

**Report of the ERINDALE COLLEGE COUNCIL** meeting held on Thursday, December 1, 2011 at 10:10 a.m. in the Council Chamber, room 3130, William G. Davis Building.

Present: G. Anderson (in the Chair), A. Mullin, K. Hannah-Moffat, P. Donoghue, D. Crocker, U. Krull, M. Overton, L. Barber, L. Gaspini, D. Hill, R. Lala, L. Oliver, M. Jamieson, M. Berger, A. Birkenbergs, P. Hannaford, P. King, R. Mazar, A. Nicholson, M. Thuna, S. Senese, I. Whyte, E. Stepanian, D. Di Censo, D. Dunlop, I. Still, S. McCarthy, M. Jalland, V. Maharaj, F. Morgan, A. Burnett, C. Capewell, C. Clairmont, B. McFadden, A. Stelmacovich, J. Stirling, L. Collins, K. Duncliffe, P. Goldsmith, D. Kreuger, J. Lim, E. Martin, D. Mullings, L. Paris, A. Vyas, R. Peters, S. Elias, V. Aivazian, P. Macdonald, M. Lettieri, P. Michelucci, S. Wall, A. Galasso, S. Kang, C. Richter, A. Daniere, D. S. Munro, R. McMillan, K. Yu, S. Stefanovic, S. Short, J. Mahew, I. Orchard, P. Goodman, A. Kahnemuyipour, B. Stewart, K. Khanin, T. Hossain, G. Virag, R. McEwan, I. Graham, X. Shi, R. Wolthoff, N. Woolridge, L. Bailey, S. Kamenetsky, H. Gunz, L. Wilson-Powels, M. Tombak, L. Brooks, S. Min Toh, E. Schumann, C. Pitchik, U. Schimmack, M. Daneman, A. Lange, H. Syme, J. Smith, I. Sheoran, M. Avadisian, S. Da Silva, N. Alim, C. Thompson, R. El-Kadri, A. Chakraborty, A. Rehman, G. Cassar, D. Diczio, M. Sajjad, G. Husain, A. Ursel, S. Hyder, A. Irimie, R. Kape, S. Khan, G. Lai, J. Parhar, D. Amos, T. Didiano, C. Enweugwu, A. Saeed, M. Usmani, K. Wang, R. Abraham, A. Ahmed, T. Ahmed, J. Boutilier, L. D'Sa, R. Dantes, D. Dick, H. Hans, H. Havili, S. Israr, T. Karkaria, E. Madan, K. Moinuddin, R. Nero, N. Yousaf, H. Receno, J. Shek, S. Sumra, M. Teng, L. Trang, R. Vieira, G. Yuen, N. Zhou, M. Pilar Galvez, R. Guo, D. Lee, S. Abbas

Regrets: J. Delves, G. Morris, A. Madhavji, A. Petersen, S. Prosser, I. Di Millo, K. Horvath, G. Kiwana, M. Zandawala, A. Wensley, I. Wiecek

In attendance: A. Lopatriello, C. Bryson, R. Hoy, R. Victoriano, D. Cervoni, A. MacIsaac, H. Mohajir, M. Fabiano, A. Ahmed, J. Chacon, C. Jones, A. DeVito, C. Scott, J. Spignoli, W. Khogali, S. Borg, C. Jankowski, T. Breukelman, J. Resendes, M. Gallagher, M. Suliman

The chair began the meeting by explaining the speaking rules of Council to members. He announced that at last year's meeting that considered the ancillary budgets, there were a number of irregularities with respect to individuals passing around voting cards for either the purposes of being recognized as a member or for double voting and noted that this kind of behaviour would not be tolerated.

A member rose to appeal the decision of the Chair to go ahead with the meeting, noting that not enough notice of the meeting agenda had been provided to members. (G. Cassar/M. Sajjad)

The Chair responded by making the following points:

- There is no reasonable or practical expectation that we count to the minute or the hour of the Council meeting when giving notice

- This provision was probably written in the days when notice was sent out by regular mail and not by email
- It is the view of the Chair that appropriate and adequate notice has been given, providing sufficient time for members to consider the agenda and its relevant items
- These items are not being newly introduced, but have also been considered by previous committees (RPPC Nov 21, Exec Nov 23) and the individual who has complained or his representative was at both of these meetings
- It would have been proper for the member making his appeal or his representative to raise this issue at the Executive Committee meeting on November 23<sup>rd</sup>, the day before the notice went out
- The matter of 3 hours and 40 minutes (10:10 a.m versus 1:50 p.m.) supposes that the call of the meeting was to the hour; in the Chair's opinion, "at least" meant that the call should have been interpreted as "greater than or equal to" with the unit of measure being one day, so that notice on the 7<sup>th</sup> day was met
- This is a frivolous issue since adequate notice has been given consistent with the constitution of 7 days as has been done historically.

