

**Committee on Student Services meeting**  
**March 24<sup>th</sup>, 2016 10:00-12:00,**  
**Brown Student Services Building, room 3001**

---

**Participants:**

Chris Buddle, Erin Sobat, Robyn Wiltshire, Vera Romano, Tamara Western, Chloe Rourke, Brighita Lungu, Ahmed Walid, Linda Webb (secretary) Ollivier Dyens, Lucy Lach, Jim (Avik) Ghoshdastidar, Drusica Maysinger, Lina Di Genova, Hanna Berman delegate Todd Cool, Alexander Kpeglo-Hennessy.

**Absences or Regrets:**

Gregory Brown, Ian Simmie, Rene Iwo, Gillian Lane-Mercier, Julia Nantes, David Benrimoh,

**Meeting called to order at 10:05**

**1. Approval of Agenda**

The agenda was approved as circulated.

Action items all dealt with except ones scheduled for April (note that SDSS currently working with communications to have past progress reports publicized)

**2. Approval of Minutes**

Approved as circulated

**3. Business Arising**

a. OSD Advisory Board (R. Wiltshire)

The OSD Director sits on several university level committees that have student representation but does see the merits of establishing a dedicated OSD Advisory. The plan is to establish the new Advisory for Fall 2016.

b. Budget Update (O. Dyens)

An annual timeline for budget presentations to CSS will be presented at the April CSS meeting. The plan is for a preliminary budget to be presented in the fall, and more definitive numbers in the winter term.

Presenting FY17, and projections for FY18

Good news is the provincial and federal budgets. Bad times should be over, no anticipated budget cuts.

The figures presented for FY12 to 15 are actual expenditures; for FY 16 expenses are projected to year end the proposed budget is presented for FY17.

The figures presented will be posted on the Student Services website

Some highlight of the presentation include:

- The increase to salary budget includes salary policy for unionized and administrative staff and the budget includes benefits.

- Funding to OSD has changed following a change to government funding and the transfer for FY17 is to fund the revised OSD budget. The revised budget will be closely monitored given the complexity of funding changes, and adjusted for FY18 as necessary.
- Operating expenses for all units were held at FY16 . Cost of living increases were applied as required to items such as energy expenses.
- To create a sustainable budget for the Services, the next increase to the Student Services fee should include an annual increase to cover cost of living and university salary policy.
- SLL Overhead was introduced as a measure to project services provided in Student Life and learning from budget cuts. This pressure should decrease in coming years.

#### Some Questions and Comments:

- Erin asked the University to consider using a model similar to U of T's occupancy model. OD replied that the University is not likely to change to a non-overhead charge model. The one-time charge in FY16 won't be repeated in coming years
- What is the reason behind the one-time charge? Simply put, to meet the budget cut. The budget is developed in phases. After the initial phase that included the increased overhead rate from 3% to 4% for FY17, units were asked to contribute more to help balance the budget.

#### Discussion of overhead

- Chloe objected to the increasing overhead charges. With no budget cuts from the Government, would expect OH it to at least stay the same. RW reported that many units, including Faculties, lost funded support staff positions during the recent voluntary retirement program, which had an impact on student access to advisors and other support staff.
- Chloe noted that the Student Services Fee is regulated by the government, voted on by students and salary increases are not what students intended it for. Concern that when the students are asked to support an increase, the support will not be there.

With decreases University funding, alternative sources of income are being sourced, philanthropy for example.

- IT project manager: facilitate creation of business case and integration of new IT with University systems. Upgrading IT systems will improve efficiencies in every Service. Other IT investment is a shared electronic medical record to facilitate hand offs and transfer between units and make the student experience better
  - Chloe questioned the innovation fund proposal for queuing software and wonders if this is something that we consider this for Student services as well
  - Wonders if this is something that students will be consulted on in terms of the front end of the software use to ensure the user experience is optimal and does not create more frustration.
  - Chris sees the booking of appointments with academics happening with this software as well.
  - DM supports the integration of students into the evaluation of the It systems; Protocol has to be made from the layperson's objective.

- Discussion of funding provided for professional development and capital improvements. Erin asked that equity training and cross training development be included in professional development.
- DM comment that it would be essential for representative from student body participate in workshop development to highlight what are student needs versus questions being addressed theoretically.

Surplus will be reduced to just over \$3million, with a goal to bring it down over the future to \$1M.

Looking into the future, within 3 years, Student Services will no longer have a surplus and we will be looking for help to avoid cutting services. Some informal research show that we are in the ball park with respect of what students are currently paying at other universities (assuming that the services offered are equivalent). It would be interesting to see E. Sobat research on other universities Student Services funding models. Annual increase should cover not only cost of living but also salary policy

c. Innovation Fund Progress Reports

Members were invited to forward all comments to the Chairs who will in turn, forward to R. Wiltshire. There was an observation that the existing progress report template is burdensome to the Directors who have to complete it and therefore, there is still work to be done to streamline the report template.

