



UCC

UPPER CANADA COLLEGE

Boarding Task Force Report

2008

Members of the Boarding Task Force

Andy Pringle '69 (Chair) – former Chairman of the Board of Governors (2002-2006), former President of the UCC Association (1987-1988), and parent of two alumni

Rob Prichard '67 (Vice-Chair) - former Governor (1989-1996), parent of two UCC alumni, President Emeritus of the University of Toronto

Brian Bené '08 - IB2 (Grade 12) current boarding student

Lincoln Caylor '87 - current parent, former boarder, President of the Barbara Barrow Foundation

Gordon Cheesbrough '71 – former Chair of the Board of Governors (1997-2002), former boarder, parent of alumni

Kit Dalaroy '89 - former boarder from Montreal, active UCC volunteer

Paul Gooch - President of Victoria University at the University of Toronto and a current member of the UCC Board of Governors (2003-present)

Steve Griffin - Head of the Upper School (2006-present), former Boarding Housemaster

Susan Guichon - parent of current student and alumni, active UCC volunteer, Association Council member (1999-present)

Loudon Owen '76 - current parent, member of the Board of Governors (2002-present)

Richard Phillips '85 – Trustee of the UCC Foundation (2004-present)

Suzanne Heft (Secretary) – Director of Development, UCC Advancement Office (1999 to present)

The Task Force would like to acknowledge the support and participation of the following individuals who have been consulted or who assisted with the information-gathering process for this committee:

Dr. Jim Power, Michael MacMillan, David Matthews, Doug Blakey, Bradley Adams, Michael Miller, Dr. Stephen Johnson, Karen Murton, Bruce Neal, Eric Barton, Dr. Richard Sadleir, Patrick Bassett, David Hadden, Chantal Kenny, Julia Drake, the UCC Association Council, Andrew Turner, Brent MacKay, Marco Cianflone, Cian O'Neill Kizoff, Taylor Hallahan, Andrew McEwan, Stephen Kupfer, Marian Spence, Innes van Nostrand, Julia Rhodes, Patti MacNicol

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Task Force Consultation Process: Outline	2
Alternatives We Considered	4
Our Best View and Recommendation	4
Appendix A: Interviewees/Presenters at Boarding Task Force Meetings	10
Appendix B: Speakers at Public Forums on Boarding	11
Appendix C: UCC Community Members who Gave Input on Boarding	12

Introduction

Generations of boys have greatly benefited from the UCC boarding experience. However, boarding has been in relative decline at Upper Canada College for at least two decades. There is evidence to support the following: that the residential life program is less strong than that available at many competitor schools; that demand for boys-only boarding has declined; that the residential facility has not been significantly renovated in over 75 years and suffers as a result; and that boarding, which was once a vibrant and integral part of the fabric of the College has languished -- "too broken to be excellent, but not broken enough to fix" -- for too long. Some of this decline is market-driven but some of it is also the result of benign neglect as other priorities commanded greater attention and resources.

It was in this context that the College's Board of Governors, in the fall of last year, confronted the decision of whether or not to wind the program down for good. The Board's decision was a difficult one -- to address a deteriorating enterprise whose present state is untenable and whose future seemed uncertain. As we have spent the last six months re-examining all the current and historical data that was put before the Board in the spring of 2007, and the important work done by the Long-Range Planning Committee before that, we can readily appreciate the difficulty of the decision the Board faced.

We can also appreciate both how the Board concluded that the boarding program should be closed and that UCC should focus on other priorities. But in the same spirit, we can appreciate why many in the UCC community were disappointed by the Board's choice, knowing it would end 180 years of tradition in which boarding has been understood as a central element of the UCC experience.

As a result, we applaud the courage of the Board of Governors and Principal to revisit the decision. By appointing this Task Force, the Board and the administration aimed to ensure two things: a process that would allow for greater participation in the decision from the UCC community and a thorough re-assessment of all aspects of the issue. Our immersion in this subject has been both intensive and exhaustive. Each member of the Task Force has been involved in the College in a variety of ways at different times for many years. We are grateful for this opportunity to serve on the Task Force and we believe we have met the Board's two objectives.

The Task Force concurs with the Board of Governors that the status quo of the boarding program is not acceptable - a view that has been echoed repeatedly by almost everyone in our consultative process, including former Principals, current school administrators, faculty, teachers, students and many alumni. The perception that the program itself, as well as the facilities, are below the standard to which UCC aspires and regularly achieves in other areas of school life, is accepted. In the case of boarding, change is required. Either the program should be significantly strengthened or it should be closed.