He opened the floor to discussion.

The member making the appeal made the following points:

- He expressed his concern that appropriate notice of the Agenda had not been met as described in section 8 of the Constitution which stated that "at least seven days' prior notice of the dates and agenda of the Council meetings shall be given to all members of the Council and to the UTM community"
- He noted that because the agenda had not been sent out on the 7<sup>th</sup> day before 10:10 a.m., but rather almost 4 hours later, that students had not had time to prepare for the meeting sufficiently
- He argued that the matter of 3 hours and 40 minutes made a difference to students, given the sensitivity of the time period, which was study break

The Chair of the Resource Planning and Priorities Committee explained that the parking ancillary budget was presented at a November 10 meeting of the Transportation and Parking Subcommittee meeting and noted that both the President of UTMSU and the President of EPUS were attendance. The ancillary budgets were then presented at the November 21 meeting of the RPPC, which was again attended by student leaders. He made the point that therefore, plenty of notice had been given with respect to the ancillary budget items.

Before putting the appeal to a vote, the Chair spoke again to explain that in the proposed Constitution section IX-5, which was approved by ECC on November 3<sup>rd</sup> and by the Academic Board on November 17<sup>th</sup>, the new wording more clearly explains the spirit behind and the practical expectation for adequate notice. He read from that text as follows: "All reasonable efforts shall be made to ensure that Council agendas are posted at least one week prior to Council meetings." He noted that as the Executive Committee of Governing Council had yet to confirm this new version of the Constitution, it would take effect on December 5, 2011.

The motion was put to a vote. The decision of the Chair to go ahead with the meeting despite a challenge as to the appropriateness of the notice given for the agenda was sustained.

1. Approval of Minutes of Previous Meeting (November 22, 2011)

The report of the previous meeting was approved. (N. Woolridge/D. Kreuger)

It was duly moved and seconded

THAT

The agenda be changed so that the curriculum reports from the Academic Affairs Committee be moved up from item 2b, to item 2a, earlier in the agenda (A. Mullin/G. Cassar)

The motion was carried.

2. Reports of Standing Committees and Officers

b) Academic Affairs Committee: Report of November 22, 2011 —Prof. Nick Woolridge

The Chair of the Academic Affairs Committee, Professor Woolridge, noted that both major and minor curriculum changes were approved at the Committee's last meeting. He noted that the curriculum reports in their entirety were posted online for information and gave a brief summary of the minor changes in the three reports of Humanities, Sciences and Social Sciences.

Professor Woolridge noted that major changes and major modifications stemming from the 2012-13 Curriculum Reports and a proposed new certificate program were also approved and would now be presented to Council for approval.

He called on Professor Michelucci to present item I. Professor Michelucci referred members to proposal A, and summarized the major modification in the French Studies Major Program, in the Department of Language Studies.

Professor Michelucci explained that two of the existing majors in French, French Language and Linguistics (ERMAJ0525) & French Language and Literature (ERMAJ1295) will be consolidated and offered as one single renamed program: ERMAJ1295 French Studies. This program will be modified to incorporate existing 300-400 level courses previously associated with ERMAJ0525 (French Language and Linguistics). Students in the French Studies Major retain the option to select concentration in either Literature (in a simplified way) or Linguistics in their upper level courses. The two current Major programs and courses continue to exist within a common amalgamated structure. It is also proposed that the program be increased to 8.0 credits in order to accommodate extra language requirements, which include the highest advanced levels of language proficiency (in written and oral French).

