

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO  
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL  
**REPORT NUMBER 157 OF**  
**THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD**

**April 20, 2010**

To the Governing Council,  
University of Toronto.

Your Board reports that it met on Tuesday, April 20, 2010 at 4:30 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, with the following members present:

Ms Judith Goldring, Vice-Chair, In the Chair  
Professor David Naylor, President  
Professor Jill Matus, Vice-Provost, Students  
Ms Lucy Fromowitz, Assistant Vice-President,  
Student Life  
Ms Diana A.R. Alli  
Dr. Louise Cowin  
Professor William Gough  
Mr. Allan Grant  
Ms Joeita Gupta  
Mr. Adam Heller  
Professor Bruce Kidd  
Mr. Chris McGrath  
Mr. Olivier Sorin  
Mr. John David Stewart

**Non-Voting Assessors:**

Mr. Louis Charpentier, Secretary of the  
Governing Council  
Professor Angela Hildyard, Vice-President,  
Human Resources and Equity  
Professor Cheryl Misak, Vice-President and  
Provost  
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)

**Secretariat:**

Mr. Henry Mulhall (Secretary)

**Regrets:**

Ms Greta Chiu  
Ms Erin Fitzgerald  
Mr. Maciek Lipinski-Harten  
Mr. Ben Liu  
Ms Kimberley Stemshorn  
Dr. Sarita Verma  
Ms B. Elizabeth Vosburgh, Chair

**In Attendance:**

Mr. Jeff Peters, Member-Elect of the Governing Council, and President, Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students (APUS)  
Professor Franco Vaccarino, Vice-President and Principal, University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC)  
Mr. Amir Bashir, Acting President, Scarborough Campus Students' Union (SCSU)  
Ms Sheree Drummond, Assistant Provost  
Ms Joan Griffin, Coordinator, Student Policy Initiatives, Office of the Vice-Provost, Students  
Dr. Anthony Gray, Special Advisor to the President  
Mr. Anwar Kazimi, Committee Secretary and Chief Returning Officer, Office of the Governing Council  
Ms Mae-Yu Tan, Assistant Secretary of the Governing Council  
Ms Katie Wolk, Outreach Organizer, APUS

ALL ITEMS ARE REPORTED FOR INFORMATION

**REPORT NUMBER 157 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – April 20, 2010****1. Report of the Previous Meeting**

Report Number 156 (March 16, 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. Compulsory Non-Academic Incidental Fees: Student Society Fees****(a) Report on Financial Statements and Internal Auditor's Opinion**

The Chair acknowledged and thanked representatives of several of the University's student societies who were in attendance to assist in answering members' questions regarding requests for fee increases. She noted that, under the *Policy for Compulsory Non-Academic Incidental Fees*, where the University collected a compulsory non-academic incidental fee on behalf of a student society, the society was required to present financial statements audited by an independent public auditor licensed under the Public Accountancy Act. For smaller groups, the society could be exempted from doing so by the University's Internal Auditor, who needed to satisfy himself that the society was maintaining proper books of accounts and supporting documentation.

Professor Matus added that the Report was an important annual accountability mechanism provided under the *Policy*. Each year, organizations on whose behalf the University charged a compulsory non-academic incidental fee were required to submit financial statements audited by a licensed accountant or to seek exemption from the audit requirement, the latter provision being applicable to societies with relatively low fees and other revenue. Fees were withheld from organizations which failed to submit statements until such time as the statements were received in good order. The student life offices on each campus worked with such organizations to ensure that proper statements were eventually received. The offices also noted any significant auditors' qualifications or concerns that arose, and, if appropriate, worked with the society to address the inadequacies.

The Chair invited Ms Katie Wolk, Outreach Organizer for the Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students (APUS) to address the Board. She referred to the paragraph on page 3 of the documentation regarding the Erindale Part-Time Undergraduate Students' Association (EPUS). APUS wished to continue its longstanding support of EPUS, and it maintained that APUS and the part-time students of the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM), rather than the University administration, should decide whether EPUS should cease to exist. Since EPUS had been operationally inactive for only two years, its fee should not have been discontinued, and every effort should be made to make it fully operational once again. A member added that there did not seem to be a clause in the *Policy* concerning societies that were temporarily inactive, and she agreed that the part-time students on the UTM campus should determine whether or not EPUS continued to exist.

