

Council on Student Services (COSS)

Summary Notes (Quorum not met) of Meeting – January 25, 2019

Koffler Student Services Centre, Room 313, 3:00 – 5:00 pm

ATTENDANCE:

Voting Members:

Present:

- Beth Ali, Executive Director, Athletics & Physical Activity, Faculty of Kinesiology & Physical Education
- Heather Kelly, Senior Director, Student Success, Student Life St. George
- John Monahan, Warden, Hart House
- David Newman, Senior Director, Student Experience, Student Life St. George
- Mark Overton, Dean of Student Affairs and Assistant Principal, Student Services, UTM
- Meredith Strong, Director, Office of the Vice-Provost, Students
- John Monahan, Warden, Hart House
- Richie Pyne, Association of Part-Time Undergraduate Students
- Jennifer Coggon, Association of Part-Time Undergraduate Students (over phone)
- Anne Boucher, University of Toronto Students' Union
- Joshua Grondin, University of Toronto Students' Union
- Desmond Pouyat, Dean of Student Affairs, UTSC
- Tyler Biswurm, University of Toronto Students' Union

Absent:

- Yuli Liu, University of Toronto Students' Union
- Atif Abdullah, Quality Service to Students (QSS)
- Qusai Hassan, Council on Student Services (CSS)
- Samantha Stead, Graduate Students' Union
- Branden Rizzuto, Graduate Students' Union

Non-voting Members:

- Julia Smeed (Secretary)

Guests:

- Jim Webster (KPE)
- Brienne Berry Crossfield (APUS)
- Serena Persaud (SL)
- Francesca Dobbin (SL)
- Janine Robb (H&W)
- Michelle Brownrigg (HH)
- Suzanne Macintyre (HH)
- Shannon Simpson (SL)
- Sherry Kulman (HH)

- Katherine Beaumont (CIE)
- Amelia Merrick (SL)

Chair:

- Cameron Davies

Recording Secretary:

- Sarah Matias

AGENDA ITEMS

1) Land Acknowledgment

Chair Davies starts meeting with a personalized land acknowledgement.

2) Introductions

Chair welcomed the members and guests and gave a brief overview of the meeting.

3) Meeting Called to Order

Chair called the meeting to order at 3:19 pm. Committee does not have quorum.

4) Approval of Agenda

Chair acknowledged that we could not approve agenda since we do not have quorum.

5) Approval of Minutes

Chair acknowledged that we could not approve minutes since we do not have quorum.

6) Budget Process Overview

Strong presented an overview of the budget protocol including the process and the student fee calculations under the Policy on Compulsory Non-Academic Incidental Fees (campus service fees and student society fees). The “Protocol” includes the establishment of the COSS body, which considers Student Services Fees and provides advice to University Affairs Board (UAB). Decisions of COSS (approval or failure to approve) related to fees are then conveyed to UAB. This protocol is a Memorandum of Understanding between the University and the representative student societies. The Protocol provides for the establishment of bodies to provide a “means by which students will be involved in decisions to increase compulsory non-tuition related fees or to introduce new ones”.

If the majority of student members approve the fee increase on February 15th, the fee increase is brought forward to UAB for approval. If the majority of student members do not approve the fee increase, UAB may approve increases based on two indexes. CPI is the inflation factor equal to the Consumer Price Index, and UTI is the University of Toronto Index, which accounts for changes in salary and benefit costs, revenue from other sources, occupancy costs, and changes to enrolment.

In the event that COSS does not approve the budget, UAB can approve a permanent increase (the lesser of the UTI increase or the CPI increase) and temporary increase of up to 3 years (the greater of the UTI increase or the CPI increase).

Questions & Answers

Pyne: What are the implications to this process due to the new legislation, and how will the formula change? Strong responds saying we do not have any information about this yet. But whatever that framework looks like we will have to look at our current policies and how they are structured. Currently 2 bodies are needed to make changes to the protocol but at this point we do not have any further information on implications.

Student Life Budget Presentation

Newman provided an overview of the Student Life operating plan, including an overview of the types of services and programs in Student Life as well as areas of current strategic priority including: student development and engagement, internationalization, health and wellness, programs and services for graduate students, academic support, and divisional and university support services.