The decision to consolidate the French Language and Linguistics & French Language and Literature Major programs into French Studies was made as a result of extensive consultations with Faculty who teach in French Studies. It was felt that the focus should be geared toward developing stronger language skills with a minimum of 3.0 credits in language proficiency (up to and including the advanced levels) and to provide students with the opportunity to focus their upper level courses in the areas of literature or linguistics. Maintaining two separate programs with the same language proficiency learning outcomes and a close distribution of 4.0 shared credits, which follow the same disciplinary logic of fleshing out a solid knowledge of a general field, was seen to create an artificial distinction and lack of clarity for our students. As the specified program description included at the end of this document mentions, the core of the consolidated Major in French Studies is as follows: "3.0 other FRE credits to be completed within ONE area of concentration: [either] Linguistics [or] Literary and Cultural Studies".

The additional required language course will make certain that strong language proficiency is attained within the Major as described, and with the consolidation of the two existing programs promotes ease of choice. It also eliminates confusion and difficult choices for our students when deciding on a program of study.

It is proposed to align FRE offerings, whether they are in Linguistics or Literature, on the same model: after their second year, students choose FRE credits among available offerings in Linguistics or in Literature. Students in French literature will no longer be required to take a 0.5 credit in each period grouping (Groups B, C, and D) of courses. This is in line with present faculty resources at UTM.

This proposed change is also in-line with remarks expressed in the Departmental Review Final Report (2008-09): the external reviewers recommended that the French Studies discipline streamline its program offerings.

It was duly moved and seconded,  
THAT

Erindale College Council approve the major modification in the French Studies Major Program as described in [Proposal A](#), dated November 4, 2011. (P. Michelucci/A. Lange)

The Chair opened the floor to discussion.

The motion was approved.

Professor Woolridge called on Professor Michelucci to present item II. Professor Michelucci referred members to proposal B, and summarized the major modification in the French Studies Specialist Program, in the Department of Language Studies.

Professor Michelucci explained that currently, the Department of Language Studies offers a

specialist program in French with a concentration in literature (ERSPE1295 French Language and Literature). Given the distribution of faculty expertise in the discipline at UTM, the department wished to expand choice for students who wanted to specialize in French by offering the option to include upper level courses in linguistics. The current French Language and Literature program will be re-named French Studies, which is consistent with the Major in French Studies (a consolidation of the two existing Major Programs currently offered in literature and linguistics).

The decision to include French linguistics in the renamed French Studies program was the result of extensive consultation within French Studies. Faculty felt that students should have the opportunity to choose whether they would like to specialize and maintain interest in each of the two areas of French Studies – French literature on the one hand, and French linguistics on the other hand – if they so desire. Students can still opt for a traditional "French Language and Literature" distribution if they wish to select Literature courses, as before. But they can also continue with some French Linguistics courses beyond the 200 level, if they are interested in the new stream, which may be an attractive option for CTEP students.

It duly moved and seconded,  
THAT

Erindale College Council approve the major modification in the French Studies Specialist Program as described in [Proposal B](#), dated November 4, 2011. (P. Michelucci/A. Lange)

The Chair opened the floor to discussion.

The motion was approved.

Professor Woolridge called on Professor Michelucci to present item III. Professor Michelucci referred members to the proposal describing new minor program in English Language Linguistics in the Department of Language Studies.

Professor Michelucci explained that the courses offered in the current Minor and Major programs in Linguistics are mainly focused on theoretical constructs that are relevant in the analysis of the grammar of all languages. The existing programs also explore Linguistics as an academic discipline and prepare students for graduate studies. The proposed Minor in English Language Linguistics (ELL) is equally grounded in disciplinary linguistics, but while the current programs consider a broad spectrum of the world's languages in relation to the human language faculty, the ELL program emphasizes the structure of English.

Students enrolled in the new program will be able to apply theoretical constructs to understand the rules that underlie the sound system of English, English word formation, and English syntax. This knowledge will then deepen their understanding of how different registers and varieties of English are used, how second languages are acquired, and how they are best taught.

The program will offer students a secondary set of skills involving the application of linguistic analysis to written English. They will be able to recognize and understand the principles of cohesion and coherence in written passages (logic, rhetoric, discipline specific/ non-discipline specific vocabulary). The practical training will allow them to analyze, understand, and evaluate written English, with a special focus on the academic uses of the English language. These are necessary tools for academic success in any discipline at the University level. Any student in Health care, in professional degree programs or in the Humanities; any local or international student with a need to develop linguistic skills will benefit from the type of training in linguistic analysis offered by the Minor in ELL.