Professor Matus referred members to the documentation which indicated that EPUS had not submitted audited financial statements since the 2001-02 fiscal year, that fees had been withheld from the society since January, 2004, and that it had ceased to be operational after the 2007-08 year. The administration had suspended collection of the EPUS fee beginning with the summer 2009 session. There had been no effort among part-time UTM students to reconstitute the society, and it was apparent that the organization had ceased to exist and that the fee should be cancelled. Further advice was being sought concerning the necessary steps to bring to a close the affairs of the society, the payment of outstanding debts, and the disposition of any remaining funds withheld from the society.

**REPORT NUMBER 157 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – April 20, 2010****3. Compulsory Non-Academic Incidental Fees: Student Society Fees (cont'd)****(b) Student Society Proposals for Fee Increases**

The Chair noted that, as part of its responsibility for matters that concerned the quality of student and campus life, the Board was responsible for the approval of requests for fee increases proposed by student societies. She reminded members that the Board's role was not to debate the merits of the individual fee requests, but rather to consider the processes, governed by policy, by which they had been brought forward for approval. If the Board was satisfied that these processes had been appropriate and thorough, and that any issues that had arisen had been dealt with satisfactorily, then it had a responsibility to approve the fees.

Professor Matus noted that the consideration of student society proposals for fee increases was an annual item of business for the Board. All such requests had to be supported by constitutional and fair processes within student societies. The assessment of requests for fee increases was normally based upon the following expectations. The student society was required to make the request in a manner consistent with the *Policy for Compulsory Non-Academic Incidental Fees* and the University's procedures for increases to student society fees. Each organization had to comply with the provisions of its own by-laws, rules of procedure, and specific policies and procedures approved by its board or council. Cost of living increases had to be supported by a referendum in a previous year. Increases greater than the cost of living or a pre-approved inflation factor had to be supported by a positive result in a referendum for a fee increase, and special conditions established by the society, such as quorum, also had to be met. Referendum questions needed to be clear and had to provide sufficient information to allow students to gain a full understanding of the implications of the questions and proposed fees. Referenda had to be conducted fairly, advertised and promoted in a reasonable manner, and the members of each organization had to be given a reasonable opportunity to vote. Finally, there was no University requirement for minimum voter turnout in referenda. However, some student societies had established their own minimum voter turnout requirements.

Professor Matus stated that the administration relied considerably on the assurances of the officers of societies that proper procedures had been followed. If a complaint was brought to the attention of the administration, the society was first asked to respond to the allegations. In rare instances where the society's response was not satisfactory, further inquiry was made to investigate the complaint. She noted that the administration had received no complaints with respect to any of the requests under consideration. However, in the case of the request from the Scarborough Campus Students' Union for the implementation of a levy for a proposed athletics facility, the Office of the Vice-Provost, Students had been aware of one complaint which had been submitted to SCSU but had been ruled to be inadmissible because it had been untimely. The complaint had been internal to SCSU and had not been considered there, and it had also not been forwarded to Professor Matus' office. However, in order to be as thorough as possible in its review of the fee requests, her office had carefully considered this complaint and had satisfied itself that it had no merit.

More generally, Professor Matus and her staff had carefully reviewed the information and documentation related to the SCSU referendum. Their assessment had indicated that a very thorough process had been undertaken, pursuant to the relevant SCSU by-law, and authorized by the SCSU, that had allowed for substantial opportunities for students to consider the proposal described in the referendum. Two officers of the SCSU had declared formally that the organization had complied with the terms of its constitution and by-laws, and there had been no reason to question this conclusion based on the review of the materials that had been provided. The referendum question had been very well-publicized. The results of the referendum had been clear and indicated that, of those undergraduate UTSC students who had voted, a substantial majority had been in favour of the new fee. As was the case in many elections and referenda, there had been allegations that both proponents and opponents of the proposal had breached various rules. However, no formal complaints had been considered by the referendum committee. In summary, the careful review

**REPORT NUMBER 157 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – April 20, 2010****3. Compulsory Non-Academic Incidental Fees: Student Society Fees (cont'd)****(b) Student Society Proposals for Fee Increases (cont'd)**

by the Office of the Vice-Provost, Students had indicated a sound basis to present the fee request to the Board with a recommendation for its approval. Professor Matus referred members to the memorandum that had been provided which outlined the relevant details of all the requests for fee increases, and she clarified that it did not include any requests where referenda had failed.

The Chair invited Ms Katie Volk to address the Board on behalf of APUS. In Ms Volk's view, many UTSC students had been misinformed during the SCSU referendum process: they had believed that the athletics facility would not be built at UTSC unless students paid 80% of the University's share of the cost, that the facility would have been built in Markham if the referendum had failed, and that students would pay \$40.00, rather than \$40.00 per term, increasing to \$140.00 per term in 2014. In contrast, APUS believed that if the referendum had failed, the University would have raised the necessary \$30-million from other sources such as fundraising. APUS estimated that the student levy would raise approximately \$63-million over 25 years. It asked that the misinformation regarding the SCSU referendum be corrected, and that the Board defer consideration of the proposed fee for the UTSC Sports and Recreation Complex in order to allow any complaints or appeals regarding the referendum to be considered.