Newman highlighted the importance of planning alignment, primarily through student and community feedback but also through the University's response on the Truth and Reconciliation Commission, Policy on Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment, Mental Health framework, Experiential Learning White Paper, Presidential Priorities and Strategic Mandate, etc. Highlighting all priorities are aligned with APUS, UTSU, UTGSU.

Budget Highlights:

Newman explained that Student Life has put in a lot of work and time to reduce the amount of money they are asking from students through fees. Over the past three years, Student Life has reduced the total portion of our operating revenue from 66% to 61% - this is a 5% decrease over a 3 year period.

In 2018-19, 12 new positions at Accessibility Services were hired, including 10 On-Location Accessibility Advisors positioned at various academic divisions across St. George campus. The Rossy Family Foundation Gift has been renewed for another 3 years. This is a significant grant to support University initiatives through Health and Wellness. The Division sees a need for more work study opportunities and have increased funding for such positions from \$200,000 to \$275,000.

A detailed 2019-20 budget was shown and Newman noted that some of the student-facing parts of services that aren't part of Student Life are funded through the Student Life fee (i.e. Early Learning Centre, Family Care Office, and Sexual Gender and Diversity Office).

Under Divisional Services and Support, in Non-Salary Expenses, the amount has been amalgamated locally (i.e. print costs with Communications and Information Technology resources) which covers/effects all units in Student Life. Health and Wellness stands out as we have a non-salary expenditure line which mostly comes from OHIP fee for services charges, supplies and vaccines etc. Occupancy Costs have been broken down by each service in units of Student Life. A little over half of this is cost comes from the spaces that student societies occupy within the St. George campus, which falls under the Student Life budget. Strong notes that when UTSU moves to the Student Commons it will no longer be apart of this cost.

In highlighting sources of funding for Student Life, in 2018-19, student fees made up 64% and University contributions made up 22%. In the proposed 2019-20 budget student fees make up 61% and University contributions make up 26%. The student fee contribution has decreased by 3% and the University

contributions have increased by 4%. Newman noted that we are always looking for grant funding and other sources so that the impact on students are minimal.

In overviewing operating expenses for 2019-20, non-salary expenses decreased to 20% from 28% and compensation increased to 74% from 66%, from 2018-19. These are typically all fixed costs as certain programs and licenses that fall into this category for students.

Hart House, KPE and Student Life all have different percentages applied to the average merit/steps due to the different staff agreements – SL is at 4%. (UTI: 17.26, CPI: 2.88)

The proposed increase is a 4.8%. St. George full-time students \$7.52, St. George part-time students \$1.51/per term and is not accessed for UTM and UTSC students as these are local and determined at each campus.

Questions & Answers

Biswurm: What has the annual increase looked like historically? Newman explains that UTI creates variation and we are happy to share what previous year UTI's have been. Persaud shares that the average has of 4.4% since 2013.

Grondin: What type of changes will happen in services with the increase in funding? Newman explains that the biggest change in services in the last year was the hiring of 12 Accessibility Services advisors and On-Location support. Moving forward Health and Wellness will be extending their hours and a focus on prioritization that can be aligned with Health and Wellbeing.

Newman encouraged any student groups to reach out to him should they require clarification or want to speak to further.

Hart House Budget Presentation

John Monahan introduced Suzanne Macintyre (Director of Finance) to present the Hart House budget. Monahan reminded the group that Hart House has a dual reporting relationship to COSS and to the Service Ancillary Review Group (SARG). Focused around arts, dialogue, wellness and community involvement.

Monahan overviewed the Hart House Finance Committee, notes that it is comprised of a number of students and has been one of the largest and most active standing committees at Hart House. On January 8, that Committee unanimously passed the proposed Hart House budget for 2019-20. Two days later, on January 10, the budget was presented to the Hart House Board of Stewards, where it was also passed unanimously. On February 4, this budget will be presented to the Service Ancillaries Review Group (SARG) and reviewed by COSS on February 15 and hopefully approved.

