

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL
REPORT NUMBER 107 OF
THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD

April 30, 2002

To the Governing Council,
University of Toronto.

Your Board reports that it met on Tuesday, April 30, 2002 at 5:00 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, with the following members present:

Dr. John P. Nestor (In the Chair)
Dr. Shari Graham Fell, Vice-Chair
Dr Sheldon Levy, Interim Vice-Provost,
Students
Mr. John Bisanti, Chief Capital Projects
Officer
Dr. Robert M. Bennett
Professor Marion Bogo
Ms. Margaret Hancock
Professor Bruce Kidd
Ms. Karen Lewis
Mr. Paul McCann
Professor Ian R. McDonald
Mr. Kashif S. Pirzada
Ms. Parissa Safai
Dr. John Wedge

Ms. Geeta Yadav

Non-voting Members:

Ms. Susan Addario, Director of Student Affairs
Mr. Louis R. Charpentier, Secretary of the
Governing Council
Professor Ron Venter, Vice-Provost,
Space and Facilities Planning

Office of the Governing Council:

Ms. Cristina Oke
Mrs. Beverley Stefureak, Secretary

Regrets:

Mr. Muhammad Basil Ahmad
Ms. Aisling Burke
Mr. Jacob Glick
Ms. Gail Paech
Ms. Wendy Swinton

In Attendance:

Ms. Christine Capewell, Director, Business Services, University of Toronto at Mississauga
Mr. Jim Delaney, Assistant Director, Student Affairs
Mr. Anthony Fairclough, Student Teachers' Union
Ms. Anne Lewis, Manager, Student Accounts
Ms. Jennifer Matthews, Students' Law Society
Ms. Joan McCurdy-Myers, Manager, Career Centre
Mr. Ashley Morton, Engineering Society
Mr. Mark Overton, Dean of Students Affairs, University of Toronto at Mississauga
Professor Paul Perron, Principal, University College
Ms. Emily Sadowski, President, Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students
Mr. Sundeep Singh, Scarborough Campus Students' Union
Mr. Jorge Sousa, President, Graduate Students' Union
Ms. Emoline Thiruchelvam, Students' Administrative Council

ITEM 5 IS RECOMMENDED TO THE GOVERNING COUNCIL FOR APPROVAL.
ALL OTHER ITEMS ARE REPORTED FOR INFORMATION.

1. Report Number 106 – March 26, 2002

Report Number 106 (March 26, 2002) was approved.

2. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting

There was no business arising from the previous meeting.

3. Operating Plans for the Student Services at University of Toronto at Mississauga for 2002-2003

The Chair recalled that the process for the approval at the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM) of the operating plans for Student Services for 2002-03 had not been concluded in time for this item to be considered at the last meeting of the Board.

Introducing the item, Dr. Levy referred to his memorandum of April 23, 2002 and its attachments, which members had had the opportunity to review prior to the meeting.

A member asked what the margin of approval had been when the plans for the Recreation and Wellness Centre were considered by Quality Service to Students (QSS) at the UTM. Mr. Overton was invited to respond. He said that the motion at QSS had been approved by a vote of nine to one, with five of the six students voting in favour. The member wondered about the need for a referendum. Dr. Levy explained that the process governing the increase of these fees was outlined in the *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 (the Protocol)*. Under the terms of the *Protocol* a referendum was not necessary when the Council of Student Services (COSS) or its suburban equivalent approved operating plans and budgets. In this case, the equivalent body had been QSS and its approval obviated the need for a referendum.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the annual Operating Plans for the Student Services – University of Toronto at Mississauga and the Operating Budgets outlined under cover of Mark Overton's memorandum of April 23, 2002, be approved;

THAT beginning in the 2002-03 Winter Session the full-time Health Service fee remain at \$35.00, the full-time student fee increase from \$153.50 to \$191.13, the full-time Athletics fee increase from \$95.00 to \$96.15;

3. Operating Plans for the Student Services at University of Toronto at Mississauga for 2002-2003 (cont'd)

THAT the Athletics Building levy for full-time students be instituted at \$25.00 for the year 2002-2003, increasing annually by 3%; and

THAT beginning in the session in which the new athletics and wellness center opens and continuing until the final mortgage payment is made, an annual fee of \$150 per full-time student be instituted, increasing by 3% annually.

4. Compulsory Non-Academic Incidental Fees: Student Society Requests for New Fees, Increases to Existing Fees, and Continuation of Special Levies

The Chair indicated that members had received a second document relating to this item – a memorandum from Dr. Levy dated April 29, 2002. It had been circulated electronically yesterday and placed on the table today. If members had no objection, this late addition for a fee increase would be considered with the others. There were no objections.

Dr. Levy referred to his memorandum of April 22, 2002 which members had received with the Agenda package. He also drew the attention of members to his memorandum of April 29, 2002 which outlined a request from the Students' Administrative Council (SAC) to approve an additional fee increase. He explained that the omnibus motion to approve the increases proposed within the April 22 memorandum should exclude what had been proposed there for SAC. Approval for the SAC fee would be based on what was proposed in the memorandum of April 29.