The Chair invited Mr. Amir Bashir, Acting President of the Scarborough Campus Students' Union (SCSU) to address the Board. He reported that the SCSU referendum had been held over three days (March 17-19, 2010), with voting occurring between 10:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. each day for a total of 27 hours. All full-time and part-time UTSC students had been eligible to vote, and the voter turnout of nearly 25% was very high when compared to other student referenda. Of those voting, nearly two thirds had supported the student levy. In Mr. Bashir's view this result spoke for itself, and he urged the Board to approve the proposed fee for the Sports and Recreation Complex.

A member stated her view that the UTSC referendum had been internal to a student society, and that the University should not have interfered in the process by suggesting that the athletics facility would have been built in Markham if the referendum had failed. She challenged the statement that the University did not provide funding for non-academic buildings. The member asked for clarification regarding how the operating costs for the facility would be covered, and a guarantee that students would not be asked to do so; she asked for a guarantee that the existing UTSC athletics fee would be revoked once the new Sports and Recreation Complex was in use by 2014; and she asked who would cover the toxicity abatement costs related to the site of the facility. Finally, the member stated that the student levy would raise an estimated \$70 million by 2039, rather than the \$30 million that had been stated.

Professor Matus clarified that the operating costs for athletics facilities were currently part of the existing physical recreation and athletics fee. Operating costs for the new Sports and Recreation Complex would be the subject of future discussion at the UTSC Council on Student Services.

The President stated that the SCSU referendum had produced a very clear outcome, and he disputed any suggestion that the large number of students who had been actively engaged and had voted could have been misled. During the campaign the two sides had taken polarized positions, and questionable statements had been made regarding the implications of both a "No" or a "Yes" vote, but this did not constitute misrepresentation. From the outset SCSU had supported the project with a view to leveraging the student contribution in order to realize a much larger facility than would have been otherwise possible. From the early stages it had also been made clear that, since the legacy facilities would benefit UTSC students, a substantial student contribution would be necessary. To suggest that students could have voted "No" in the referendum and still realized the facility was questionable, and UTSC students had clearly not taken such a

**REPORT NUMBER 157 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – April 20, 2010**

**3. Compulsory Non-Academic Incidental Fees: Student Society Fees (cont'd)**

**(b) Student Society Proposals for Fee Increases (cont'd)**

view. If the referendum had failed, no backup plan had been in place, and the University would have been in a very difficult position with respect to its partners in the project. It is conceivable that the University's role might have been significantly reduced, and student access to the athletics facilities could have been jeopardized. In contrast to these uncertainties, the "Yes" vote had secured the funding necessary to allow the University to move forward with the project.

A member stated his view that a clear and transparent referendum process had been followed, and that this had been supported by the lack of complaints that had been received. The outcome would allow for the development of an outstanding facility of great benefit to the UTSC community. Another member commended the SCSU for the manner in which it had conducted its referendum, and for its support for the project based on student needs. He urged the SCSU to remain closely involved in the ongoing planning process for the sports and recreation complex in order to ensure that its detailed design met those needs.

On the recommendation of the Vice-Provost, Students,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT beginning in the fall 2010 session, the **Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students (APUS)** fee be increased as follows: (a) by \$0.04 per session in the Canadian Federation of Students (CFS) / CFS-Ontario portion of the fee; and (b) by \$2.22 per session in the Accident & Prescription Drug Plan portion of the fee. If approved, the total APUS fee will be \$79.79 per session, charged to all part-time undergraduate students on all three campuses.

THAT beginning in the fall 2010 session, the **Engineering Society** fee be increased as follows: (a) an increase of \$0.27 per session in the Society portion of the fee for all full-time Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering students; (b) continuation of the Blue Sky Solar Team portion of the fee; and (c) continuation of the Concrete Canoe Team portion of the fee. If approved, the total Engineering Society fee will be increased to \$123.45 per session, charged to all full-time Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering students. The fee for part-time students would remain unchanged at \$20.99.

THAT beginning in the fall 2010 session, the **Faculty of Information Studies Students Council (FISSC)** fee be increased by \$12.50 per session (\$6.25 per session part-time) in order to establish a society portion of the fee. If approved, the total FISSC fee charged will be increased to \$62.50 per session for full-time students (\$31.25 for part-time students), charged to all Master of Information students.