#### 4. New Business

a. 2016 Innovation Fund Applications (projects over \$5.000)

**ON LINE APPOINTMENT BOOKING SYSTEM:**

Members Questions and Comments:

- Why is this not funded by other sources?
- Why do we not have this already?

Members Recommendation:

Members suggest that this is not the right funding source for the project. Further, this investment would be a bit premature due to the interwoven nature of this project with other IT projects that are in the planning stages.

There is a strong interest in collaborating on this project and Student Services will communicate that there is the hope of engaging with this proposal and perhaps integrating it into an ongoing project, outside of the Innovation Fund platform.

**E-HEALTH SERVICES**

Members Questions and Comments:

- Considered to be an important and essential service which, when looking at stepped care, we don't currently have capacity for.

- C. Rourke also supports and says is evidence proven that this is effective way to provide care – a better care for certain types of students and increases access but does not replace therapy.
- V. Romano confirms that it fills a need that we have with the current population and fills a gap in current treatment and is very effective.
- Annual licensing fee, once determined that this system works well and is right for our population, will be integrated into operating budget of the units.
- Training costs are included.

Members Recommendation:

Members recommend approving this application.

### **EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING APP**

Members Questions and Comments:

- Members agreed that the cost of the app seems quite high. O. Dyens indicated that the University is currently negotiating with a different provide for a lower costing app that will look similar to existing apps. This will also lower long term costs associated with project. Quite confident that cost would be around \$35 - \$40,000.
- Belief that there is a bigger project that what is anticipated - Quite a complex app.
- Work required to define what is needed to be included.
- App will have to connect with exiting platforms that students currently use. L. Di Genova confirms that the connectivity with mymcgill is only lacking IT support but the functionality is there.
- E. Sobat - the partner “net” could be broader. Partnerships with other University departments not completely developed. Also questions integration with existing app.
- Cost per student not ideal – a large amount of money that will impact a relatively small amount of students.
- Supports the increase of experience but questions the cost.
- R. Wiltshire highlights that it ties in to an ongoing project that will flag courses that have component of experiential learning. McGill commitment to state that all students will have the opportunity to have at least one experiential learning opportunity in their lifespan at McGill Reflection opinion that is part of the app is most important piece of the learning experience
- Feeling that the app is premature, but we could support part of the process.
- The app not a current a priority however the environmental scan is

Members Recommendation:

Members recommend asking for a lighter proposal that focus on and provides a budget for an environmental scan, and maps the connection to other University areas. A one-pager that illustrates goals and deliverables.

### **SPIN BIKE GARDENS**

Members Questions and Comments:

- Members love this project.
- It is seen as innovative.
- Supported by research

Members Recommendation:

Members suggest approving the project and suggested libraries as a location and also suggest that the team inquire if funding would be available from PGSS and SSMU library fund.

**UDL@McGILL**

Members Questions and Comments:

- O. Dyens recommends approving a segment of funding e.g. up to a certain amount and ask for benchmarking prior to releasing other funds.
- Members concerned with length of project and hiring of two people, adding to Student Services service budget. Proposal does not reflect that it is per meanest budget but questions sustainability.
- Project does not see clearly defined enough to release all funds
- Important initiative, however are partnerships optimized?
- The project is innovative and important to students and will have a more concrete impact in more students.
- Timeline seems well developed
- The toolkit important and needs to happen, but should be more of a university wide strategy.
- Members believe that it should be funded out of operational budget
- Need to develop the workshop to ensure that it reaches appropriate audience.
- There does not seem to be an alternative source of funding.

Members Recommendation:

- CSS would recommend funding part of the project to start. in part if not in full
- Recommend to have T. Phillips at April CSS.

**CAFE COLLAB**

Members Questions and Comments:

- Like breadth and facilitated conversation with underrepresented groups
- Missing a sustainability plan
- Mac campus needs to be included in this
- An excellent way for Student Services to increase visibility and presence with students

Members Recommendation:

- Due to lack of time, recommendation tabled to next meeting.

Any additional comments to be sent to co-chairs to direct to applicants by next Tuesday.

**5. Executive Director's Report**

There was none

**6. Other Business**

There was none

---

**NEXT MEETINGS:**

April 6, 2016

10:00

**ACTION ITEMS FROM CSS MEETING 2016-03-24**

1	Issue	CSS received budget presentation from Deputy Provost
	Action	Presentation to be made available on Student Services website by April 1, 2016
2	Issue	Question as to date of April CSS meeting
	Action	Secretary to confirm meeting date via e-mail
3	Issue	Student Services Innovation Fund Applications reviewed
	Action	Responses to be sent to applicants where there were final decisions (Spin Bike Garden, E-Health Service)
4	Issue	Questions surrounding application from OSD (UDL@McGill)
	Action	Secretary to invite Teri Phillips to April CSS meeting to discuss SSIF application
5	Issue	Discussions to be carried forward to next meeting
	Action	SSIF Applications for: ExL App, OnLine appointment Booking, UDL@McGill, Café Collab
6	Issue	review timing of CSS actions / review mandate of CSS
	Action	Meeting scheduled for Co-Chairs, CSS Secretary and Senior Director Services for Students on 2016-04-01