A member asked if data were available on the usage of benefits provided under the drug plans. He thought it would be appropriate, when approving an increase in fees, if the Board were to be informed on how successful the plans were. Invited to respond, Mr. Delaney said the plans were fully subscribed. The increases were, in fact, due to the heavy use and he believed these were among the most visible of the services offered by student groups.

The Chair reminded members that the mandate of the Board in approving these fees was to determine that policy and procedure had been respected when a request for an increase came forward. Implementation was the concern of the student governments.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT beginning in the fall/winter 2002-03 sessions, a new fee of \$10.00 be established for the Occupational Therapy and Physical Therapy Graduate Students' Council charged to all graduate students in Occupational Therapy and Physical Therapy each fall/winter academic year.

THAT beginning with the fall/winter 2002-03 sessions, the Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students fee be increased by \$3.57 from \$56.78 to \$60.35 (composed entirely of an increase

in the Accident and Prescription Drug Insurance Plan portion of the

4. Compulsory Non-Academic Incidental Fees: Student Society Requests for New Fees, Increases to Existing Fees, and Continuation of Special Levies (cont'd)

fee, including provincial sales tax) for all part-time undergraduate students.

THAT beginning with the fall/winter 2002-03 sessions, the Engineering Society fee be increased by \$0.42 (composed entirely of an increase in the society portion of the fee) for all full-time undergraduate Applied Science and Engineering students.

THAT the designated portion of the Engineering Society fee of \$4.75 Blue Sky Solar Team and the designated portion of the Engineering Society fee of \$100.00 for Special Projects be continued through the fall/winter 2003-04 sessions.

THAT beginning with the fall/winter 2002-03 sessions, the Graduate Students' Union fee be increased by \$5.76 from \$197.40 to \$203.16 (including a \$0.14 increase in the CFS/CFS-Ontario portion of the fee and a \$5.62 increase in the Supplementary Health Coverage portion of the fee, including provincial sales tax) for full-time graduate students and by \$0.07 from \$36.47 to \$36.54 (including a \$0.07 increase in the CFS/CFS-Ontario portion of the fee) for part-time graduate students.

THAT beginning with the fall/winter 2002-03 sessions, the Innis College Student Society fee be increased by \$0.40 from \$44.02 to \$44.42 (composed entirely of an increase in the society portion of the fee) for all undergraduate Innis College students.

THAT beginning with the fall/winter 2002-03 sessions, the Student Teachers' Union fee be increased by \$10.00 from \$50.00 to \$60.00 for all undergraduate OISE/UT students to support the Teacher Employment Preparation Centre.

THAT beginning in the fall/winter 2002-03 sessions, the Scarborough Campus Students' Union fee be increased by \$0.66 from \$81.50 to \$82.16 for full-time UTSC students and by \$0.20 from \$20.75 to \$20.95 for part-time UTSC students to fund the capital and operating costs of the UTSC Student Centre.

THAT beginning with the fall/winter 2002-03 sessions, the Students' Administrative Council fee be increased by \$16.57 (including a \$9.72 increase in the Dental Plan portion of the fee, including provincial sales tax; a \$3.42 increase in the Accident and Prescription Drug Insurance Plan portion of the fee, including provincial sales tax; an increase of \$2.00 for wheelchair accessibility projects; an increase of \$0.60 for a refugee student; a refundable increase of \$0.50 for health initiatives in developing

countries; an increase of \$0.10 for foster children; and an increase of \$0.23 in the society portion of the fee.)

4. Compulsory Non-Academic Incidental Fees: Student Society Requests for New Fees, Increases to Existing Fees, and Continuation of Special Levies (cont'd)

THAT beginning with the fall/winter 2002-03 sessions, the \$15.00 designated portion of the Students' Law Society fee for Capital Projects be discontinued, and the designated portion of the same fee for the Public Interest Advocacy Summer Employment Program be increased by \$15.00 (from \$15.00 to \$30.00).

5. Capital Project – University College Residence

Referring to his memorandum of April 23, 2002 and the attached report, Mr. Bisanti recalled the interesting history of this project. An earlier proposal had situated the residence expansion on the back campus. This had not been acceptable within the University or the greater community. The current proposal, which remained critical for University College students and which would increase the percentage of their students housed in residence from 12% to 20%, sited the expansion on the eastern edge of the Sir Daniel Wilson quadrangle in a north-south configuration. The challenge with respect to this site would be to obtain City approval. Currently, the area was zoned University Open Space and, in a meeting following the presentation of this proposal to the Planning and Budget Committee, the administration had learned that the City was strongly opposed to the site. Two alternatives had been proposed, one being a taller structure on Site 22 (the parking lot to the north of Sir Daniel Wilson) and the other a re-exploration of the back campus. The City had been amenable to working with the University on either of these two sites. The administration had opted to bring the proposal to the Board today in its present format because of the need to continue moving forward. When issues with the City were resolved, there may be a need to come back with a revised site plan.