The proportion of students at the University of Toronto Mississauga with English as their second or third language is expected to continue to rise, due to both the multicultural and diverse Canadian student body and the growing number of international students. Many of these students face language-related challenges. In addition, the general student population, including students with English as their first language, has serious difficulties with academic writing. This calls for an action plan to provide discipline-based opportunities to all such UTM students to acquire the linguistic and critical-thinking skills needed to succeed in their academic programs. The English Language Linguistics program will provide students with an opportunity to improve their communicative and writing abilities through an academic training in the field of linguistics with a focus on English, as discussed in more detail below.

Courses in the proposed minor program are primarily designed to equip students with the analytic tools required for a scientific approach to language. These tools in turn are recruited for two complementary objectives: 1) to help students make linkages between the advanced language skills (communicative, analytical and pragmatic competence) required for success at the university level and the description of the English language through the tools and methods provided by Linguistics; and 2) to provide students with the training in linguistics required to effectively read, evaluate, present, and write academic work.

The ELL Minor program is distinctive and unique, as it draws on the strengths of contemporary linguistic analysis in both the theoretical and applied domains to provide students with a sophisticated understanding of the structure of English. This knowledge is then applied to their own command of the language, especially in the academic sphere. The Minor aims at producing well-rounded students with superior communicative skills and is suitable to those looking for enhanced linguistic skills to express themselves at an appropriate level both orally and in writing in order to improve their overall academic performance.

It was duly moved and seconded,  
THAT

Erindale College Council approve the new minor program in English Language Linguistics in the Department of Language Studies as described in the [proposal](#) dated November 14, 2011.  
(P. Michelucci/D. Kreuger)

The Chair opened the floor to discussion.

The motion was approved.

Professor Woolridge called on Professor Tombak to present item IV.

IV. [Proposal: Global Management Fundamentals Certificate Program](#), Department of Management - Professor Mihkel Tombak, Chair

Professor Tombak described the proposed certificate program as follows. In an effort to meet growing demand for specialized business training in an international environment, the Department of Management is proposing the Certificate in Global Management Fundamentals. The program will be 7.5 weeks in duration (36 days of tuition), and will consist of intensive instruction in six management areas. The program will focus on attracting undergraduate students, typically after the equivalent of at least two full years of study in management- or business-related disciplines. The material covered in the intensive program will provide enrichment for the students' concurrent studies at their home institutions. The instructional modules are designed to provide participants with an understanding of business and management in a more global context, and will offer perspectives in the various management disciplines that may not be available to them at their home institutions. Participants will live on campus with students from other institutions, will receive instruction from UTM faculty, and will engage in professional development activities. Participants may also undertake a Business Communication module, running concurrently with academic coursework, which will provide them the opportunity to refine their English language skills, and will help them to develop a discipline-specific vocabulary.

As part of the University of Toronto Mississauga's effort to create new and innovative relationships with universities abroad, and to further the University-wide objective of increased recruitment of international students, the Global Management Fundamentals program will be drawn from selected institutions abroad.

Participants will be drawn from students currently enrolled in business and management programs in top universities in regions with emerging economies, with which UTM is developing strategic partnerships. Initially, UTM will focus on creating partnerships with institutions in India, and if successful, recruitment efforts will be expanded into other markets like China. The Office of the Vice President & Principal, UTM, including the Director, International Academic Liaisons, will forge these partnerships in consultation with the Office of the Vice-Principal Academic & Dean, and the Department of Management. This will ensure that partnerships are only developed with high-quality universities in target markets, and will allow the Global Management Fundamentals program to utilize the expertise of the local institution to identify their top students for enrolment in the summer program. A growing number of undergraduate business students in these regions are in need of specialized training in both a North American and a more broadly global context. The Global Management Fundamentals program will provide participants with grounding in North American business practices, as well as an opportunity to interact with business and



management students from other regions.

The Department of Management is prepared to offer this program as an element of its own long-term academic plans. The certificate program will be self-funding. Any surplus generated by the program will be used to enrich the Department's current traditional degree program offerings. For example, the surplus can be used toward the hiring of additional full-time, tenure-stream faculty members, that will allow the Department to provide first-rate instruction in the certificate program, while also increasing the number of sections taught in the degree programs by tenured and tenure-stream faculty members.