THAT, beginning in the fall 2010 session, the **Graduate Students' Union (GSU)** fee be increased as follows: (a) an increase of \$0.35 per session for full-time students (\$0.17 for part-time students) in the society's portion of the fee; (b) an increase of \$0.03 per session for full-time students (\$0.01 per session for part-time students) in the Canadian Federation of Students (CFS) – CFS-Ontario portion of the fee; (c) a decrease of \$1.92 per session (full-time students only) (not including provincial sales tax) in the Supplementary Health Coverage portion of the fee; (d) an increase of \$5.96 per session full-time and part-time students (not including provincial sales tax) in the Dental Plan portion of the fee; (e) an increase of \$0.50 per session (full-time students only) in the Supplementary Health Coverage Administrative Fee portion of the fee; (f) an increase of \$0.50 per session in the Dental Plan

**REPORT NUMBER 157 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – April 20, 2010**

**3. Compulsory Non-Academic Incidental Fees: Student Society Fees (cont'd)**

**(b) Student Society Proposals for Fee Increases (cont'd)**

Administrative Fee portion of the fee; and (g) the establishment of a new designated portion of \$0.50 per session for full-time students (\$0.25 for part-time students) for University of Toronto Bikechain. If approved, the total GSU fee will be increased to \$215.41 per session for full-time students (\$87.71 per session for part-time students), charged to all graduate students.<sup>1</sup>

THAT beginning in the fall 2010 session, the **Innis College Student Society (ICSS)** fee be decreased as follows: (a) an increase of \$0.22 per session in the society portion of the fee; and (b) the elimination of the designated portion of the fee of \$0.50 per session for the Harold Innis Foundation. If approved, the total ICSS fee will be \$21.93 per session, charged to all full-time and part-time Innis College students.

THAT beginning in the fall 2010 session, the **Erindale College Student Union** (operating as the University of Toronto Mississauga Students' Union; UTMSU) fee be increased as follows: (a) an increase of \$0.15 per session in the society portion of the fee; (b) an increase of \$0.97 per session in the UPass portion of the fee; (c) an increase of \$0.01 per session for the Academic Societies portion of the fee; (d) an increase of \$0.01 per session for the Food Bank portion of the fee; and (e) an increase of \$0.01 per session for the Student Refugee Program portion of the fee. If approved, the total UTMSU fee will be increased to \$82.09 per session, charged to all full-time undergraduate University of Toronto at Mississauga students.

THAT beginning in the fall 2010 session, the **Scarborough Campus Community Radio (SCCR)** fee be increased by \$0.04 in the society portion of the fee. If approved, the total SCCR fee will be increased to \$3.59 per session, charged to all full-time University of Toronto at Scarborough students.

THAT beginning in the summer 2010 session, the **Scarborough Campus Students' Union (SCSU)** fee be increased by \$40.00 per session for full-time students (\$8.00 per session for part-time students) for a UTSC Sports & Recreation Complex. If approved, the total SCSU fee charged during the summer 2010 session will be \$110.69 per session for full-time students (\$19.88 for part-time students), charged to all undergraduate University of Toronto Scarborough students.

THAT beginning in the fall 2010 session, the **Scarborough Campus Students' Union (SCSU)** fee be increased as follows: (a) an increase of \$0.28 per session for full-time students (\$0.02 for part-time students) in the society portion of the fee; (b) an increase of \$0.08 per session (full-time students only) in the Canadian Federation of Students (CFS) – CFS-Ontario portion of the fee; (c) an increase of \$0.41 per session for full-time students (\$0.12 for part-time students) in the Student Centre portion of the fee; (d) a decrease of \$3.08 per session (including administration fee and provincial sales tax) in the Accident & Prescription Drug Plan portion of fee; (e) an increase of \$3.75 per session (including administration fee and provincial sales tax) in the Dental Plan portion of the fee; and (f)

---

<sup>1</sup> Secretary's Note: Two minor corrections were subsequently made to the motion for the Graduate Students' Union (GSU) fee. The word "not" was added to sections (c) and (d), so that each read: "not including provincial sales tax". The figures in the final sentence were amended (from \$215.90 to \$215.41, and from \$87.95 to \$87.71) to reflect the correct sum of the component parts of the total GSU fee.

## REPORT NUMBER 157 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – April 20, 2010

### 3. Compulsory Non-Academic Incidental Fees: Student Society Fees (cont'd)

#### (b) Student Society Proposals for Fee Increases (cont'd)

continuation of the Student Refugee Program portion of the fee through fall/winter 2010-11. If approved, the total SCSU fee will be increased to \$165.56 per session for full-time students (\$11.98 for part-time students), charged to all undergraduate University of Toronto Scarborough students.

