

President (continued from page 14)

How is our academic planning to proceed? Detailed discussions of the content, committee responsibilities, and timing have been underway during the past week in preparation for a report to Senate in early March. This follows Senate's decision of last November to develop 3 to 5-year academic plans. During the interim, Senate APPC and Vice-President Found have been receiving reports on existing planning procedures within Faculties. An analysis of these reports has convinced APPC that much more directed and specific planning guidelines must be provided the Faculties in early March.

A second committee to bear major responsibility in the planning process is the Budget Sub-Committee, which will be charged with converting the academic priorities determined by Senate into an appropriate flow of funds, and into the fairest distribution of budget cuts.

The system of interaction among the Faculties, Senate APPC, the Budget Sub-Committee, and the Office of Vice-President Found is more complicated than we wish to describe here; but it is expected that the interaction, plus considerable perseverance, will lead to well-formulated academic plans and an appropriate budgeting system by February of 1981. By that time we will be in a much better position to implement budget cuts than now. We will also be in a position to utilize the increased formula funding resulting from the "investment" of funds in new academic programs in 1980-81.

One-year relief from budget-cutting

This one-year relief from budget-cutting may or may not mean accepting a temporary deficit position, depending upon our ability to maintain the savings program and initiatives which we have undertaken for the past two years. In any event, it should be understood that, as a first claim against the budget in the following year, the commitment accepted by our Policy Committee is to meet any deficit from the 1980-81 fiscal year. In that case, we then face the question: what is a reasonable deficit, and what could we possibly cope with in the few years ahead?

Policy for student fees

That question takes us directly to the issue of an appropriate policy for student fees. As you know, the government has allowed universities this year to increase their fees up to an additional 10 percent. On the basis of our information, most of the universities of the province will be taking up all or part of that latitude. However, as I indicated earlier, I believe that our policy should be one that is based on a progressive and not regressive posture.

Fee increases in the past decade have been well below the level of inflation.

The whole philosophy of student fees is an interesting one. One way of looking at the issue is to suggest that there should be no fees because students will pay more if they earn more as a result of the investment in them through the progressive income tax. It would even be conceivable to argue that, because university graduates receive both an economic and a personal benefit from attendance at universities, there should be an income tax surcharge for all university graduates in the future as a way of avoiding university fees and also having adequate funding.

It should be noted that fee increases in the past decade have been well below the level of

inflation. In the 10-year period from 1970-71 to 1979-80, fees at York University increased from \$560.00 to \$817.50 or 45.9 percent (i.e. an average of 4.6 percent per year). Addition of the planned 1980-81 increase of 7.5 percent in basic formula fees plus the supplementary 10 percent increase would result in an average fee for a full-time student of \$952.50, bringing the overall increase over eleven years from \$560.00 to \$952.50 or 73.2 percent (i.e. an average of less than 6.66 percent per year).

Meanwhile, the Consumer Price Index (CPI) has climbed by more than 100 percent in the same 10 years, i.e., at an average of 10 percent per annum with corresponding impacts on all the costs the University must meet. Further increases in the Index may be expected. In the 10-year period from 1970-71 to 1979-80, the minimum wage has increased by 130 percent (i.e. by an average of 13 percent per annum).

It should also be noted that fees as a proportion of Ordinary Income have steadily decreased since 1966 when they represented 28.4 percent. In the 10-year period from 1970-71 to 1979-80, they have dropped from 24.4 percent in 1970-71 to 17.7 percent in 1979-80. In 1980-81, fees would represent 19.4 percent of projected 1980-81 Ordinary Income after applying the 7.5 percent basic increase and if we were to take up the supplementary 10 percent increase.

The Government has put the universities in the difficult position of having to decide by how much they should increase fees, if at all. At the same time, the Government has recognized that its increases in grants do not meet the legitimate needs of the universities for maintenance and development of quality programs. This is so at York. To avoid further crippling cuts in academic programs and support services, it would appear that we need the revenue which an increase in fees will provide. At the same time, we must do whatever is possible to mitigate any negative consequences which the increases might have on our ability to recruit new and retain existing students. Meanwhile, we face many uncertainties as I suggested earlier.