Boarding at present does not appear to have any particular focus, priority or vision. It operates as a sub-optimal ancillary program largely disconnected from the broader UCC community in many ways. This is neither a credit to the school nor the fulfillment of our best promise to the students within it and must be addressed. We believe that the reasons for inadequacy are not the result of singular events, decisions or decision-makers, but rather the result of underinvestment (in terms of the residential facility and program) over at least two decades.

It is important that the Board make a thoughtful and final decision based on careful evaluation. We recommend that boarding continue. However, to continue, the program must have a clear vision and purpose; it must be of the highest calibre, sustainable and financially viable; it must be intentionally and fully integrated within the fabric of the school and the role and many benefits of boarding to the broader school must be clearly defined and communicated.

Should the College pursue the revitalization of boarding, it will not be easy. It will require leadership, vision, determination and additional resources. We believe boarding is worth this effort and commitment. We are recommending a re-commitment to boarding that reflects UCC's stated goals and gives faithful expression to the College's vision and corresponds to UCC's national ambitions. Our reasons and specific conclusions are set out below.

The Task Force Consultation Process

The mandate of the Task Force as given to us by Board of Governors' Chairman Michael MacMillan at our first meeting on December 17th was as follows:

- i. to initiate a full and thorough review of all information, current and historical, related to the review of the boarding program;
- ii. to conduct an open and full consultation with the school community of students, teachers, staff, parents and alumni, in order to engage in dialogue and receive comments and opinions from the broadest representative group of constituents, both in Canada and around the world;
- iii. to make a recommendation to the Board of Governors and the Principal with respect to this issue in April 2008 that makes very clear a proposed course of action which the Board and Principal would then consider.

The only constraints placed on our Task Force were that any recommendation must respect the school's commitment to the International Baccalaureate, and to the College's commitment to being a boys-only school. It must also fit within the context of the College's present overall Strategic Plan.

To that end, our task was divided into two key steps:

- i. to obtain, compile and review an exhaustive and inclusive collection of documents and reports related to the boarding program and its assessment over time, some of which date back to the 1970s and 80s. This compilation totals over 1,000 pages of documents, reports, survey information, internal memos, discussion papers, consultant reports and committee briefings. It also contained all correspondence on the Strategic Plan and boarding that were received from October to December 2007 and an inclusive set of media clippings;
- ii. to solicit input from any member of the UCC community who wished to make a statement to the Task Force encouraging them to communicate electronically or in writing and offering instruction for so doing, as well as the immediate announcement of two dates for College-wide public forums to be held in February and March 2008 at which the members of the Task Force would welcome in-person presentations by any constituent or their designated proxy. A full list of all those who made presentations at both public forum can be found in **Appendix B** of this report and a list of all those who wrote to the College about boarding is located in **Appendix C**.

From January to March 2008, the Boarding Task Force consulted with the following:

- i. current boarding students;
- ii. current and former boarding staff and teachers
- iii. former UCC principals and senior administrators;
- iv. representatives from the National Association of Independent Schools (NAIS), International Boys School Coalition (IBSC); and
- v. Leaders of Branksome Hall, St. John's Ravenscourt in Winnipeg, Lakefield College, and several independent schools in Canada, the United Kingdom, Australia and New Zealand.

These consultations (**see Appendix A**) served as helpful and important steps in gaining a full appreciation of boarding trends, best practices, peer and competitor school strategy, trend-line differences between girls' and boys' school boarding programs, competition for qualified and suitable applicants, the importance of rigorous marketing and recruiting practises, and clear brand identity for communications and advertising.

During March and April, the Task Force considered and debated all the evidence and information gathered in the first stage of its process, and examined a number of possible models for moving forward. Finally in late April we developed our conclusions and analyzed the financial implications of our preferred direction before preparing this final report.

It is clear that UCC can, if it wishes, again have an exceptional boarding program. Central to the decision, however, is the context of the College's other ambitions as stated in the Strategic Plan of October 2007. Considering the opportunity cost to UCC of a continued, refreshed and re-branded boarding enterprise, we understand why the Board was persuaded that the best course of action was closure. It allowed the school to focus its resources on other priorities and avoided the claim on resources that a strengthened boarding program would require.

UCC has had a boarding program for almost 180 years. Once it is eliminated, it will be almost impossible to re-introduce. At several periods in the College's history, UCC was predominantly a boarding school and twice came close to becoming 'boarding-only'. An examination of boarding's historic role at the school illustrates the longevity of some of our present day issues, (i.e. lack of boarding-day student integration), but also provides a backdrop of boarding's past notable achievements, many of which have contributed to making the College a better school for all. Many boarding alumni have enjoyed profoundly positive experiences at UCC, and have themselves made valuable and significant contributions to school life over the years. That said, boarding at the Prep was closed in 1980 and few doubt that this was the right decision and that it strengthened the Prep.