THAT beginning in the fall 2010 session, the **Students' Administrative Council** (operating as the University of Toronto Students' Union; UTSU) fees be increased as follows: (a) an increase of \$0.20 per session in the society portion of the fee; (b) an increase of \$0.01 per session in the Student Refugee Program portion of the fee; (c) an increase of \$0.08 per session in the Canadian Federation of Students (CFS) – CFS-Ontario portion of the fee; (d) an increase of \$5.48 per session (including administration fee and provincial sales tax) in the Accident & Prescription Drug Plan portion of fee; and (e) an increase of \$4.67 per session for the Dental Plan portion (including administration fee and provincial sales tax); and (f) for full-time undergraduates on the St. George Campus only, an increase of the fee for the Student Common Project of \$0.51 per session. If approved, the total UTSU-St. George fee will increase to \$149.92 for all full-time undergraduate students on the St. George Campus; and the total UTSU-UTM fee will increase to \$142.08, charged to all full-time undergraduate students on the U of T at Mississauga campus.

THAT beginning in the fall 2010 session, **The Varsity** fee be increased by \$0.02 per session in the society portion of the fee. If approved, the total Varsity fee will be increased to \$1.29 per session, charged to all full-time undergraduate University of Toronto students.

### 4. 2009 Annual Report of Equity, Diversity and Excellence

The Chair reminded members that the University Affairs Board was responsible for matters of a non-academic nature that directly concerned the quality of life on campus. The Annual Report of Equity, Diversity and Excellence addressed the quality of life for all members of the University community, including students, faculty, and staff. This report was intended to enable the Board to monitor the University's activities in implementing its equity policies.

A member asked what response had been provided by the Equity Offices to an incident the previous October in which five students had made use of Blackface at a campus Hallowe'en party. She also expressed her concern regarding what she considered insufficient accommodation provided for deaf students, and regarding the planned closure of the UTM Early Learning Centre on June 30, 2010.

Professor Hildyard responded by introducing the equity officers in attendance, and by commending the very professional service that they and their colleagues in the divisions provided to the University community. She assured the member that the Anti-Racism and Cultural Diversity Office had worked closely with the Black Students' Association following the Blackface incident the previous October, and that the Office continued to address the issues that had been raised. While the University was proud of the extensive accommodation that it provided to students with disabilities, it was aware of the issue raised by the member concerning hearing impaired students. There existed a province-wide shortage of sign language interpreters, and the University had to compete for the services of these highly skilled professionals.

Finally, Professor Hildyard shared the regret of the member that the UTM Early Learning Centre had not proven to be financially viable and consequently would have to be closed. She noted that the Family Care Office as well as the Office of the Dean of Student Affairs at UTM were working to assist affected parents to find alternative facilities. The member commented that in her view the Centre was being closed

**REPORT NUMBER 157 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – April 20, 2010****4. 2009 Annual Report of Equity, Diversity and Excellence (cont'd)**

prematurely, that its services needed to be advertised more widely, and that the fees it charged were prohibitive. Professor Hildyard responded that the Centre had been marketed extensively, and that it charged the same fees as the Early Learning Centre on the St. George Campus which had a considerable waiting list. In the end it had been clear that an insufficient need for the Centre's services existed on the UTM campus.

**5. Report of the Elections Committee**

Members received for information Report Number 60 (March 24, 2010) of the Elections Committee. A member who was also a member of the Elections Committee commended the Chief Returning Officer for his work in conducting the 2010 Governing Council Elections Process.

**6. Report of the Senior Assessor**

Professor Matus had no matters to report to the Board.

**7. Date of the Next Meeting**

The Chair informed members that the next regular meeting of the Board was scheduled for Tuesday, June 1, 2010 at 4:30 p.m.

**8. Other Business**

A member noted that he had received a number of complaints from students in the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering regarding the length of their final examination period. It had been shortened to eight days during which they had been required to write six examinations. The member urged reconsideration of this condensed schedule, and was assured by Professor Matus that this was an issue currently being discussed by the Council of First-Entry Deans.

In response to a question, Professor Matus reported that consultations were ongoing regarding the update of the *Code of Student Conduct*. There had been much interest by groups and individuals, and once the consultations were concluded, she would report on their outcome to the Board. In response to a further question, Professor Matus confirmed that a review of the Noah Meltz programme was being planned. Once the details of the review process had been determined, she would report these to the Board.

There was no other business.

The meeting adjourned at 5:35 p.m.

---

 Secretary

---

 Chair

April 28, 2010