Macintyre provided an overview of Hart House's operating revenue which is at 19.7 million. Hart House is anticipating that 54% of its 2019-2020 budget will come from student fees, with the other 46% coming from revenue.

Hart House operates on a social enterprise model, wherein revenue generated from operations helps to offset the reliance on student fees. Hart House estimates that approximately 75% of its operating

expenses are ultimately returned to students, either in the form of student employment or as student-focused programs and services.

In 2019-20, 58% of expenses will be comprised of salaries/wages/benefits and UofT overhead charge. The budget also includes 27% for utilities, equipment, maintenance, and capital renewal, and 2% for designated for Hart House Committee and Club-related programming. Hart House is not charged an occupancy cost by the central University; rather, it is responsible for the direct payment of its own utilities and other facility-related costs. 87% of the expenses in the Hart House budget are fixed; those that are not include the cost of food sold in Hart House's catering and restaurant businesses, general office costs, software, laundry, and other sundry expenses, etc.

MacIntyre noted that Hart House is trying to increase revenue, and this year is their 100 year anniversary and some increases are related to this milestone. Hart House provides students with access to free space for events/meetings, free audio visual equipment/tech support, common spaces, Hart House farm (76%), and the remaining usage is made up of other departments/alumni (8%) and outside clients (16%).

Hart House has many facility and capital requirements in an aging building. Monahan adds that they are planning to undergo a large-scale infrastructure renewal project, and that Hart House needs to keep a healthy amount of money in its capital reserves in the meantime in order to position itself strategically to leverage other forms of financing. Hart House has a tri-campus mandate, it will also incur some additional costs related to that work.

Under the Protocol, Hart House is asking for a 9.57% increase to the student fee. (UTI: 11.74, CPI: 1.69) Historically, Hart House has always tried to come under the Protocol, and had been aiming for a 50/50 split, but it has become increasingly more difficult due to the infrastructure and need for renovations. This is the first year Hart House is asking for the full UTI amount. This is due to the cost of the Arbour Room renovations exceeding the original estimate by 88%, various other projects and safety concerns that cannot wait any longer to be dealt with.

Monahan encourages anyone with further questions to reach out to him and or Suzanne.

Questions & Answers

Pyne: Is Hart House asking for donations from external groups, alumni etc.? Hart House does not have a formal project approved and we all units at the University are expected to coordinate and cooperate in setting schedules for fundraising campaigns. We will be working with DUA to get this going and their have been conversations where opportunities have been raised. Fundraising is a major part of what we are doing and it is estimated that 5 million dollar is realizable through fundraising and the project is estimated to cost 65 million dollars.

UofT Sport & Recreation at KPE Budget Presentation

Ali begins her presentation enforcing the commitment Sport and Rec has to the students on all 3 campuses and Student Unions' Priorities, which includes ensuring that the values of accessibility, equity, mental health, school-life integration, campus life and funding. Ali mentions that UofT Sport and Rec is completely dependant upon the student ancillary fees to fund the programs. Ali also gives a briefing on the Sport and Rec (KPE) presentation from two weeks prior.

The Council of Athletics and Recreation (CAR) Budget Committee is annually tasked with the responsibility of reviewing the Sport and Rec (KPE) budget as prepared by the staff. The preparation of the program, facilities and services plan and budget begins each May after a thorough review of the budget actuals of the previous year and the results of the program evaluations and surveys, and information gathered through focus groups and meetings. Once the review is complete, the staff prepares the budgets and plans for each program area facility and services. This process continues until the final plans and budgets are approved by directors. Once this approval has been confirmed, the budget is presented to the CAR Budget Committee which is made up of students (representatives from all 3 student governments, UTM, UTSC and staff from diff areas). The CAR Budget Committee approved the draft Sport and Rec (KPE) 2019-20 budget unanimously and sent it to CAR for consideration and approval. CAR approved the 2019-20 Sport and Rec (KPE) Budget as presented on January 14, 2019. It was carried with the full support of the Council except for one abstention.

Ali provided an overview of the Sport and Rec budget and the proposed 2019-20 budget plan.