We urge the Board to reflect on the historical context of its decision as they weigh our recommendation.

Once we finished information-gathering and research, the Task Force deliberated as a group and reached the following conclusions:

- i. The boarding program status quo cannot and should not continue.
- ii. A very plausible case can be made for closing boarding, as per the Board's original plan, reflecting the long-term decline in the current program and the apparent demographic changes in the marketplace.
- iii. It is, however, the unanimous view of this committee that UCC should maintain boarding. However to do so will require a reinvestment and a rededication as well as an effort to better focus it, internally and externally.
- iv. A significant investment must be made in capital, program enhancement and leadership, starting immediately. In addition, the school leadership, with the Board's full endorsement, must focus time, effort and energy on integration and excellence.
- v. Boarding is worth this extra effort and commitment.
- vi. There are diverse views in the UCC alumni community on the boarding question. What the Board decides to do next and how that is communicated, is of paramount importance to the ongoing relationship between UCC and its Old Boy community.
- vii. The attention and engagement of UCC alumni on this issue in the last five months represents a significant possible opportunity that did not exist in October 2007. If the Board decides to continue the boarding program and improve it, strong philanthropic support should be available from Old Boys, who are strongly committed to the program.
- viii. UCC can be a great school with or without boarding, but to eliminate boarding would be to overlook an important opportunity for the College to fulfil its mission and vision to the fullest.

The Alternatives We Considered

Taking into consideration all the information received, historical and present day, and in light of all the expert views that we heard, the Task Force identified a number of options with respect to future recommendation.

These included the following:

- i. To endorse the decision to transition out of the boarding program permanently.
- ii. To eliminate a traditional campus-based boarding program in favour of a billeting or home-stay program, allowing day families to take in boarding students on a fee basis and thereby enabling small groups of students to attend UCC from outside Toronto.
- iii. To strengthen the existing traditional model with significant enhancements to capital, program, marketing/recruiting practices and resources as well as enhanced staffing and residential life opportunities.
- iv. To embrace a model of boarding with an on-campus sub-community of smaller units of 15-20 students in single home dwelling or townhouse-like residences where 2 or more adults per group would be responsible for supervision and mentorship. Enhancements from Option iii would also apply.
- v. To create a small (less than 50) elite boarding program focused on academically superior performers, drawn from a representative national network of cities or provinces as well as internationally, predominately scholarship recipient students with high achievement in academic and extra curricular activity.

Our Best View and Recommendation

We endorse the College's Strategic Plan and the admirable and ambitious objectives within. Central to the Plan is the notion of accessibility and diversity: that by changing UCC from a school where only the financially advantaged can attend, to a school that is open to smart, talented boys of every background, we can realize Sir John Colborne's founding vision for UCC, to be a school that educates boys from across the province (and in today's terms, across the nation), who, with the benefit of a great education, will "make a difference" to Canada and to the world. Our objective is to offer our best advice to the Board and the Principal on the manner in which its decision on boarding can best implement this goal and vision.

We believe that if UCC keeps its boarding program, this will present a remarkable opportunity to better fulfill the College's Strategic Plan, including contributing to the objective of accessibility and diversity.

In fact, we argue, that *with* boarding, there is an extraordinary opportunity for UCC to position its accessibility commitment on a national scale – an opportunity which should be embraced.

We believe:

1. Boarding has the potential to provide leadership opportunities and a small community unit that reinforces the Strategic Plan's concept of "big school opportunities/small school feel".
2. Boarding can inject student diversity (cultural and geographic) into an overall school landscape in an important way (especially if greater attention is given to interactive opportunities between day and boarding students).

3. Boarding can enrich the impact of future international programs and partnerships by providing reciprocal opportunities and integration with curricular programming. We will be better able to develop opportunities for UCC students to travel to Asia or Europe on study abroad programs if we have a student residence here in Toronto to enable a reciprocal arrangement for students overseas to visit Canada. Boarding can be a critical lever in that goal.
4. Above all, boarding provides a context by which UCC can aspire – and achieve – a truly national ambition: to be *Canada's* foremost and best school for boys, and in doing so to rank as one of the best boys' schools in the world. In every sense, this harkens back to our founding principles as a school. It gives UCC a unique place in the marketplace among peer and competitor schools. It offers a "grand and noble" vision of a UCC every parent and graduate can be proud of. If UCC could truly be accessible to bright, capable and motivated boys in every city and region of the country, we could claim this vision for our own.

The Task Force therefore concludes:

1. The College continue to operate a boarding program

We do not recommend this because UCC cannot continue to be a good or even great school without boarding. Rather we recommend it because it is most consistent with achieving the fullest possible vision of UCC as a school of national significance. We believe UCC can and should aspire to be Canada's national school for boys, as well as one of the best boys' schools in the world. A condition of fulfilling that ambition is a successful, thriving boarding program.