Possibilities

There are an infinite number of possibilities, but let me suggest four:

(1) *The current proposal before the Executive Committee is to take the full 10 percent increase, but to allocate one-quarter for student assistance. Accordingly, I have asked the Vice-Presidents concerned to suggest a program for the use of approximately one-quarter of the amount generated by a 10 percent fee increase, for the purposes of ensuring that the increase would not prevent the attendance at York of those who would otherwise have attended or cause undue hardship on students already enrolled.*

The program would require the direction of increased funds to

recruitment, retention, and student bursary aid. We anticipate that we would need at least \$65-\$75,000 in additional general bursary funds, and similar amounts to improvements in undergraduate and graduate entrance and in-course awards in order to prevent the increase in fees from being a financial deterrent to enrolment or to accessibility. With the further assistance to be provided in OSAP of \$3.3 million, such an option could be regarded as progressive.

(2) *Increase fees by 5 percent, with no supplement to student assistance. Since the net increase under (1) is 7.5 percent, this would require deferred expenditure of about \$300,000 or a gamble on the final 1979-80 financial*

picture being improved to that degree.

(3) *Increase fees by 5 percent, with one percent in student assistance. That would require an additional \$120,000 of deferred expenditure or reallocation of funds in the proposed budget.*

(4) *No fee increase, but be prepared for a 1980-81 in-year cut after seeing the final 1979-80 picture, deferring all possible expenditures, and having the final enrolment figures available. We are proposing that the deficit be no larger than 1.5 percent of the operating budget, at any time. That would set the size of any possible in-year cut. On the other hand, it would effectively prevent the fulfilment of our no-cut objective which, as I have said, is our dominating priority.*

Recruitment and communications

We recognize, however, that great efforts will be necessary to explain the University's mission, to continue to encourage students to come to university, and to support our currently active and evolving recruitment program. At the same time, we will need to support those initiatives which are directed at enlarging York's horizons for enrolment and adding to the programs which we offer.

For example, we have had notable success in our January programs and in taking the University to places of employment. We have a whole host of initiatives currently underway in that direction. Consequently, I am prepared to devote the major part of my small discretionary fund to that purpose.

Everyone has indicated over recent months that recruitment is a top priority. I agree with that and am prepared to fund it adequately. At the same time, I am encouraged to hear that the Ministry of Colleges and Universities is contemplating a study of accessibility to university and the reasons why many choose not to come. I would propose to initiate studies in this university in the same direction, and I have already had discussions about that project with representatives of the student body.

However, our task in the future is even larger if we are to ensure academic quality without an undue burden on the backs of the students. For that reason, I suggest to this Board that the financial campaign presently being planned is of the essence to the healthy survival of York University and should be the top priority in the consideration of this Board at this time.

Recommendations

In view of this presentation, and in anticipation of the discussion which we will have at the Board meeting today, I would like to conclude by making the following five recommendations to the Board:

- The acceptance of the desirability of a no-reduction year to allow the development of a comprehensive multi-year plan to meet the challenge of future change;
- A budget policy which allows for an operating deficit up to but not to exceed 1.5 percent of the Ordinary Operating Income of the University in any year — such policy to be reviewed after two years, with a view to extension or elimination — and to be a first charge against the 1981-82 budget;
- The increase of tuition fees for all terms by 7.5 percent to meet the basic increase in formula fees;
- The expenditure of up to \$650,000 from accumulated Campaign Funds in the General Account for support of growth projects and other annual, but not continuing, costs;
- Final decision on any further increase in fees following analysis by the Budget Sub-Committee and recommendations of the Policy Committee.

In considering the matter of fees, let me stress the seriousness of this question for York University at this time. This is a question that not only involves the University but indeed public policy in the widest sense and, therefore, I believe it is a matter upon which members of the Board of Governors will wish to provide their considered views. However, there are at least three points that should not be ignored:

• The decision to provide the universities with further latitude to increase fees has been taken regrettably in advance of a study of accessibility to Ontario universities, which has put the cart before the horse.

• As a result of fees accounting for a decreasing proportion of university income from the mid-1960's through the 1970's, a much wider access has been permitted for young people in this province to universities. That was a cornerstone of the Ontario Government policy and is one that, in my view, should be enhanced rather than restricted.