Since the Global Management Fundamentals program will operate as a "certificate program in continuing studies,"<sup>1</sup> participants will not be registered as University of Toronto students, will not receive academic credit for coursework completed from the University of Toronto, and will not have a University of Toronto transcript. Participants in Global Management Fundamentals may not enrol in any University of Toronto specialist or major programs, and coursework completed during the summer program will not transfer to a University of Toronto degree program. Upon satisfying the requirements of the program, participants will receive a certificate of completion, issued conjointly by the Department of Management and the University of Toronto Mississauga, but will not be recognized at Convocation. Participants' home institutions may choose to award an appropriate level of academic credit to those participants that complete the program.

It was duly moved and seconded,  
THAT the Global Management Fundamentals Certificate Program in the Department of Management be approved by Erindale College Council, effective June 1, 2012. (M. Tombak/K. Hannah-Moffat)

The Chair opened the floor to discussion.

The motion was carried.

a) Resource Planning & Priorities Committee: Report of November 21, 2011—Prof. Lee Bailey

Professor Bailey reported that at its last meeting the RPPC reviewed the ancillary budgets to ascertain that they met their goals, to ensure that they were consistent with SARG guidelines. The parking budget was also discussed at a meeting of the Transportation and Parking subcommittee of the RPPC on November 10. The budgets are materially unchanged in their submission to ECC. He called on the CAO to begin with the parking services ancillary budget.

The CAO began his presentation by summarizing the policies that all ancillaries at the university have to follow as laid out by the Service Ancillary Review Group or SARG.



Ms. Christine Capewell, Director of Business Services then presented the parking budget. She noted over the last 12 months UTM has confirmed a new growth plan, one that could see an enrolment growth of approximately 25% over 5 years. In addition, the related growth plan for faculty and staff will cause an increase in demand in parking, which in turn will require an expansion of the existing parking deck. The parking office estimates that UTM will eventually have a shortage and would like to address that.

The forecast for the current year has very few significant variances in budget. The only variance is in the expense section for annual maintenance, which has an unexpected expense to replace signage and a rail in Lot #8. The result for the year is a positive \$478K for 2011-12. Schedule 2 shows that in the 2011-12 year there is no transfer out of the ancillary operation, so there is no contribution to the operating budget. Ms. Capewell pointed out that that there was no planned capital reserve. Instead, a new construction reserve is proposed, which would be established in the current year to address the anticipated shortage in supply as the campus grows.

The 2012-13 budget includes a 3% permit price increase. The Reserved permit price will increase from the current price of \$880.33/annum to \$906.74/annum. Premium Unreserved will increase from \$628.27 to \$647.12/annum; Unreserved from \$607.90 to \$626.13/annum; Afternoon permits from \$509.23 to \$524.51/annum & Commercial from \$1,018.46 to \$1,049.02/annum.

There is no rate increase for Pay & Display.

Expenses are expected to be similar to the forecast for 2011-12. The operating result before transfers is a surplus of \$578,744. This surplus will be contributed into the new construction reserve fund to accumulate toward a down payment on the planned parking deck extension.

The CAO continued the presentation by provide context around the significant change this year with respect to how the parking ancillary was approached. He noted that this was discussed at RPPC in October, ECC in November and again at RPPC in November. The significant change has been that contributions to the operating budget from the parking ancillary have been brought to a halt. He emphasized that the overall capital plan over the next 5 years provides an important context to the parking ancillary in that the following major capital projects are planned and currently have project planning committees: North Building, undergraduate teaching laboratories, Kaneff Centre expansion and the Student Services Plaza. There is a also a looming need for expanded library capacity and a parking deck. He noted that he had also recently met with student leaders who have said that they are going to be submitting their plan for the Student Centre expansion next week. The CAO explained that overall, UTM is facing a shortfall of at least \$124M for capital expansion. He noted that the university would continue to fundraise and lobby the government for funding, but that it could not count on these to fully fund its capital project needs.

Therefore, it is proposed that excess of revenues over costs from parking services would be

set aside for the future parking deck, which given current growth figures would likely be needed either in the fall of 2015 or 2016. The proposed 3% per year increase would allow the university to accumulate \$2.6M, which would in turn help UTM obtain an internal loan from the university to cover the rest of the cost of such a deck, which is estimated to be \$8M. The money would be retained in the ancillary itself.