2. The boarding program should be different from and significantly superior to the current boarding program.

We do not judge the current boarding program to be up to the appropriate standards for UCC. It must be significantly improved. Absent a solid commitment to improvement, it should be closed.

3. The boarding enrolment should be 60 students or more – and no less.

Based on market analysis, best practice and the views of those closest to the program over the last 20 years, we conclude that a base of 60 students is both sustainable and essential: the program's excellence is predicated to some extent on its critical mass. We could foresee scaling "up" if demand over time makes this viable; however, we would not recommend allowing enrolment to drop below 60. We also believe that a smaller program than at present can be, and should be, more selective and that by being more selective we can intensify quality which will drive increased demand. A smaller program has a greater opportunity to develop a family feel and greater adult-student relationships. A smaller program will also be more selective. This should sharply reduce the number of students who struggle with the academic program and require special help, allowing all boarders to benefit from a more cohesive program with attention to every boarder.

4. The residential life program should be enhanced

The current residential life program is insufficient to the needs of the students and sub-optimal for all involved, both the students and the administration. There was broad agreement among those we consulted that the program is well below the calibre that UCC should be delivering. This must be corrected. There is enormous potential both to improve the experience and leverage that improvement elsewhere within the school.

An enhanced program with better deliverables, and more adult involvement and supervision will elevate the quality of the student experience for current boarders whom UCC should be serving better. It will also create a more attractive offering to prospective families in the competition for excellent students. In addition, teachers involved with boarding will be encouraged and rewarded with a revitalized community. Several faculty involved in the program have excellent ideas on new opportunities. There are also many

examples from U.S. and overseas schools. We envisage a more intentional approach, with a wide variety of activities: athletic, social, cultural, co-ed, academic enrichment and more. The fact of UCC's urban setting and close working relationships with Bishop Strachan School and Branksome Hall must be made a virtue and positioned as such in the marketing and operations. Faculty must be more involved. Day student family networks should be developed to arrange weekend outings. Some of the programs can be voluntary, but some of them should be mandatory. This too will intensify and improve experiential opportunities for all. Counselling, Wernham and West Centre for Learning support and ESL support should be integrated into the boarding program.

5. The residential facility must be improved.

We have two options to improve the residential facility. The Board should decide which is preferable in the long-term. The second option is more attractive but is more expensive. In our view, either option can work well.

Option A: We propose renovating the existing residences of Seaton's and Wedd's House for \$5 million and putting 30 students in each house. There is some upward flexibility in student numbers in this option should the market demand warrant it. Most of the \$5 million would be invested in the fabric of the building. If at some later date, boarding moved to a different facility, the current space could be converted to other school uses. Only about \$1 million of the expenditure is unique to use as a boarding facility.

Option B: We propose (at a minimum) four smaller residential 'units' for 15 students each for a total of 60 students in purpose-built new construction, or some combination of apartment-like units in the current Seaton's and Wedd's plus additional 'townhouse'-style units on campus. The cost associated with this construction is projected to be \$12 million. However, if some of the construction also includes the proposed Middle School space, there are \$3 million of synergies so the incremental allocation of this option is only \$4 million over the \$5 million cost of option A.

6. UCC must operate as a national school and therefore must draw students from across Canada.

This ideal is borne of UCC's founding principles is not currently being realized or even vigorously pursued. The time to do so is now. UCC has the opportunity to present a unique proposition in the marketplace by virtue of its history, tradition and high academic standards and to position itself as Canada's best school for boys, wherever they live. Boarding is an essential means of delivering on this promise.

To achieve this we recommend developing a new financial aid program to support students from across Canada attending UCC. We recommend continuing to enrich UCC with a wide range of talented international students, but we do not recommend allocating financial assistance to international students. The potential to attract full-fee paying students abroad is high. Unless the circumstances are exceptional or until the financial aid program for students across Canada is sufficiently robust, we recommend the vast majority of financial aid devoted to boarding be focussed on Canadian students. We recommend up to 30 national scholarships at \$25,000 - \$35,000 each. This can be funded from the existing financial aid directed to the boarding program, and from additional private giving for this purpose. These funds can be increased over time should the number of students enrolled also increase.

By drawing boarders from coast to coast, assisted as necessary by financial aid, UCC has the opportunity to fully realize its national aspirations and roles. Within a 60 student boarding program, we envision at least 30 drawn from across Canada, ideally including representation from every province and territory. The remainder of the boarders should be drawn from beyond Canada, reflecting Canada's and UCC's place in the global village. But the pre-eminent concern should be to attract an outstanding group of Canadian boarders able to perform extremely well both inside and beyond the classroom. This nucleus of students will in turn help to attract outstanding full-fee boarders both from Canada and overseas, as well as enrich UCC as a whole to the benefit of all boys, day-students and boarders alike.