The most significant increases in the proposed 2019-20 budget result from:

Proposed 2019-20 fee increase is 2.55% (UTI: 1.41, CPI: 3.40). Increase to compensation is approximately 4% in 2019-20. This is largely the result of contractual obligations in collective agreements and the university's commitment to a \$15.00/hour minimum wage. Compensation is 65% of the Sport and Rec (KPE) budget. The difference was made up through increases to revenue in the Child and Youth program and a one time reduction to the Facility Renewal Fund.

Nine million dollars in revenue generated themselves during non-student peak time (May-August).

The tri-campus agreement and transfer calculation addresses the use of the ancillary fees collected from UTM and UTSC students and directed to KPE. When agreement was initiated, most of the sports were at St. George, which has since changed. The agreement has been amended to allow for an increase in the percentage of the transfer of funds to UTM and UTSC, which would change the amount to be returned back to UTM and UTSC. When this started St. George Campus housed the majority of the programs but now both UTM and UTSC have their own facilities that can accommodate their own programs. Ali notes that everyone is on the same page, UofT is made up of 3 campuses but one University.

Questions & Answers

No questions were asked. Beth adds that if anyone has any questions at a later time she is happy to meet and discuss further.

Questions & Answers after presentations:

Pyne: Directed to all 3 groups regarding reserve systems – are you required to have this? Newman responds and says not everyone has one. SL does not have one, we run on a zero based budget every year. Monahan notes that Hart House has a 10% reserve of the total budget and an additional one for special projects.

Biswurm: To HH: The degree in which the 10% ask is an exceptional increase, how might these costs look down the line? Monahan explains this is something they cannot know ahead of time and the scope of the project is currently unknown. Hart House is looking into sources of funding. The work taking place will be done in "chucks". This work will be systemic – starting with infrastructure, then accessibility, and

lastly fitness improvements. This work will take place over the course of a decade with pauses in-between. In terms of student fees, we will be closer towards the maximum under the protocol unlike in previous years where HH has come below the CPI.

Grondin: Requests to make a comment to all the student representatives on the COSS committee, especially those who are not present and for the sake of the minutes. Grondin notes that COSS often has a hard time getting their budgets passed – but would like to acknowledge how much students rely on these services and how consultative these bodies are in gaining ideas for their budgeting process. What these budgets are asking for are and these groups need money for things our students need and are requesting – for example, Hart House, access to H&W, Accessibility Services and fitness facilities. Especially after the post secondary announcement, it is important students and representatives take a stand for student services as a way to protect student services moving forward and wanted it noted for people not here to take into consideration how important these requests are.

Pyne: How do you track part time usage of services over the years? Newman, Ali and Monahan all confirm that they have data of service usage through various forms of sign-in or a swipe in/out process. Snippet of information is also gathered by going around and asking students in the physical space at HH, KPE. Ali notes that they are always looking for new ways to enhance their technology and if an effective means was found that would be shared with SL and HH as it is good business practice. Kelly notes that there will be an expansion of the CLNx across St. George (swipe technology) at our events and during programming and at the same time we have some low barrier events where we don't always want to track all the students in spaces. But we do take PT students and graduate students into consideration by means of curriculum and scheduling – like weekend and evening supports for students.

Other Business

Monahan encourages everyone to come see the production of HAIL at Hart House Theatre until Feb. 2nd. February is Black Features month and there are various events taking place at Hart House – encourages everyone to join.

Amelia Merrick, Director of Career Exploration and Education, highlights that what isn't clearly articulated is how these services are supporting student's careers; whether it's through networking, Experiential Learning, and building resiliency and directedness. Merrick touches on Grondin's comment about how central the impact for mental health is, and adds that careers is also important.

Pouyat acknowledges Grondin's comment and thanks him for the diplomacy. Pouyat goes on to state that students require these services but it comes down to the budget votes made at COSS in order for such services to be available.

Chair Davies notes that the next meeting will be held on February 15th 3 – 5pm in Room 313 (Koffler Student Centre).

Adjournment

Chair Davies adjourns the meeting at 4:58 p.m.