

COUNCIL ON STUDENT SERVICES

Thursday, March 15, 2001, 2 p.m.

Location: Hart House

MINUTES

PRESENT: J. Sousa, O. Hullen, A. Bretholz, A. Morgan, D. Mullings, S. Addario, B. Kidd, M. Van Norman, M. Le Paven, M. Hancock, M. Overton, I. Orchard, J. Saunders, T. Nowers, L. Miller, L. Mitchell (Chair), D. Fisher (Secretary)

GUESTS: J. Delaney, C. Reeve, D. Elisha, K. Lewis, J. McCurdy-Myers D. Levstek, L. Hoffman, K. Lewis, T. Rubenstein, K. Brocklehurst, B. Koolen, J. Jones

REGRETS: T. Lightowler, C. Ayala

1) Approval of agenda

(Sousa/Saunders) **CARRIED**

2) Report of the Meeting of February 1, 2001

The Report of the Meeting of February 1, 2001 was approved.
(Morgan/Addario) **CARRIED.**

3) Business Arising

The Chair reported on a discussion he had had with the Chair of the University Affairs Board concerning items forwarded by COSS to the UAB. The UAB Chair determined that the issue of the White Label Bank Machines was not in the jurisdiction of the UAB and would therefore not be considered there. Additionally, the issue of space for a community garden was not considered a matter for UAB jurisdiction but should either be pursued through administrative channels or the Planning & Budget Committee.

Adam Bretholz asked what would be considered the jurisdiction of the UAB. The Chair replied that only things pertaining strictly to the protocol would be considered. A discussion arose over the COSS mandate of "matters of student life" and how such matters could proceed through governance given the "roadblocks" encountered with three such issues this year.

Ian Orchard commented that this is the first year that motions have been sent by COSS to UAB. Susan Addario added that in the past, COSS has passed motions and sent them to administrators, rather than through governance.

4) Budget Presentation

Ken Brocklehurst, finance officer for Hart House, gave a presentation to members on the budget process for student service divisions. He distributed a paper outlining the calculation of the University of Toronto Index.

Brocklehurst described the key factors involved in the development of a budget:

- Projected enrolment for the next year: he noted that Hart House uses information provided by the Financial Services department of U of T issued in October. Other divisions use numbers issued later in the year.
- The Consumer Price Index: for 2001, this is 2 per cent.
- Projected Operating Costs for next year: in the case of Hart House, a major component is the cost of running the building, particularly because of major increases expected in utilities costs.
- Calculation of the UTI.

Brocklehurst noted that one of the new factors influencing budgets is the United Steelworkers of America contract and the salary increases resulting from it. Hart House also has unionized staff in CUPE.

Brocklehurst then outlined the four options for fees under the COSS protocol:

- Reduce the fee
- Request an increase to the lesser of UTI and CPI index.
- Request an increase on a temporary basis (3 years) of the greater of UTI or CPI.
- Request an increase of a different amount .

Brocklehurst noted that the last option required the approval of COSS.

5) Items for Discussion

A. Hart House Operating Plan 2001-2002

Margaret Hancock presented highlights of the proposed Hart House Operating Plan for 2001-02:

- The plan represents Year 5 of a 5-year long-range plan.
- Once again, Hart House had surveyed use for one day in October and found that some 6,000 people use the facilities each day.
- A survey of St. George students earlier in the year had guided the House in some of their plans. It had shown that almost half of students identified themselves as users of the House and that the biggest reason for not using the House is lack of time. Satisfaction levels among users had been high.
- A major focus for next year will be the integration of the theatre into the House. She reported that the Theatre standing committee has been established.
- Social Justice work is also a new development; plans are to more firmly embed this work into the operations of the House.

- Regarding the elevator project, Hancock reported that about half the funds had been raised and that work would begin this summer on the corridor linking the athletic and main wings.
- Finally, Hancock pointed out that the proposed budget had been approved by the Board of Stewards and reviewed by the Service Ancillary Review Group.