7. We must invest appropriately in recruitment.

A great boarding program begins with great students. The College must improve its recruitment practice in order to be proactive and to select and admit talented boys from across Canada and around the world. We recommend that the College create a new position for an individual who will champion boarding internally and externally. This new Master of Boarding would be a member of the senior administration. S/he would be responsible for developing and implementing a comprehensive multi-year plan for marketing the school and the boarding program, recruiting students, leading the renovation of the residential facilities, implementing the program enhancements, leading all faculty and staff involved with boarding and generally leading the boarding program. S/he would also act as a liaison with parents, faculty, prospective families, alumni and all agents or suppliers and would initiate recruitment activity for boarding around the globe. Absent a champion, we are not confident that the program will get the priority and leadership it needs to succeed and flourish.

8. We must become more intentional and prescriptive about integrating boarders and boarding life more fully with the rest of the school community.

Having a boarding program adds value to the UCC experience for all students, parents and families. Integration must enhance and emphasize this appropriately for the sake of all students. Boarding must no longer be a stand-alone program, separate from the rest of the school. Day students and day parents, as well as faculty, need to better understand that boarders bring special value to daily life, that their presence on the field and in classroom makes the UCC experience a richer one for all.

We recommend the full integration of boarding students into the day houses of the College and a concerted effort to achieve boarding student integration more intentionally into the fabric of daily life at the Upper School. This would mean maintaining the existing houses but a rearrangement of students such that each house would be comprised of 90% day students and 10% boarders. Given their history and the emotional attachment of graduates, it is essential that the names of Seaton's and Wedd's houses be continued. This process of reorganizing houses to include both day and boarding students should be delegated to the Principal and his team.

9. The cost is not insubstantial.

In addition to the capital costs, we estimate the annual costs of the strengthened boarding program to be approximately \$392,000 for program enhancement and faculty costs, \$383,000 for leadership and recruitment, and, optionally, \$362,000 for enhanced financial aid. We anticipate some of these costs could be mitigated by successful private fundraising. Overall we judge these incremental costs which amount to less than 3 percent of UCC's overall budget, to be reasonable relative to the contribution that a strengthened boarding program can make to UCC's overall mission.

Included in the operating budget assumptions above is \$362,000 for increased financial aid for boarding students, to take the number of boarders on financial assistance from 21 to 30, or half of all boarders. If this amount is excluded from the model assumptions (and included instead as part of a separate, comprehensive financial aid fundraising campaign), the annual incremental operating cost decreases to \$775,000.

We note that other opportunities for revenue generation (beyond the scope of this committee's work) to offset the incremental costs could be examined, including summer rental revenue from the new facility. In addition, a small overall fee increase could be considered to finance the program enhancements on a temporary basis, and a differentiated fee structure for international families could be considered.

10. We should seek necessary private support for the strengthened boarding program.

During the Task Force process, we have heard repeatedly from individuals prepared to provide private financial support for a strengthened boarding program. UCC should seek out and welcome this support. The renewal of the facilities and the provision of national scholarships are ideal projects for private giving by alumni and should be pursued vigorously and expeditiously. Success in this endeavour could mitigate some or all of the additional cost of the strengthened program and accelerate the realization of other priorities for UCC. An increasing share of the costs of boarding would be endowed and all of this would contribute to the success of UCC's advancement activities, engaging alumni and parents and raising new funds. There is a welcome overlap between the Strategic Plan's ambition to increase the endowment for financial aid for all students and the need to do so for the national boarding program we propose. Both efforts will help to achieve UCC's goals of greater accessibility and diversity.

11. This report should be made public.

The UCC community has demonstrated a strong interest in the boarding issue and has made important contributions to our work. Regardless of the Board's disposition of our recommendations, we urge the Board to make this report available to the entire UCC community. Such transparency will allow the UCC community to more fully follow the evolution of this issue and to more clearly understand its complexities, and therefore, the Board's final decision, whatever it may be.

12. The Board should move expeditiously to decide this issue.

The current boarding program is not satisfactory and must be improved or closed. Allowing the status quo to drift is not an option; doing this will make the closure of boarding a self-fulfilling prophecy. If the Board finds our recommendations persuasive, we suggest the Board ask the Principal to return to the Board by September with an implementation plan suitable for immediate action. There are important details to be fleshed out, staff to be hired and plans to be made for all of this to work. This should be done by the Principal and his faculty colleagues, not by us or by the Board, as they are at their heart, academic questions. If, on the other hand, the Board finds our recommendations unpersuasive, we would urge the Board to make a clear and final decision to close the boarding program and devote UCC's energies and resources to achieving the remainder of the Strategic Plan. We would regret such a decision, but prefer it to the status quo.

