to induce greater usage. Ms. Macdonald responded that prices had been kept relatively low.

A member noted that the time for the 89 Chestnut residence to break even seemed long, and if business planning had expected this. Ms. Macdonald noted that a lengthy break-even time had been foreseen, but had also been extended once the residence had become operational, for several reasons, the most important of which was that, the original capacity for the residence had been planned at 1200, but few students agreed to stay in double rooms. As a result, the plan had been revised to allow for changes in operations and the resulting lower realization of revenue.

A member remarked that residence rate increases at the Mississauga residences were increasing at a lower rate than planned, and asked whether such a strategy was advisable given the high demand. Mr. McGrath noted that, following consultation with the Residence's finance committee, it had been determined that students should be asked to shoulder the minimal possible increases as part of a broader culture shift on the role of student housing. Concerns remained about the long-term impact of increases in utilities costs. He noted that the residences at Mississauga had undergone significant growth, with approximately 800 new beds in the previous eight years; this situation had created an environment of significant financial constraint. Original business plans, therefore, had to be revisited regularly and used as a significant 'touch point' rather than a rigid guide for action.

REPORT NUMBER 134 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – March 21, 2006

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

On the recommendation of the Deputy Provost and Vice-Provost, Students,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

the 2006-07 operating plans and budgets for Service Ancillaries, as elaborated in the *Service Ancillaries Operating Plans for the Year 2006-2007*, dated March 9, 2006, as summarized in Schedule II; 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

In addition to the guests from the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM) already welcomed to the meeting, the Chair welcomed Ms. Joan McCurdy-Myers, Manager of the UTM Career Centre. Professor Farrar noted that the plan from UTM was a comprehensive one that had undergone extensive consultation and debate. Mr. McGrath added that the plans had been considered by the Quality Services for Students (QSS) Council. The Health Service was asking for its first increase in approximately a decade. Athletics increases, which were not supported by QSS, were requested as a temporary increase, and the Student Services fee, which also failed to elicit QSS' support, were set at an ongoing increase of 2.0% with a temporary increase of 3.0%. Since the UTM campus was close to a 10,000 student enrolment, significant expansion had occurred and the services offered to students, as a result, had undergone expansion simultaneously.

During discussion, a member noted that QSS had endorsed doubling the portion of the student services fee to the UTM Childminding Service. Another member asked if the service met demand for childminding on that campus, and asked whether the administration would provide a commitment to assist child care from its operating budget. Mr. McGrath responded that he felt that the service was meeting demand fairly well, and that the partnership between UTM and student societies was a valuable one. Professor Orchard noted that there had been a day care at the Mississauga campus that was underused and, as a result, eventually closed because of the expenses involved in keeping it open. The childminding service, run by the Students' Administrative Council (SAC) and the Erindale Part-Time Undergraduate Students (EPUS), was not the same as day care. The UTM administration continued to analyze demand for child care, and had hoped that federal commitments to child care would enable the construction of a new centre; however, given the recent change in government, such a commitment seemed unlikely. A member, noting that the UTM Women's Centre had indicated that it would like a time frame for day care development, stated that a result of the lack of child care was that no single mothers lived in UTM residences. The member then asked if the administration could allocate resources to a UTM day care, given that both other campuses had day care on site. Professor Orchard responded that the main issue facing child care development was funding, and that the administration continued to seek partnerships (especially with the Peel Region). In the mean time, however, given the lack of funds available, it would be irresponsible to make a commitment on timing of new construction.

Professor Farrar agreed to take the question under advisement and return with a response to members' concerns at a future meeting of the Board.