Hancock then invited finance officer Ken Brocklehurst to address details of the plan:

- Hart House has taken the position that the Theatre will have no impact on the financial position of Hart House. Theatre operations will begin formally May 1, 2001; at the end of three years, a decision will be made on whether to continue. The University has provided funds to assist during this period and fundraising efforts will focus on developing an endowment fund to generate income on an ongoing basis for the Theatre.
- The budget assumes existing service levels as Hart House is essentially at capacity in terms of programming and services.
- Hospitality services are also at capacity; given that student use is the first priority, revenues from external uses are generally limited.
- Hart House will spend \$1.1 million on deferred and major maintenance next year, drawing on restricted funds to do so.
- Although a \$987,000 operating loss is predicted, this will largely be made up for by transfers from the University for the theatre and drawings from the deferred and major maintenance fund.
- Brocklehurst reported that the Board of Stewards was comfortable with the deficit proposed given that retained earnings had been built up.
- The cash position of Hart House is currently healthy but is expected to deteriorate in the future.
- Last year, the Hart House student fee was reduced as a result of the end of a temporary increase; however, the amount of the reduction was redirected to the House's accessibility project and matched by the University.
- Hart House is looking for a permanent 2 per cent increase in student fees this year. This fee increase will be largely offset (1.5 per cent) by a decrease in the fee as a result of the end of a temporary increase put on in 1998-99. Effectively, then, the increase will be .5 per cent.
- Fees to senior members are also being increased by 5 per cent.

The floor was then opened for questions.

Tom Nowers asked why the student satisfaction survey was done only with students on the St. George campus, not UTM and UTSc students. Margaret Hancock provided a rationale - that the ways in which suburban campus students use the House is very different and their experiences would be blurred by the experiences of students from the larger campus.

Justin Saunders asked how many senior members there were; the answer provided was 3,500. Saunders asked why "discounted fees" appeared to be no different than regular fees; Hart House staff undertook to determine the answer.

Saunders asked for a break down in food sales. Ken Brocklehurst responded that catering is the largest of the three operations (Gallery Grill and Arbour Room being the other two.)

Andrew Morgan asked whether the temporary increase of three years ago was for a special project. Hancock replied that it was for the operating budget.

Morgan also asked for more detail on deferred and major maintenance expenses. Ken Brocklehurst explained that one of the difficulties in dealing with deferred maintenance is to try to do it without disrupting ongoing programming in the House. This restricts work to certain periods -- summer, Christmas holidays and Reading Week. This year's work would include redoing the roof over Great Hall, work to supporting walls and interior walls, upgrades to mechanical systems, and an allocation of \$225,000 for the Farm.

Adam Bretholz asked why Hart House was not requesting a UTI increase. Ken Brocklehurst replied that they were seeking a permanent increase so as not to avoid fees dropping off after three years with no corresponding decrease in expenses.

Ian Orchard clarified the protocol. COSS makes recommendations to UAB; if COSS does not approve the fee requested, UAB can only approve CPI or UTI. CPI is permanent, UTI is temporary - for three-years.

Andrew Morgan asked for clarification as to whether UTI varies from service to service. Brocklehurst confirmed that indeed it does. UTI calculation for Hart House would be a 15 per cent increase.

Adam Bretholz asked for confirmation that if COSS rejects 2 per cent, UAB can still make that recommendation. This was confirmed as correct.

Justin Saunders asked what mechanisms Hart House had in place for fundraising. Hancock replied that there is a development department -- and that much of the funds raised are for deferred and major maintenance. The House is beginning to enter into major gifts initiatives.

Jorge Sousa asked what portion of the deferred and major maintenance is paid for by the student fee. Margaret replied that funds are not applied in that way but that half of Hart House revenue is from students.

B. Faculty of Physical Education and Health, Co-curricular Programs, Services & Facilities Operating Plan 2001-2002

Dean Bruce Kidd introduced colleagues from FPEH: Jennifer Jones, Brian Koolen, Chair of CAR, Assistant Deans, Karen Lewis and Liz Hoffman, Finance Officer Terry Rubenstein, and Chair of the CAR budget Committee, Darren Levstek.

Kidd referred to the package circulated with COSS packages and noted the Faculty had moved a step further in their multi-year planning and budget framework, having completed the first significant phase of that plan. He noted, as well, that the Faculty had three major initiatives in progress: a Task Force on Intercollegiate Athletics, a Task Force on Sexual Diversity and a Task Force on Playing Fields. The Faculty had recently hired an ethno-cultural community coordinator and had initiated program reviews in several areas using a new program evaluation instrument.

He reported that the Faculty looks forward to the completion of the long-awaited user committee report for Varsity Centre, which has been held up by negotiations between Trinity College and the City of Toronto.

Kidd then addressed the proposed budget, pointing out that it satisfies three concerns high on the agendas of students and student governments:

- Reduces summer optional student fee to 1999 levels
- Retains the full array of student employment provided by the Faculty (the largest single employer of students in the University with 600 student employees)
- Enables FPEH to preserve free access for students to the Sport Medicine Clinic.

The plan also honours commitments to employees through collective bargaining and does not entail lay-offs.