It was duly moved and seconded,  
THAT the Parking Services Operating Plan and Management Report for 2012-13 be approved. (C. Capewell/P. Donoghue)

The Chair opened the floor to discussion.

A member spoke against the motion and made the following points:

- Referring to a handout distributed to ECC members by UTMSU, the President of UTMSU noted the reasons students do not accept a rate increase
- That parking presented a barrier to education in terms of increases in price versus service, which are moving in opposite directions
- That the management practices and decisions made by the university were sloppy
- That there was a parasitic relationship between the parking ancillary and the operating budget
- That during a period of price increases, service levels had actually decreased with a net loss of spaces
- Students are suffering with respect to the cost of parking: in 2005 levels compared to current annual reserve spot price increased by \$272.99 per spot - talking huge increases
- Students have to drive for practical reasons because they live far away and do not have easy or convenient access to public transportation
- Net loss position with the number of parking spaces compared to 2005
- In terms of decision making, the ancillary budget could have had more surpluses that could prevent the need for an increase: for example in 2008 parking lot #2 was ripped up and a number of spaces lost and then a year later, it was repaved at a cost of \$571K and then it was taken out of commission a year later for the construction of the Instructional Centre
- If we look at revenue figures, a 3% increase would cause between revenues of this year an other year difference of \$54,000 if this amount was not spent in this way there would not be a need this day
- Shortsightedness of that mistake and students had nothing to do with this
- SARG guidelines should not be accepted;
- Over a number of years had significant surpluses over the years in the parking budget and in the past there have been transfers from the parking ancillary budget into the operating budget and if these amounts of money had been kept in the ancillary, students would not have to bear such unreasonably high costs

- This violates one of the objectives of the parking services, which is to keep parking fees as low as possible, and argued that this was not achieved
- He does not understand why there are such hefty interest rates on internal university loans; interest rates charged are out of sync with market rates
- The student union cannot support this budget or the guidelines

It was duly moved and seconded,

THAT the ancillary budget discussion be postponed to the next scheduled meeting of ECC.  
(M. Sajjad/G. Cassar)

The member making the motion made the following points:

- Students needed to be consulted on this budget and less than seven days' notice was not sufficient time to do so
- Students needed to be consulted on amortization rates, interest rates and SARG guidelines and really need to go back to students for input

Other members spoke in favour of postponement and made the following points:

- A meeting scheduled during exam time means that not many students can attend;
- Faculty have more time and it is more convenient for them to come because they do not have as many commitments;
- More faculty are able to attend and outnumber students

Another member commented that faculty members are paying parking fees as well.

The Chair of RPPC spoke against the motion to postpone the budget discussions and noted that the parking budget was presented at a meeting of the Transportation and Parking Subcommittee on November 10<sup>th</sup>. The President of UTMSU, UTMAGS and EPUS are all members of that committee and therefore they would have been aware of the budget and able to consult with students since then.

A member noted that if the budget discussions were to be postponed to when students were back in their regular schedules their voices could be more easily heard, because they now have exams.

A non-member was granted speaking rights by Council.

The non-member spoke for the motion to postpone and noted that Council should look to getting more information in the budget presentation and talk to the student union, find out about their report and have a more thorough discussion on the budget numbers.

A member noted that students do not currently have exams as previously stated and the notion that it is much easier for faculty to attend is not valid. Another member noted that

students were studying for exams. A member noted that students and faculty should be united and there needed to be consultation; he added that there were three students on the RPPC committee, but that not all 50 ECC student representatives have seats on RPPC and therefore had no access to the budget numbers.

The Chair pointed out that the ancillary budgets were accessible to all Council members with the notice to the meeting.

The motion was put to a vote. The motion was lost.

On a point of personal privilege, a member noted that when students wanted to speak they feel that the Chair is mocking them. The Chair apologized and noted that the point was taken.

The CAO noted that he would wait until a number of questions had been asked on the parking budget and would answer them all at once.

A member asked how much money is projected to be saved by building up the proposed construction reserve and secondly, with respect to internal interest rates, he asked what the university's normal return on investment was. Ms. Capewell explained that when the parking operation needs to borrow money, it goes to the university; the university in turn must borrow that money from an outside lending operation and must pay them the interest rate that that operation charges. She emphasized that the university does not make any profit on any money being lent to UTM, and added that she was not sure why there appeared to be an issue with so called "internal interest rates." She further explained that U of T as a whole has very little capacity for borrowing, so for that reason it needs to have a solid financial plan going forward.