This is particularly important in a university such as York. In some of the older universities, there is a pattern of children from university families going on to university. Among the student body of York, only 20 percent have fathers with a

university degree and 8 percent have mothers with a university degree. The opportunities which this University has provided is one of the glories of the provincial system and is an important responsibility for us to maintain;

• We have no indication of the government's longer-term policy for universities in general, and for fees in particular. Whereas an increase of this dimension in one year is unpalatable under any circumstances, it would be less disconcerting if it were a one-time adjustment. However, we cannot be certain whether the intention is to have fees increase in large amounts for some years, leading to a fee that would be highly restrictive of access.

I believe we are entitled to some answers before going too far down the road at this time. On the other hand, it is no help at all to be told that none of the options available to us are acceptable. Without a major change in grants to universities, we cannot meet all of our objectives — the maintenance of academic quality, adequate salaries, preservation of jobs, and low student fees. We must still make some immediate decisions for the 1980-81 budget, and we will be considering those matters in the University decision-making bodies during the next few weeks.

WOMEN IN POLITICS

The Council of the York Student Federation and the York Women's Centre have designed a one-day "Women In Politics" conference to examine the role of women in all levels of Canadian politics. The events, which begin at 8:30 on Saturday, March 1, take place in the Moot Court of Osgoode Hall Law School.

The morning panel, chaired by York political science professor Naomi Black, features Marg Evans, Feminist Party of Canada; Kaye Macpherson, New Democratic Party; Anne Johnston, City of Toronto Alderman; Diane Stratas, former Conservative Member of Parliament (MP); and Aileen Nicholson, Liberal MP, who is now spoken of as a Cabinet possibility.

Afternoon workshops will provide a practical investigation of how to become involved in politics; how to move into the mainstream as riding president, candidate, or party officer; how to balance politics, job, and home; and will also discuss various non-partisan routes. Women's rights activist Laura Sabia, former appointee to the Federal Advisory Council on the Status of Women, and first Chairman of the Ontario Status of Women Council, will give a wrap-up to the day's discussions.

The conference is free and open to the public. Daycare is available and parking is free in JJ parking lot adjacent to Osgoode Hall Law School. For further information, call Jenny Gonzales, the program coordinator, at 667-2515.

CHILEAN THEATRE

Los Payasos de la Esperanza (The Clowns of Hope) will be performed in Spanish by the Chilean Theatre Company in Burton Auditorium on Sunday, March 2 at 7:30 p.m. The actors lived for a year with the Union of Unemployed Clowns in Santiago, Chile, and the play shows the harsh everyday process of fighting for a job. Tickets are \$3.50. For further information call 667-3348, from 9:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., Monday to Friday.

Author-broadcaster Warner Troyer will act as moderator.

On March 22, the conference concludes with a full day's workshop featuring representatives from the National Institute on Mental Retardation, the Blind Organization of Ontario with Self-Help Tactics, York's Faculty of Education, and the Centre for Handicapped Students.

The "Labelled Disabled" conference is open to the public. Both day care and support care will be available for all sessions. For further information and the necessary registration, call 667-3312.

"LABELLED DISABLED" CONFERENCE

The problems for the handicapped in being "labelled disabled" is the subject of an upcoming conference of the same name scheduled for March 10, 17 and 22.

The conference will also provide a forum where disabled citizens, professional service providers, students, and the public can discuss issues critical for the disabled, leading hopefully to greater consumer self-determination for the handicapped.

On Monday, March 10, a panel of disabled consumers will present individual perspectives on how their lives have been affected by the problematic provision of services.

Service providers will have their chance to respond in the March 17 panel.

Both panel discussions begin at 7 p.m. in Curtis Lecture Hall I.

SITCOMS

Noam Pitlik, director and writer of the ABC television series *Barney Miller*, and King of Kensington star Al Waxman, will be part of a panel discussion on Canadian and American situation comedies at York University on Monday, March 3 from 12 noon to 3 p.m. in Room S137 of the Ross Building, at York's main Keele Street campus.

Sponsored by York's Faculty of Fine Arts, the panel discussion will explore such aspects of television sitcoms as acting, writing, taping and directing, comparing methods used by American and Canadian companies.

On Wednesday, March 5, Pitlik will lecture on the taping and editing technique used for his show (which he claims is unique), from 12 noon to 3 p.m. in the Film Studio Screening Room in Central Square, and Waxman will discuss King of Kensington in Room 202 of the Administrative Studies Building from 3 to 6 p.m.