REPORT NUMBER 134 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – March 21, 2006

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

On the recommendation of the Deputy Provost and Vice-Provost, Students,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the 2006-07 operating plans and budgets for the UTM Student Services (including the Health Service; and the Centre for Physical Education, Recreation and Athletics, including the Wellness Centre), as presented in the documentation dated March 13, 2006 from Mr. Mark Overton, Dean of Student Affairs; and

THAT the sessional Student Services fee for a full-time student on the UTM campus be increased to \$102.20 (\$20.44 for a part-time student), which represents a year over year permanent increase of 2.0% and a temporary three year increase of 1.0%; and

THAT the sessional Health Service fee for a full-time student on the UTM campus be increased to \$18.69 (\$3.74 for a part-time student), which represents a year over year permanent increase of 3.0%; and

THAT the sessional Centre for Physical Education, Recreation and Athletics (including the Wellness Centre) fee for a full-time student on the UTM campus be increased to \$145.90 (\$29.18 for a part-time student), which represents a year over year temporary three year increase of 2.0%.

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

The Chair and Professor Farrar invited Mr. Nowers to introduce the operating plans for student services at the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC). Mr. Nowers welcomed, in addition to those guests from UTSC already announced, the following:

Ms. Yien Ha, Business Officer and Assistant to the Executive Director, Student Affairs;
Mr. Jaan Laaniste, Director, Physical Education & Athletics; and
Ms. Alexandra Love, Director, Health & Wellness Centre.

Mr. Nowers expressed gratitude to the students of UTSC, who had supported the budget and who had been extensively involved in the development of the plan before the Board since discussions began in September, 2005. He was pleased to report to the Board that the UTSC Council had received a unanimous endorsement of the services and their operating plans.

A member congratulated UTSC on its forward-looking enhancement to accessibility, stating that it demonstrated foresight.

A member asked why there was a substantial increase in the Health and Wellness fee of 5%, after several years of either no increases or very small increases. Mr. Nowers responded that, as part of a five-year plan, the increase was designed in such a way to cushion the total increase needed while drawing down reserves; following that draw-down, annual percentage increases would be significantly lower. It was important to invest in basic services (such as custodial or utilities) in order to maintain high quality. In addition, plans were revisited every year in such a way as to plan for orderly upgrades while at the same time managing expectations.

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

REPORT NUMBER 134 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – March 21, 2006

A member asked about the proposed shift in fees towards the career centre, rising to 32% (from 28%) of the fee allocation, and whether it was appropriate, especially given that the career centre mixed both curricular and co-curricular services. In particular, the member noted his worry that the expansion of the career portion of the fee was an increase that should be funded through the base grant, but was being paid directly by students. Mr. Nowers noted that the career service was, indeed, a 'hybrid', but that the academic portion and the co-curricular portion were separately funded, and the portion requested for Board approval was only for the co-curricular elements of the service.

Another member asked about the appropriateness of the transfer of funds from UTSC to St. George for career services. Mr. Nowers noted that the transfer was a historical feature of the budget, and that UTSC students were relying less and less on the St. George centre over time. In addition, it was helpful for employers to have a single point of contact with the University at the St. George campus, upon which the UTSC career centre depended. In that sense, he noted, the attribution of costs was an appropriate recognition of a benefit received. The level of the attribution was discussed from time to time to achieve an appropriate balance. Professor Farrar and Mr. Elisha confirmed that this was the case.

On the recommendation of the Deputy Provost and Vice-Provost, Students,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the 2006-07 operating plans and budgets for the UTSC Student Services, as presented in the documentation from Mr. Tom Nowers, Associate Principal, Students, dated March 13, 2006; and

THAT the sessional Student Services fee for a full-time student on the UTSC campus be increased to \$118.59 (\$23.72 for a part-time student), which represents a year over year permanent increase of 12.3%; and

THAT the sessional Health and Wellness fee for a full-time student on the UTSC campus be increased to \$40.31 (\$8.06 for a part-time student), which represents a year over year permanent increase of 3.0%; and

THAT the sessional Physical Education and Athletics fee for a full-time student on the UTSC campus be increased to \$86.84 (\$17.37 for a part-time student), which represents a year over year permanent increase of 3.5%.