In every other respect, the budget holds the line: improvements to many areas have been postponed. Kidd indicated the FPEH has no mandate to cut programming as they have waiting lists for a number of areas and receive many complaints about areas of programming that need to be strengthened and enhanced due to demand.

To achieve all the above and to balance the budget, Kidd reported, the Faculty is proposing a \$6.40 increase to the full-time St. George fees. Kidd said he felt this was the fairest method of assessment as it goes across the board, is eligible for income tax deductions, OSAP and UTAPS support, and avoids the imposition of user fees. Kidd said the Faculty regrets having to raise fees but feels it does provide value for money. He noted that of the \$320,000 of revenue the fee increase will generate, \$280,000 will go to salary increases negotiated by unions and the rest to reduce the summer fee. All other increases are borne by other revenue sources.

Liza Miller noted that non-student membership fees (community, faculty, staff) have not increased in the plan and asked why. Terry Rubenstein responded that there is a review in process but that the \$600 community membership fee is already at the high end in terms of the market for health and fitness clubs. This means there is no room to move it up and remain competitive. The fees are also on par with Hart House. Faculty-staff joint memberships must be negotiated with a number of partners and will be investigated next year. Finally, with respect to non-joint-memberships, once again FPEH is on the high end and charges more than Hart House.

Justin Saunders asked why the increase is being shouldered by students only and asked why the reduction of an optional fee is being borne by an increase in a mandatory fee.

Jorge Sousa added that this was not the proposal of the GSU as Kidd has indicated, but that the GSU did feel last year's increase in the summer optional fee was unfair.

Bruce Kidd responded that he regretted attributing this proposal to the GSU. His intention was to point out that the Faculty had tried to respond to the GSU's concerns about the summer fee and, given few other revenue sources, had corrected it by raising universal fees. Kidd said he recalled last year's debate in which COSS members were told the alternatives were cuts or user fees and, since a fee increase was not approved, increases in user fees did result.

Jorge Sousa expressed frustration that the summer fee had been increased immediately after the FPEH budget had been rejected at COSS and felt this was done so that the impact would be felt immediately by students. He questions whether other options were discussed and feels that a year was wasted in the interim.

Bruce Kidd repeated that he does not feel he has a mandate to cut programs as FPEH is under enormous pressure to increase programming. He urged the Council to make some tough choices and take responsibility for making those decisions.

Ian Orchard pointed out that Bruce Kidd has lobbied the University for assistance in funding but that, at the moment, the Provost is unable to respond positively on this. If government funding improved, he would revisit that issue. As it stands, the Provost has applied a 2.5 per cent cut to divisions in order to avoid a large deficit.

Andrew Morgan asked a procedural question around whether COSS could reject specific line items or does it fall on a service to decide how to deal with the repercussions. The Chair responded that COSS can only accept or reject entire plans but encouraged students to work with services outside of the COSS forum.

Jorge Sousa said it has been a very productive year in getting to understand the budget of the athletic facilities. However, Sousa stated, the GSU policy on intercollegiate athletics is clear: they feel it should not be funded by student fees. Sousa added that the GSU takes its responsibility very seriously but that the issues of intercollegiate sport funding has not been discussed at all.

Justin Saunders indicated he understood the difficult position FPEH is in. He asked for a breakdown as to how much of the fee increase would be applied to reducing the summer fee and to salary increases. The response provided was that \$280,000 was for salary increases, \$60,000 to cover the reduction in the optional summer fee.

Opale Hullen expressed difficulty in seeing what costs were related to negotiated salary increases. Terry Rubenstein responded that the Faculty

deals with two groups of SteelWorkers, two groups of CUPE, UTFA and has some non-unionized staff. Salaries are \$6.2 million in total and the average increase was 4.5 per cent. Benefit costs have also risen. The Faculty employs 120 appointed staff and over 1000 casual staff.

Manon Le Paven asked whether the \$35 fee for non-student visitors to the sport medicine clinic would stay in this plan. Kidd responded that yes it would. Le Paven also suggested that the Faculty should not have unsafe equipment in use, as she felt the plan indicated was the case. It was clarified that none of the equipment in use is unsafe at this time.

Le Paven then indicated that the APUS board had authorized her to approve 2 per cent increases but that she would bring the FPEH request back to her board for consultation. She asked what had been done with the settlement arising from the FPEH lawsuit against the makers of the film *Varsity Blues*. Kidd replied that it had been used to create bursaries and an endowment fund.

Le Paven completed her remarks by expressing concern that the lift to the Benson Pool was put on hold again. The Chair ruled that that issue was not relevant to the budget being discussed.

Opale Hullen asked about relationship of the Faculty Association to this budget. The answer provided was that athletic instructors are members of UTFA.