On a motion duly moved and seconded the meeting was extended by 45 minutes. (A. Birkenbergs/L. Bailey)

A member noted that faculty are paying for parking too and added that parking is about convenience and that users had to pay for having that convenience. He encouraged members to use carpooling and public transportation.

A member noted that parking costs were just adding on to an already ballooning student debt. The member added that when parking lot #2 was taken out, parking fees still increased. She also asked whether administration considered public transportation when calculating future demand against the anticipated enrolment growth.

A member was called to order for passing around a member voting card to a non-member.

A member commented that many students are forced to drive to school because they live far away from campus and very distant commutes such as from Vaughn would be a hassle to accomplish with transit.

A member asked whether the planned new parking deck would result in a net total loss of parking spaces, since when the existing deck opened, a net of 149 spaces were lost. The CAO replied that the reason the university decided to forego surface lots in favour of parking decks was so that no new green space would be paved over. He explained that the difficult decision to locate the Instructional Centre on parking lot #2 was made because it made sense from a planning point of view; at that time, there were approximately 300 vacant spaces on campus because spaces were overbuilt on the surface lots. Planning for future parking has to make sure that the parking operation can meet the expected demand without overbuilding.

A member asked how it was decided that the parking surplus would be contributed to the campus's operating budget given that ancillaries have to operate without a subsidy from the operating budget, but are then encouraged to contribute to the operating budget without charging interest. She also asked what happened to these funds. The CAO explained that the ancillaries were reviewed and the decision is made each year where the surplus would go; once it goes into the operating budget of the campus, it was difficult to see exactly where or how it was used. He further noted that the current change in the parking ancillary – a construction reserve - makes it very transparent where these funds would reside.

In response to a member's question about whether or not it was true that parking funds were subsidizing the rest of UTM if contributions were made to the operating budget, the CAO answered in the affirmative.

A member suggested that UTM not put any money into the operating budget and charge less for parking, so that the stated mandate of the parking operation of trying to maintain parking rates as low as possible could be fulfilled.

A member asked for an explanation of the difference between a capital and a construction reserve. The CAO answered that a capital reserve is for major maintenance and improvements such as major paving. The construction reserve has been given that name so that its purpose is transparent and so that it is shown to be explicitly for the needed new parking deck, which is projected at \$8.6M. He further explained that both reserves are capital, but one is substantially smaller in scale.

Referring to a member's previous comment about driving and parking on campus being a convenience, a member objected and noted that owning a car is not convenient.

A member remarked that the proposed 3% increase for the next 5 years would constitute a future value is \$1020.54 and asked members to vote no to the proposal.

A member commented that U of T is a prestigious school and in order maintain the university's academic standing there had to be some common sense in how the money was being spent; she further noted that members complain about the lack of parking spaces, but at the same time don't want to pay for them.

A member remarked that when prices increased, customers declined, so increasing prices did not make sense. The Director of Business Services replied that if the university does not build a parking deck to accommodate projected demand, the resulting shortage of spaces would be irresponsible to the campus community.

A member asserted that students are here to get an education, which is a right not a privilege in Canada. She further stated that students pay thousands of dollars for tuition and noted that as the person at UTMSU in charge of bursaries, she sees students on a regular basis who have high GPA's but cannot afford to attend university and have to drop out. She added that parking rates going up would make it even more unaffordable for students to come to UTM and other solutions could be found if there was a shortage of parking spaces.

A member noted that a vast majority of students use public transportation and encouraged everyone to lobby transit providers to provide more opportunities for people to forego driving to the campus.

A member noted that she lived in Vaughn and could not use public transportation and could not afford an increase in parking rates. Ancillaries increasing are just adding to the debt of students.

In response to a member's question about why pay and display rates were not being raised at the same time, the Director of Business Services replied that pay and display rates were only periodically increased because of the use of dollar bills and coins; these rates were normally increased by increments of dollars every few years.

A member suggested looking at fundraising or government funding to cover parking construction. The CAO noted that the Government of Ontario simply does not fund ancillaries at all, including parking, food and residences.