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

(a) Advice from the Council on Student Services

The Chair invited Professor Farrar to comment on the recommendations of the Council on Student Services (COSS) for the St. George campus operating plans for 2006-07. Professor Farrar referred members to his memorandum, and reported that all of the operating plans placed before COSS were rejected, with the single exception of the plan for the Health Services and Psychiatric Service. He informed the Board that COSS' reason for the rejections appeared to be that there was a belief among many of the members of COSS that the budgets for the various

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

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

REPORT NUMBER 134 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – March 21, 2006

services should not be paid for by mandatory student fees, but rather, by some other means, either from the operating budget of the University or by government grant.

The Protocol governing the assessment of fees (the 'COSS Protocol') allowed, in instances where COSS had rejected the administration's plans, for a proposal to come forward for a permanent increase of up to the lesser of the Consumer Price Index (CPI) and the University of Toronto Index (UTI), and a temporary three-year increase of up to the greater of the two. All of the St. George plans, save that of Student Affairs, could be achieved under the COSS Protocol. The Office of Student Affairs was required to alter its budget after COSS' review to meet the requirements of the Protocol.

The Chair informed members that the Protocol required that, if COSS were to vote against any plan, the Chair of COSS would be invited to the Board to explain the reasons for the rejection. To that end, the Chair invited Mr. Jeff Peters, Chair, Council on Student Services, to address the Board.

Mr. Peters thanked the Board for its invitation for him to speak, and explained the reasons for COSS' rejection of most of the administration's operating plans. For Hart House, COSS had concerns over the closure of the Arbor Room, especially since he felt that no figures had been provided to COSS to explain why it was necessary to do so. He also expressed COSS' concern that there was an insufficient number of student votes on the House's Budget Committee, and without change COSS was reluctant to support such a budget. Lastly, he noted that, given the fact that the Government of Ontario had recently unveiled a tuition policy that would allow institutions to raise instructional fees after a recent two-year freeze, increases to other fees were undesirable.

In the case of Student Services' plan, COSS raised concerns that the plans did not present either a five-year projection or an adequate budget history. Furthermore, COSS members alleged, there had been insufficient student input into the budget process. Next, as with other fees, COSS members felt that support for Student Services should be supported centrally rather than through dedicated fees. For the Health Services and Psychiatric Service plan, Mr. Peters reported COSS' support, given the importance of the service and the relative lack of increases in the previous decade.

The operating plans for Athletics were rejected because of COSS' concerns about the burden placed on students at the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM). COSS members recommended that the UTM student fee be removed.

Lastly, Mr. Peters commented upon the Operating Plan for Student Affairs. Although COSS claimed to be supportive of the administration's Multi-Faith Centre initiative, it was unwilling to vote for full funding for a staff member to operate it. In addition, according to Mr. Peters, COSS members were unhappy with the structure of the Office of Student Affairs, believing it to be insufficiently concerned with providing services to students; instead, he and other members felt that its services should be incorporated into Student Services, with the remainder of the Office restructured to allow for greater student involvement and accountability to students. In particular, members believed, a 'Management Board' should be created, comprised of

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

REPORT NUMBER 134 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – March 21, 2006

representatives from the major student associations, to which the Director would be accountable. Finally, Mr. Peters reported, COSS was concerned that a recommendation to help fund student handbooks through the Office's purchasing of space therein had not been acted upon.

Mr. Peters then informed the Board that COSS had engaged in a discussion [beyond its legislated purview] on the appropriate level of tuition.

The Chair then invited Mr. David Bateman, Treasurer, Graduate Students' Union (GSU); Mr. Terry Buckland, Vice-President, External, Association of Part-Time Undergraduate Students (APUS); and Mr. Walied Khogali, Vice-President UTM, Students' Administrative Council (SAC), to address the Board. The Chair informed the Board that he had met with representatives of the three organizations to allow them to collaborate on a presentation if desired. Mr. Bateman reported the GSU's dismay that Woodsworth College had requested that the administration reassign the space currently allocated to APUS and take on central responsibility for that space, and expressed disappointment in how the announcement of the move had been handled. He reiterated Mr. Peters' comments that there appeared to be insufficient student input into the Offices of Student Affairs and Student Services, and that the GSU was, as a result, reluctant to support any plan emanating therefrom. Lastly, he noted that the GSU believed that students should have greater control of funding to services, and expressed his belief that student services should be funded centrally or by government grant, and not by dedicated student fees.