C. Office of Student Affairs Operating Plan 2001-2002

Susan Addario introduced the operating plan and outlined the process used to develop it. The plan was developed in conjunction with an Advisory Committee recommended to us by COSS last year, involving the GSU, SAC, APUS and seven students representing the other program areas of Student Affairs. The plan presented had received approval from that committee.

Addario then gave highlights of the plan:

- No fee increases are proposed.
- It eliminates the subsidy to the UTM shuttle bus, for which notice was given last year.
- Re-allocating the bus subsidy, in addition to revenues expected from enrolment increases, have allowed Student Affairs to meet needs identified by the Advisory Committee and other groups, specifically:
- Nancy's Part-time Child Care Centre's pay equity plan.
- A fund to assist student groups in maintaining their buildings/facilities.
- Continued work toward the establishment of a Multifaith Centre.
- Creation of a new position in leadership development and administration of the Sussex Clubhouse.

Addario noted that although Student Affairs was asked to develop a 5-year plan, a number of factors prevented them from doing so. She committed to developing a longer term plan next year.

Addario then introduced Jim Delaney, assistant director, to address some of the initiatives in the area of student life programming. Delaney described more fully the role of the proposed new Student Life Development Officer. This person's role would fall into two main areas: 1. To animate the new Sussex Clubhouse, developing and offering resources, performing administrative tasks; and 2. To develop a Student Leadership program. Delaney provided some background in this area by telling members that Student Affairs has historically played some role in offering skills development programming for student leaders but activity has heightened in recent years. In June 2000, Student Affairs organized a highly-successful student leadership conference at Hart House. That event helped identify the need for a more coordinated effort in the area of leadership development – in creating a central databank of opportunities, in developing, with divisions such as FPEH, Hart House, the Career Centre and University College – a program in leadership skills, and in recognizing the contributions of student leaders.

Susan Addario then directed members to Schedule 1 and A1 of the Student Affairs Operating Plan, pointing out:

- An increase in the transfer to Nancy's from \$70,000 to \$90,000, in support of the Centre's pay equity plan.
- An increase in the honorarium to the Campus Chaplains Association from \$10,000 to \$15,000, in support of their work in multifaith initiatives.
- A fund of \$15,000 for repair of student group space.
- An increase in the allocation to the handbook due to decreasing revenues from affinity programs, and in order to increase the print run to 45,000.
- Salary increases of 2.1 per cent are expected.

The floor was then opened to questions.

Adam Bretholz asked about Zoom advertising funds. Addario replied that Student Affairs is not responsible for this fund but that she, and students, sit on a committee to determine how the fund should be allocated. It does not appear in the Student Affairs budget.

Dale Mullings expressed concern about the elimination of the subsidy to the UTM shuttle. He said few students knew about this issue and worried that it will set a precedent for dropping funding to Erindale.

Susan Addario responded that she was assured by colleagues at UTM that they would disseminate information about this change. She extended the offer to visit the campus to explain what had taken place. Addario provided some background on this issue: a ridership survey had revealed that about 35 per cent of riders on the bus were St. George students who lived in Peel and used the bus to commute. In recognition of that, Student Affairs proposed to transfer 35 per cent of the student cost of running the shuttle out to UTM. The costs of running the shuttle have since escalated. Last year, the Vice-Provost and Director of Student Affairs met with UTM colleagues and indicated the subsidy would be withdrawn. A one-year grace period was

agreed to in order to implement a fare system that gave UTM students a reduced fare, compared to St. George students. Addario added that there was a strong sense within the Student Affairs Advisory Committee that student fees should be used to help with transportation costs for all students, not just those in Peel.

Dale Mullings suggested the savings of \$76,000 could be used to reduce the fee. Addario responded that it would amount to a very small reduction and that Student Affairs already took a reduction last year.

Adam Bretholz inquired about the COSS process. The Chair reiterated that COSS cannot do a line-by-line vote but members can make recommendations individually. Bretholz then asked about the increase in the subsidy to the Campus Chaplains Association. Addario replied that it was non-salary and meant to recognize their work on campus, particularly in the area of multifaith initiatives and the Multifaith Centre project, as well as their role in crisis response.

Bretholz asked how much money had been allocated to repair and maintenance for student group space in prior years. Jim Delaney replied that this was a new fund and that nothing was allocated last year. Bretholz stated that he felt normal wear and tear is part of the University's responsibility and questioned why additional funds were required. Delaney responded that this fund would mean student groups would not have to finance this kind of work through their operating budgets.