A member asked why the City had objected to the proposed site. Mr. Bisanti's view was that the strong objections to closing off the quadrangle related to the City's concern with maintaining green space and the possibility of setting an undesirable precedent by agreeing to this rezoning request. There were indications that the City was supportive of a tower residence on Site 22 and that they would help move this along quickly.

There was brief discussion about the funding contribution from University College. Professor Perron said the College had a campaign underway which was expected to gain vigor when an actual project had been identified and approved. The College had been realistic and the amount quoted seemed what they would be able to manage. Professor Perron briefly reviewed the history of this project, including the need for additional residence space, consultations that had taken place, feasibility studies, redesigns and reviews of options that had finally led to this current proposal.

A member expressed hope that there would be no further consideration of the back campus. Though he could appreciate the conundrum with which the College was faced, he hoped that an alternative could be found that was more reasonable than utilizing critically needed and much used playing fields.

A member asked for clarification. Was the Board being requested to endorse a proposal that would never become a reality? Professor Venter responded. When the proposal had been

taken to the Planning and Budget Committee, the administration had not been aware of the strong objections of the City to the rezoning request. The proposal before the University Affairs Board was the same as what was going forward from Planning and Budget to the

5. Capital Project – University College Residence (cont'd)

Academic Board. Professor Venter indicated that negotiations with the City would continue. In the meantime, the administration had decided to keep the proposal moving through governance. If at the end of May there were a clearer definition of the eventual site, the Board may see a revised proposal. Professor Venter was fairly certain this proposal would need to be reconsidered by governance but it was unclear at this stage what elements would change.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD CONCURRED WITH THE PROSPECTIVE
RECOMMENDATION OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD:

THAT the Project Planning Report for the University College Residence Expansion, dated April 8, 2002, be approved in principle;

THAT the project scope totaling some 10,708 gross square metres, allowing for the addition of a north/south wing to complete the eastern edge of the Sir Daniel Wilson residence quadrangle, and using an approved building site (Site 22) and an area currently zoned University Open Space requiring municipal approvals be approved; and,

THAT the project cost of \$31.100 million be approved, with the funding sources as follows:

- (i) Donation from University College of \$3.0 million,
- (ii) University College ancillary operation allocation of \$2.385 million,
- (iii) University Infrastructure Investment Fund [UIIF] of \$1.3 million, and
- (iv) Financing in the amount of \$24.407 million to be repaid from residence fees over a 25-year amortization period.

6. Report of the Assessors

Dr. Levy referred members to the memorandum of April 16, 2002 which had been circulated electronically and placed on the table and which outlined the results of the Varsity Centre referendum. He expressed disappointment and the belief that the result had not indicated disagreement with the proposal. Rather, students had stated that they were not prepared to pay for the facility. Unquestionably, the proposed facilities were important to the students of the University of Toronto and to the greater community. The great challenge now was to determine how the quality of student life could be maintained while respecting the message sent by the referendum.

The Chair recognized Mr. Sousa, who began by welcoming Dr. Levy on behalf of the Graduate Students' Union (GSU). Mr. Sousa reflected on the outcome of the referendum. The Varsity Centre plan had been good and it was a loss to the

University that it could not be realized. However, the issue had clearly become a debate on principle with respect to ever-increasing costs to students. He believed that the lessons

6. Report of the Assessors (cont'd)

learned had been the following. Earlier and more open consultation with students should have taken place; the process should not have been adversarial with athletics pitted against non-athletics; and the student governments should have been engaged in a process of this kind. Student societies had the ear of the student population. The GSU now called on everyone to work together to develop that site in the best interests of the students and the larger University community.

A member noted what, in his view, was a low voter turnout. Six thousand votes out of a voting pool of over 50,000 might be interpreted as low interest. Dr. Levy said that this had been a large turnout by University of Toronto standards for a referendum. He thought it would be equally a mistake to presume that those who did not vote were uninterested.

A member agreed with Mr. Sousa that the University community should work together to find a solution for Athletics. Critically needed facilities were not available and now there was equally not a plan to achieve them. The solution would require much more work, in good faith, recognizing that meeting the Faculty's obligations for September would now be very difficult.

In response to a member's question with respect to timelines for followup, Dr. Levy said that meetings would take place in the next few weeks to consider alternatives. Plans for a solution would need to be in place by September.

A member asked if University matching funds would be kept in place until an alternative plan were developed. Professor Venter indicated that they would not. Although self-funding parts of the project, e.g. residences, could go ahead, it would be inappropriate to proceed without a review of the entire plan, including athletic facilities, residences and parking. The administration would need to be sure that future generations of students were not disadvantaged by scaled down plans for the site.

Dr. Levy added that any decision on one element of the plan inevitably had an impact on other elements and he hoped that it would be possible to move forward without limiting options for future development. Certainly the students had a role to play. With many now departing campus for the summer, it would be a huge challenge to come up with a plan before September.

7. Date of Next Meeting: Tuesday, June 4, 2002

The Chair reminded members that the next meeting, and the final meeting for this academic year, was scheduled for Tuesday, June 4, 2002.

8. Other Business

There was no other business.

The meeting adjourned at 5:50 p.m.

Secretary
May 14, 2002

Chair

(19935)