Mr. Buckland reported APUS' strong belief that the Office of Student Affairs required a review, noting that members of APUS believed that it appeared on occasion to be working against the best interest of students. He alleged an unwillingness to listen on the part of the Office of Student Affairs, and supported Mr. Peters' contention that its services should be moved to the Office of Student Services. Lastly, he expressed his belief that, with a concerted lobby effort directed at the Government of Ontario, it would be possible to obtain funding that would provide adequate funds not only for student services, but for the University as a whole.

Mr. Khogali referred to SAC's concerns that Hart House's planning processes had not taken sufficient account of SAC's objections to the pending closure of the Arbor Room, especially given recent renovations to the Gallery Grill and plans for a new house for the Manager of the Hart House farm. He reiterated Mr. Peters' objections to the apparent relative lack of involvement of student representatives on the House Finance Committee.

A member stated his belief that the COSS process was simply not working, with its goal of allowing students and the administration to come to a common understanding of the needs and goals of student services never having been met; instead, the process appeared antagonistic, with relationships damaged, agreement rarely reached, and to the detriment of good student service provision. He cited the importance of the improvement of the student experience as part of *Stepping UP*, the current academic planning process, and questioned whether the COSS process was sufficient to provide the excellence required by the plan.

REPORT NUMBER 134 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – March 21, 2006**6. Operating Plans: Student Services, St. George Campus (cont'd.)****(b) Student Services and Health Services**

The Chair welcomed Mr. Davis Elisha, Executive Assistant, Office of Student Services, who could comment on the Student Services plan in the absence of the Director. Professor Farrar reminded members of the recommendations put forward by his Office and discussed by COSS. Mr. Elisha reiterated for the Board that the requests for increases were to pay for negotiated salary settlements, benefits and occupancy costs for offering the service.

A member commented that it had been remarked that Health Services had not asked for large increases for a number of years. Mr. Elisha noted that there had been increases in the previous years, but that they had been quite small.

On the recommendation of the Deputy Provost and Vice-Provost, Students,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the 2006-07 operating plans and budget for the Student Services, as presented in the documentation from Marilyn Van Norman, Director, dated March 7, 2006, be approved; and

THAT the sessional Student Services fee for a full-time student on the St. George campus be increased to \$56.29 (\$11.26 for a part-time student), which represents a year over year permanent increase of 2.0% and a temporary three year increase of 1.5%; and

THAT the 2006-07 operating plans and budget for the Health Service and the Psychiatric Service, as presented in the documentation from Marilyn Van Norman, Director, dated March 7, 2006, be approved; and

THAT the sessional Health Services fee for a full-time student on the St. George campus be increased to \$17.73 (\$3.55 for a part-time student), which represents a year over year permanent increase of 3.5%, be approved.

(c) Student Affairs

Professor Farrar asked Ms. Addario to address the Student Affairs operating plan. Ms. Addario noted that the Office of Student Affairs comprised a large range of programs, including student retention, crisis response, child care, policy oversight, student leadership, community partnerships, orientation, club support, Lesbian/Gay/Bisexual/Transgendered/Queer (LGBTQ) support, communications, and multifaith. Different elements of the programs were supported by student fees, direct fees (i.e., 'user' fees), governmental or other external funding, and the operating budget. The operating plan as originally planned envisioned two major changes, relating to funding for the Multifaith Centre and to implementing the recommendations of a communications strategy review. In 2005, a review of the University's *Getting There* handbook, which was designed to assist students in navigating the myriad services offered by the University, had taken place. The review took note of the implementation of a student portal, as well as duplication of key information in student society handbooks. The review included data from two stakeholder surveys, and obtained legal advice on how recommendations might be