Andrew Morgan asked about the handbook and its use by staff and faculty members. Since students pay for the book, he wondered if there was a need to control the distribution. Susan Addario responded that divisions were given only enough books to provide one per student, as per their enrolment figures. The plan this year is to put in a proposal to the Vice-Provost for a University contribution for an extra print-run for faculty and staff

Jorge Sousa asked whether Sussex Clubhouse was the name chosen for the facility at 21 Sussex. Jim Delaney replied that the Committee to Allocate Student Activity Space had chosen the name. Susan Addario added that a Tenants Association will be initiated and that that group could decide to change the name if it so desired.

Sousa expressed concern about the effects of the new St. George rate for the UTM shuttle bus on grad students whose supervisor is at UTM. Addario agreed to work on a strategy for this group of students.

Tom Nowers commended Student Affairs on the presentation and content of its report. He then conveyed the concerns of Scarborough students around the handbook; he asked whether last year's survey included a significant number of UTSc and UTM students. Deanne Fisher responded: the survey did include some UTSc and UTM students. The year prior, a consultation had been held with UTSc students on the organization of the book and some changes had been implemented as a result. Nowers indicated that there is a general lack of satisfaction with the book and that the students at UTSc are considering publishing their own.

Justin Saunders asked whether the SAC Dollar for Daycare fund had been considered as a source of funding for Nancy's. Addario replied that it was her understanding that the Dollars for Daycare money was to be applied to families in need. Saunders followed up by asking what the subsidy to Nancy's entailed. Addario replied that because Nancy's is part-time, it does not get direct operating grants and is not eligible for City of Toronto funding. It has therefore always relied on an operating subsidy from the University.

Adam Bretholz inquired about the role of the proposed Student Life Development Officer and whether they would work closely with the SAC Clubs Commissioner. Jim Delaney indicated that close ties between these two positions, and any assistance SAC could provide, would be welcome.

Tom Nowers commented on the handbook by saying that students at Scarborough generally feel like second class citizens and that this is reflected in the handbook, though he noted it was gradually getting better.

A discussion arose about suburban campus services, including the lack of a University transportation system to the Scarborough campus. Jim Delaney gave some background on that issue, citing high costs, relatively high quality service from the TTC as well as a TTC monopoly on routes as reasons that Scarborough shuttle has not been feasible.

Tom Nowers reported that Scarborough had seen improved service from the TTC recently and that he would be pleased to participate in a tri-campus transportation strategy.

D. Student Services Operating Plan 2001-2002

Marilyn Van Norman presented the operating plans for Student Services and announced that the plans had been approved by the Student Services Advisory Committee. She noted that no fee increases were proposed but did caution that next year would likely see a need to raise fees as a result of a loss of funding from the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs for First Nations House.

Opale Hullen asked whether the Psychiatric Service was engaged in a service restructuring. Van Norman replied that they were doing some surveying on client satisfaction and were working on outreach to cultural communities. Jorge Sousa commended Van Norman on the participatory process by which the operating plan was developed.

E. Nomination of the COSS Chair

Jorge Sousa introduced this motion on behalf of the sub-committee charged with formalizing the appointments process. He made one change to the Nomination Process as outlined in the document circulated. The text on C.4. was changed to read: "Up to three recommendations will be forwarded to the President of the University."

With that change to the process, the following motion was moved:

BIRT COSS approve the recommended Nomination process for the position of Chair for the Council on Student Services (COSS) as an amendment to Appendix A of the COSS protocol. (Sousa/Hullen)

The floor was then opened for discussion of the motion.

Justin Saunders asked when nominations would take place. Sousa responded that it would happen at the last COSS meeting of the academic year.

Mark Overton asked for clarification on A.4. of the proposed process. Sousa explained that the student government responsible for nominees in a given year would take suggestions from anyone, as long as the individuals were members of that constituency. If three nominees could not be identified from that constituency, the student government would pass up their opportunity to nominate a chair that year.

Bruce Kidd questioned whether COSS has the ability to change the protocol. Andrew Morgan replied that the motion is not to change the protocol but its appendix.

Susan Addario pointed out that COSS can make recommendations on changes to the protocol, and its appendices, but that changes can only be made with the agreement of the Governing Council and SAC, APUS and the GSU.

Ian Orchard suggested that the nomination process need not be an amendment to the appendix but can simply be adopted as COSS policy. Jorge Sousa accepted as friendly an amendment to delete the words "as an amendment to Appendix A of the COSS protocol" from the motion.

The vote was then called on the following motion:

BIRT COSS approve the recommended Nomination process for the position of Chair for the Council on Student Services (COSS).

(Sousa/Hullen)

CARRIED.

6.) Motion to adjourn (Addario/Morgan) CARRIED.