If the Board finds our recommendations persuasive in principle but has concerns about their feasibility, the Board could defer a decision to develop a full implementation plan and instead invite the Principal to return to the Board with a feasibility study as a first step. In this event, we recommend the feasibility study be completed by the end of June, so that a decision can be taken before the summer. Assuming a decision to go with a full implementation plan at that time, this would leave the full summer available to develop it. This would still allow a final decision by the Board to implement the plan in September.

13. There should be regular monitoring and reporting to the Board on the progress made in strengthening boarding.

Assuming the Board accepts our recommendation to proceed with a revitalized national boarding program, it will be important that progress be regularly monitored and reported to the Board. The current controversy has given boarding a welcome visibility and attention within the school and our community. This in turn has inspired action. This momentum should be maintained and we must guard against a return to benign neglect. The Board should establish measurable goals, an aggressive but achievable timetable and clear accountability. The Board should receive regular reports against these measures.

14. UCC should aim high.

UCC has an enviable record of achievement and leadership in education, a record obtained by setting its sights high and then delivering. We believe a genuinely national boarding program, attracting excellent students from across Canada and beyond, offers the prospect of yet another era of achievement and leadership consistent with UCC's history and possibilities. Realizing such a program will take a determined effort, considerable resources and inspired leadership from the Board, Principal and faculty and strong support from the whole UCC community. We very much hope this is the direction the Board will choose.

We recognize, however, that this is the Board's decision, not ours, and that the Board must consider UCC's full strategic plan and the opportunities and constraints facing the school. This is a different perspective and task from ours. Furthermore, the Board has a duty to consider the financial implications of our recommendations on UCC's overall financial resources and capacity, including private support for boarding and all the school's other priorities. While we would assign a prominent place to strengthening boarding among these competing priorities, we accept that this decision is the Board's responsibility alone.

In closing, we wish to record our gratitude to everyone who assisted our work over the last six months.

APPENDIX A

Interviewees/Presenters at Boarding Task Force Meetings

Brad Adams – Executive Director, International Coalition of Boys Schools & Former Head of Upper School, Student Affairs, Upper Canada College

Eric Barton – Principal Emeritus, Upper Canada College

Patrick Bassett – President, National Association Independent Schools

J. Douglas Blakey – Principal Emeritus, Upper Canada College

Julia Drake – Director of Communications, Upper Canada College

David Hadden – Headmaster, Lakefield College School, Former Head of Wedd's House

Chantal Kenny – Executive Director, Admissions, Upper Canada College

Brent MacKay – Senior House Advisor, Seatons' House and Director of Athletics, Upper Canada College

Michael MacMillan – Chair, Board of Governors, Upper Canada College

David Matthews – Assistant Head of Upper School, Upper Canada College and Secretary, UCC Board of Governors

Michael Miller – Assistant Head of Upper School, Upper Canada College and Former Head of Seaton's House

Karen Murton – Principal, Branksome Hall

Bruce Neal – Director of Studies, St. John's Ravenscourt School

Richard Sadleir – Principal Emeritus, Upper Canada College

Andrew Turner – Director of Residential Life, Senior Advisor (Wedd's House) Upper Canada College

UCC Association Council – Rob Parsons, Brian Domelle, Jonathan Foo, Jim Houston, Sagar Chandaria, Linda-Pincott-Kitchen, John Medland, Jim Pottow, Fred Bruun, John Cape, Russell Higgins, Susan Guichon, David MacDougall, Janice Sgro, Vivien Cappe, Kathy Martin, Matt Johnston, Patricia Gouinlock

Appendix B

Speakers at Public Forums on Boarding

February 27, 2008 (in order in which they presented):

Martin Abell '81 (as proxy for Michael Law Kun '81, Kenneth Tan '88, Antony Abell '83, Normand Brunelle '81, Sloan Dinning '88, Cannon Sum '77)	Vicar Rizvi'07
	Ali Merali '02
John D. Stevenson '47	Brent Fullard '72
Robert Acheson '58	Edward Bracht '55
J. P. MacKay '02	Rick Blickstead
Adam Markwell '92 as a proxy for Andrew Williams '91	Vello Ehvert '79
Iain Taylor '81	Marco Cianflone '09
	Cian O'Neill-Kizoff '08

March 25, 2008 (in order in which they presented)