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

REPORT NUMBER 134 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – March 21, 2006**(c) Student Affairs (cont'd.)**

implemented while ensuring the University met its legal obligations to students. Included in the recommendations were goals of eliminating the daytimer portion of *Getting There*, eliminating the binder format, and the purchase of 16 pages in student handbooks. The director of the program unit had been in contact with student societies prior to the COSS meeting, and the plans submitted to COSS to achieve the goals included an increase of 4%, which was greater than the sum of CPI and UTI. The changes amounted to a total of 90 cents per term for a full-time student, or \$1.80 per school year, to implement.

Student Affairs fees, she observed, had risen very slowly over previous years, and in real terms would be rising to levels last seen in the 1999-2000 academic year. Student Affairs believed that the increases were moderate, and were driven by salary settlements, occupancy costs, and utilities increases – that is, the increase would allow only for the maintenance of existing services. Student Affairs accepted the recommendations of the *Getting There* review, contingent upon COSS' approval of the plan. Since COSS had not approved the plan, the assumptions were revised downward to permissible levels, and as a result, the purchase of pages in the student handbooks had been removed from the plan.

During discussion, a member noted that Student Affairs was a 'hybrid' service, with multiple sources of funds required for different elements of the service. The member asked what portions of the services offered did not come from the student fee. Ms. Addario stated that the portion funded by student fees was approximately 65% of the Student Affairs budget, not including child care and accessibility services.

A member asked whether the request for the lesser amount would have an impact on planning for the Multi-Faith centre. Ms. Addario informed the Board in response that the development of that centre was currently a top priority, and planning would not be affected. The reductions were to the *Getting There* document (\$25,000 removed) and to the Chaplains' group (\$10,000 removed, but with minimal impact given the advent of the Multi-Faith centre).

A member, noting that intervenors at the Board had argued that Student Affairs' planning processes did not allow for student input, asked what mechanisms were in place for student involvement. Ms. Addario responded that there had been an Advisory Committee for the Office to advise on all sorts of elements of Student Affairs' mandate, but that the experience was not positive. Although representatives from the student governments sought to provide input, the effort was demoralizing on students who represented the various programs and activities of the Office. Instead, Student Affairs had determined that it would be more appropriate to have smaller, dedicated advisory groups, to provide better understanding and to ensure better accountability to the Board. Ms. Addario stated that, in her opinion, the system was more respectful of student opinion and generated better knowledge and participation than the previous system of the broadly mandated Advisory Committee. The input provided by students was well-respected, and all involved were concerned with the creation of student services of the highest quality.

A member noted her happiness in hearing the prioritization of the Multi-Faith initiative. She then asked whether the plan to purchase pages in the student handbook was cost-effective, asking

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

REPORT NUMBER 134 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – March 21, 2006

what the cost would have been. Ms. Addario responded that it would have been at 65 cents for 16 pages per handbook.

A member noted that there appeared to be a disconnect between students who dedicated their time to individual service units and their plans, and those who sat on COSS. He stated his belief that the COSS system deserved discussion at a later date, given the apparent antagonistic relationship between the administration, whose mandate was to provide the best possible services to students, and student groups represented on COSS, who appeared to have a strong desire to lower costs regardless of consequence.

On the recommendation of the Deputy Provost and Vice-Provost, Students,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the 2006-07 operating plans and budget for Student Affairs, as presented in the documentation from Susan Addario, Director, dated March 8, 2006, be approved; and

THAT the sessional Student Affairs fee for a full-time student on the St. George campus be increased to \$23.84 (\$4.77 for a part-time student), which represents a year over year permanent increase of 1.8% and a temporary three year increase of 2.0%.