A member noted that parking fees were too high ("too damn high and students were getting screwed over") and faculty were not saying anything because they were happy with the status quo. The member then noted that the university's "Boundless Campaign" should include fundraising for ancillaries, since they are encompassed in the education of students. He further stated that he has to question why central administration offers no help with UTM's parking situation. Parking fees were becoming a business at UTM and central administration should be told to reorganize their priorities.

The Director of the Advancement office, explained that UTM and other divisions fundraise based on academic priorities, which have been approved by the Provost and parking decks are not approved academic priorities. He further noted that the university actively raises funds that go towards scholarships, endowed chairs, new buildings and programs.

A member stated that with respect to the fundraising campaign, the university should perhaps change its priorities. He further noted that members would be complacent if they allowed

these fees to go up; it was time for change. He added that looking at the numbers in 2010 and 2011 the parking variance was approximately \$43,000 and revenues were at \$54,000, and that these numbers represented almost 80% of what the proposed 3% increase was supposed to achieve. The Director of Business Services, Ms. Capewell, explained that the variance in the previous year was due to the parking deck opening late, which skewed forecast figures. She noted that when preparing the budget, staff looked at everything that might impact parking revenues and readjust based on current analysis. She explained that the current year should be closer to forecast figures.

A member asked why last year's profit of \$522K went into a *black hole*. Ms. Capewell referred members to the budget and noted that all of the money is staying within the parking operation to fund the deck expansion.

A member noted that U of T's operating budget is not being charged interest for UTM's contributions into it and asked why UTM was not reaping the benefits of these contributions. The CAO explained that these contributions were not a loan. Ms. Capewell added that there seems to be some confusion on this subject and referred members to the budget. She pointed to schedule 2 and explained that transfers out of the ancillary operations planned to contribute \$630K to the operating fund, but that instead, the ancillary was building up a construction reserve. In addition, she noted that last year's contribution of \$420K into the operating fund went towards the existing parking deck, whose cost totaled \$6.7M. She repeated that there was no planned contribution to the operating budget.

A member noted that whenever the parking ancillary experienced a surplus in the past, there was never a reduction in fees even though one of the goals of the parking ancillary is to try and keep prices as low as possible.

A member asked when the 3% increases will stop and wondered if fees would be increased even further in future years.

A member noted that last year's rationale for the 3% increase was to raise that \$630K transfer that is no longer there, so he wondered why UTM was no longer contributing to that parking deck. A member questioned whether the needs presented by administration were false needs. The CAO explained that as a result of previous discussions at ECC, he was introducing the construction reserve fund in an effort to make the budget even more transparent and to be fiscally responsible. The need for a new deck in the next five years is based on a real analysis of demand: an increase in the campus population of 5% per year and a utilization rate of 15-17% will still produce a shortage of parking spots even after the new parking deck is introduced. The CAO stated that this analysis is not false and is based on real numbers.

A member rose on a point of order and stated that based on the information just received, if members continued with the vote, he felt that the spending of the money in the ancillary will be in a different direction than what was called for last year.



On a motion duly moved and seconded, the previous question was called. (U. Schimmak/M. Berger)

On a point of order a member rose to say that the rules were being contradicted in that the Previous Question should count as if it had never been said since the Chair should exhaust all those who were on the speakers' list and wished to speak before recognizing a new speaker. The Chair noted that there was no speakers' list and that he was trying to recognize members who had not spoken on the motion twice before and those could have something new to add to the discussion. Another member interrupted saying that the member making the previous question motion was not on the speakers' list. The Chair explained again there was no speakers' list, and there was no requirement to keep one and noted that he was trying to recognize speakers who had not spoken before.

The vote on the Previous Question was taken. The motion was carried.

A member noted that the meeting had come to an end and no further business could be conducted.

It was duly moved and seconded,  
THAT the meeting be extended by 10 minutes. (A. Birkenbergs/M. Berger)

A member rose to a point of order that the meeting adjournment time of 12:45 had just passed and therefore the meeting could not be extended. The Chair and the secretary explained that the previous question motion had been passed and that it should be carried out and that the motion to extend the meeting was in order and up to Council to decide. A member interrupted to say that the motion to extend was out of order since the meeting was over.

The motion to extend the meeting was put to a vote. The motion was carried.

The main motion was put to a vote. The main motion was carried.

The meeting adjourned at 12:49 p.m.

Secretary \_\_\_\_\_ Chair \_\_\_\_\_