Simon Burke '85	Adam Markwell '92 (and as a proxy for Theo Caldwell '91)	Max Rosenfeld '99
Martin Abell '81		Michael Carter '98
Robert Acheson '58	Douglas Matthews '42	Shawn Kao '79
Bill Rosenfeld '53	Ryerson Symons '85	Vicar Rizvi '07
Ali Merali '02 (as proxy for Simon Hermant '00, Campbell Tory '96, Graham Brown '03, Charlie Steers '05, Mark Laidlaw '03, Scott '00 & Geoff '02 Gregoire)	Cian O'Neill Kizoff '08	Blake Hutcheson '80
	David Austin '87	Lucia O'Neill
Jacoline Loewen	Derek Ground '81	Terence Bredin
	Eliot Johnson '94	Charles Bracht '61
	Gregory Dole '94	Robert F. Wilson '81

Appendix C

UCC Community Members who Gave Input on Boarding (Oct. 1 – Mar. 30, 2008)

Mr. Martin G. Abell
Mr. & Mrs. John N. Abell
Mr. Gesta Andrew Abols
Mr. Robert J. Acheson
Mr. & Mrs. Michael R. Adams
Mr. Ryan M. Adams
Mr. Geoffrey P. M. Adamson, C.F.A.
Mr. & Mrs. Hugh H. Aird
Mr. J. Neil Aitken
Mr. Konstantine S. Aivaliotis
Mr. Peter B. G. Allen
Mr. Sylvanus C. Apps III
Mr. Andrew F. Archdekin
Mr. & Mrs. Sanford Argabrite
Mr. David C. Austin
Mr. & Mrs. Andrew W. Aziz
Mr. Joseph S. Aziz
Dr. Cheol Woon Bae & Ms. Mee Kyung Park
Mr. & Mrs. Edward Ballon
Mr. Ralph M. Barford
Mr. & Mrs. J. E. Reid Barter
Mr. Lyle W. Bateman
Mr. Peter M. Batiste
Mr. Lance N. Beatch
Mr. David R. Beatty
Mr. & Mrs. Raffi Bedrosyan
Mr. Glen R. Belfry
Mr. Daniel J. Bernhard
Mr. Kevin E. Bertsch
Mr. John E. Bethell
Mr. George A. Biggar & Ms. Mary F. Cornish
Mr. Michael W. H. Biggar
Mr. & Mrs. Gregor B. Binkley
Mr. Alan J. Bishop
Mr. Thomas W. Bittner
Mr. R. John Bloomfield
Mr. Auguste A. Bolté
Ms. Lise Boutin
Prof. John R. F. Bower
Mr. & Mrs. Edgar A. Bracht
Mr. Jonathan Broer and Ms. Maureen Marshall
Mr. Normand M. Brunelle
Mr. Walter H. Burgess
Mr. Simon M. Burke
Mr. Richard J. Burston
Mr. John A. Burt
Mr. Ralph S. Butler III
Mr. Simon A. Bregazzi
Mr. Warren W. Cabral
Mr. Francois Cadieux
Mr. Theodore J. P. Caldwell
Mr. David L. Campbell
Mr. Ryan T. Campbell
Mr. John O. Cape
Mr. & Mrs. Donald H. Carlisle, C.F.A.
Mr. Christopher J. Carnegie
Mr. Neil A. Carragher
Mr. Andrew C. Carragher
Mr. Michael O. F. Carter
Mr. Matthew S. Casey
Mr. Lincoln J. Caylor & Ms. Melissa M. J. Nixon
Mr. Colin Chan & Ms. Gentle Shiu
Dr. & Mrs. Pimarn Charnvarnichborikarn, Ph.D.
Mr. Gordon F. Cheesbrough
Mr. Gordon F. H. Cheesbrough
Mr. Max M. Chen
Mr. Bo Chen
Mr. James F. Cherrier
Mr. Derek M. K. Cheung
Mr. Lincoln Cheung
Mr. & Mrs. Byungryeol Choi
Mr. Douglas D. Chow
Mr. Kenneth Chu
Mr. Tenniel Chu
Dr. John Clark & Ms. Marsha Copp
Mr. & Mrs. Kevin C. Clark
Mr. Mark S. Cohon
Mr. Bryan Colangelo & Ms. Barbara Bottini
Mr. Robert F. G. Colcleugh
Mr. & Mrs. Jean-Pierre Colin
Mr. Guy E. S. Coltman
Mr. Sean K. Conacher
Mr. & Mrs. Gregory S. Connor
Mr. & Mrs. John Cook
Dr. Wm. G. Coombs
Mr. William Terence Corcoran
Mr. James G. Cossar
Dr. James W. Coulton, Ph.D.
Mr. & Mrs. Anthony S. Courtright
Mr. Martin J. Couture
Mr. & Mrs. Gordon W. Cowan
Mr. John-Andrew R. Cox
Mr. & Mrs. Stephen R. Coxford
Dr. Robert K. Creasy
Mr. Sean A. Cromarty
Mr. Robert T. F. Crothers
Mr. Christopher Cruz
Mr. & Mrs. Paul G. Crysler
Mr. Trevor G.M. Currie
Mr. Kit Dalaroy
Mr. Peter J. Dalglish
Mr. Ian A. P. Dalglish
Mr. Christopher D. Davidson
Mr. Francois M. de Gaspé Beaubien
Mr. Adrian de Valois-Franklin
Mr. & Mrs. C. Ronald De Mara
Mr. & Mrs. William G. Deeks
Mr. & Mrs. Robert G. DeJong