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

The Chair welcomed the following individuals to the meeting:

Ms. Liz Hoffman, Assistant Dean, Co-curricular Education, Faculty of Physical Education and Health;
Ms. Karen Lewis, Assistant Dean, Administrative Services and Equity, Faculty of Physical Education and Health;
Ms. Sarah Lipton, Co-chair, Council of Athletics and Recreation;
Mr. Adam Pomper, Co-Chair, Council of Athletics and Recreation;
Mr. Terry Rubenstein, Manager, Financial Services and Information Technology, Faculty of Physical Education and Health;

Professor Farrar invited Professor Leith to describe the operating plans for Athletics. Professor Leith summarized the process by which the recommendation had been arrived at, noting that it was student-driven and very transparent. He noted that co-curricular programs in Athletics were in very high demand, with 7,500 instructional programs offered and 428 intramural teams on waiting lists. The key mandate of the program was to enhance the student experience through physical activity; even so, the increases requested under the plan allowed the unit to keep up with inflationary pressures.

A member asked for an explanation of why it appeared that the request was for a higher than allowable amount. Mr. Rubenstein answered that with the removal of a three-year temporary increase, the total available was exactly the same. The member then asked why the cost of intercollegiate sports was so high, given the small number of students partaking of the program.

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.)

REPORT NUMBER 134 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – March 21, 2006

Professor Leith responded that funding for Varsity Blues Athletics was the result of a commitment to restore the program, and that it was indeed a challenge to balance the needs and aspirations of the various aspects of athletics programs. Mr. Rubenstein added that increases to the Varsity Athletics program appeared higher than they might otherwise be because of the fact that between 1997 and 2003, funding for the programs was frozen, and as a result the 'catch-up' required a relatively high level of investment. Furthermore, he noted, a significant portion of the money spent under that budget line went to pay salaries that supported not only the program in question by all of the Athletic program. The balance of support had been advised by the Council on Student Services several years earlier. Ms. Lipton added that varsity athletes frequently had to add significant amounts of time and resources of their own to ensure that the programs continued. Professor Leith added that 1994 saw a rapid decline in funding, and that, given the decline, the operating planning process attempted to redress that sharp cutback.

On the recommendation of the Deputy Provost and Vice-Provost, Students,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the 2006-07 operating plans and budget for the Faculty of Physical Education and Health: Co-curricular Programs and Services, as presented in the documentation from Professor Larry Leith, Acting Dean, dated March 7, 2006, be approved; and

THAT the sessional fee for a full-time student on the St. George campus be increased to \$104.91 (\$20.98 for a part-time student), which represents a year over year permanent increase of 2.0% and a temporary three year increase of 5.2%; and that the sessional fee for a full-time student at UTM or UTSC be increased to \$12.58 (\$2.63 for a part-time student), which represents a year over year permanent increase of 2.0% and a temporary three year increase of 5.2%.

(e) Hart House

Ms. Hancock informed the Board that Hart House had had a tremendous year, and felt that the operating plan before members was a creative one. She thanked the Board of Stewards and the Finance Committee for an excellent plan.

A member asked Ms. Hancock to elaborate on the pending closure of the Arbor Room, which had been alluded to several times previously in the meeting. Ms. Hancock noted that the Arbor Room food service operation had been losing money for some time, and despite attempts to end the loss, the Board of Stewards agreed that it would be appropriate to close the food service portion of the room as of June 30, 2006 and to search for a new service provider. In response to criticisms that the new provider would be a franchised chain, Ms. Hancock stated that there was currently a request for proposals that might generate interest from franchises, but that given the emerging criteria for the service, she felt it would be difficult to see a franchise operating successfully according to criteria. A member pointed out that only a small number of

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

(e) Hart House (cont'd.)

independent food providers who served relatively inexpensive yet high quality food remained on campus, and that it was regrettable that the Arbor Room was not successful. A member asked who would be responsible for reviewing and recommending the contracts. The Warden noted

REPORT NUMBER 134 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – March 21, 2006

that it was her responsibility to do so, but that she would consult appropriately prior to making a decision.

Ms. Hancock noted in response to an earlier comment that each of the Students' Administrative Council, the Graduate Students' Union and the Association of Part-Time Undergraduate Students (APUS) had voting seats on the Board of Stewards, and were welcome to attend and participate in discussions in the Finance Committee. Although they did not have votes on the Committee, the Committee had to forward its recommendations to the full Board in any case. As a result, the groups did have appropriate information and influence in the process.

A member asked about the difference between a Hart House club and one recognized by the Office of Student Affairs. Ms. Hancock responded that the differences lay in the mode of recognition and the methods of funding and accountability; in particular, each of the 32 Hart House clubs had its own budget and was run by elected students under the auspices of the Board of Stewards. Mr. Delaney noted that some of the groups recognized by Student Affairs were small, voluntary groups, while for Hart House, the clubs constituted Hart House's programming.

On the recommendation of the Deputy Provost and Vice-Provost, Students,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the 2006-07 operating plans and budget for Hart House, as presented in the documentation from Margaret Hancock, Warden, dated March 8, 2006, be approved; and

THAT the sessional Hart House fee for a full-time student on the St. George campus be increased to \$63.67 (\$12.73 for a part-time student), which represents a year over year permanent increase of 2.0% and a temporary three year increase of 1.5%; and that the sessional fee for a full-time student at UTM or UTSC be increased to \$1.95 (\$0.40 for a part-time student), which represents a year over year permanent increase of 2.0% and a temporary three year increase of 1.5%.

7. Date of Next Meeting

The Chair informed members that the next meeting would take place at 4:30 p.m. in the Council Chamber of Simcoe Hall on April 25, 2006.

REPORT NUMBER 134 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – March 21, 2006**8. Other Business****(a) Recent Incidents on Campus**

A member asked what statement the Deputy Provost was prepared to make in response to recent incidents involving intolerance of Islam on campus. The member felt that, in his opinion, the administration's lack of statement had set a double standard, given its earlier rapid response to incidents involving a different religious group, by apparently refusing to remove an intolerant poster placed on campus. Students, he stated, were feeling anxious by what appeared to be a sudden, significant increase in anti-Islamic acts. Professor Farrar responded, emphasizing the University's consistency in supporting free speech and free inquiry as fundamental to the University, while actively opposing the criminal behaviour demonstrated by hate crimes. The poster in question, he reported, had been ordered removed. He also informed the Board that the President of the University would be making a public statement about the University's position at the Governing Council meeting of March 23, 2006. A member pointed out that, in the case of truly offensive postering, individual members of the community should take initiative themselves, rather than waiting for administrative action.

(b) Woodsworth College Space and the Association of Part-Time Undergraduate Students

A member asked about the claims of the Association of Part-Time Undergraduate Students (APUS) that it was being evicted from its space unfairly and without regard to students' rights. Professor Farrar responded that the situation had apparently been misunderstood. APUS, he noted, occupied space in Sidney Smith Hall and Woodsworth College. Woodsworth College had determined that it required the space currently occupied by APUS, and had approached the central administration with a request that it should not bear responsibility for providing space for a University-wide organization, given that its status as a College for part-time students had faded over the years and that part-time students were in many different divisions across campus. Professor Farrar had agreed with the request, and had requested an analysis of APUS' space needs. He committed to the Board that appropriate space would be found for APUS prior to the date on which Woodsworth College required the space occupied by APUS. Professor Farrar noted that there remained some disagreement between APUS and the administration over the issue of what constituted equivalent space, but that he anticipated all issues would be resolved in due course.

(c) University Staff and Preparation of Operating Plans

A member congratulated all those staff members responsible for the preparation of operating plans, stating that, without exception, he was impressed by the care and professionalism taken in their preparation, and the clarity of presentation and argument made during the Board meeting. The Chair reiterated the Board's thanks, and members applauded.

The meeting adjourned at 6:45 p.m.

 Secretary

 Chair

March 29, 2006
36146