Mr. William Deng
Mr. Ramsay Derry & Ms. Patricia Jackson
Mr. Karl W. Desy
Mr. Sloan R. B. Dinning
Mr. Geoffrey Dittrich
Mr. David K. Dixon
Mr. Gregory E. Dole
Mr. P. W. Timothy Doyle
Mr. Marc-Olivier Dozois-Lyrette
Dr. Quentin J. Durward
Mr. & Mrs. Ian K. Easterbrook
Mr. John C. Eaton
Mr. Alan M. Ely
Dr. Bela W. Fejer
Mr. Rupert Charles Field-Marsham
Dr. Paul E. Filmer, Ph.D.
Ms. Krystyna Finnermark
Mr. Donald P. Fish
Mr. & Mrs. Derek A. Fisher
Captain James Flannery
Mr. & Mrs. Marc Ford
Mr. Poku A. Forson
Mr. Simon Fothergill
Mr. & Mrs. Shaun C. Francis
Mr. & Mrs. B. Gary French
Mr. Matthew H. Frisch
Mr. David Y. W. Fung
Mr. Colin D. Furness
Mr. Colin Gaffney
Mr. Sean H. Gaherty
Mr. Chanze Gamble
Mr. & Mrs. Michael R. Gardiner
Mr. Neil R. Gardiner
Mr. Murray H. Gee
Mr. Richard S. L. Gibson
Mr. Benjamin Gilbank
Mr. Richard V. Gilbank
Mr. John B. Gillespie
Mr. James F. Giroday
Dr. Henry M. Gladney
Mr. Tom A. Gladney
Mr. Joseph V. Glionna
Dr. Robert G. Gordon & Mrs. Jane Southey-Gordon
Mr. Laurence S. Grafstein
Mr. Jonathan A. Graham
Mr. Ian M. Gray
Mr. & Mrs. Evan Green
Mr. Colin Greening
Mr. Scott J. Gregoire
Mr. Derek T. Ground
Mr. & Mrs. Gregory M. Guichon
Mr. John R. A. Gullick
Mr. Grant G. Gush
Dr. Bernard H. Gustin
Mr. Neil Guthrie
Ms. Joan Haberman
Mr. Patrick Hainault

Mr. Edward Kyu Teck Han & Ms. Vicky Myung Deok Kim
Mr. & Mrs. Rob Hannah
Mr. Norman J. Hardie
Mr. & Mrs. Paul H. Harricks
Mr. Richard A. Harvey
Mr. James Hayhurst
Mr. Peter T. Hazlett
Mr. Amir Heinitz
Mr. & Mrs. Thomas G. Heintzman
Mr. Ralph R. Heintzman
Mr. & Mrs. Patrick J. Hickey
Mr. Gilles P. Hickey
Mr. Christopher J. T. Hickman
Mr. Russell S. Higgins
Mr. Anthony Higson & Mrs. Eva Halasz-Higson
Mr. Gordon L. Hill
Mr. & Mrs. Matthew G. Holland
Mr. & Mrs. James E. Houston
The Hon. Peter H. Howden
Mr. & Mrs. Peter T. Howe
Mr. Zoran Hristov
Mrs. Luzia R. Hung
Mr. Reynold Hung
Mr. & Mrs. Bryce M. Hunter
Dr. & Dr. Mansoor Husain
Mr. David A. Hutchison
Mr. Alexander P. Ignatieff
Reverend Edward J. R. Jackman
Mr. & Mrs. Hans Jebesen
Mr. Evan D. E. Jennings
Mr. & Mrs. John K. Johnson
Dr. Stephen M. Johnson & Ms. Deryn Lavell
Mr. Elliot Johnson
Mr. Matthew H. Johnson
Mr. Ali Jutha
Dr. Shawn S. K. Kao
Mr. Alan R. Kester & Ms. Marijke Bakker
Mr. Ryan M. Kichler
Mr. John S. Kidder
Dr. & Mrs. Won Joon Kim
Mr. Inseop Kim & Ms. Mee Kyong Lee
Ms. Shinae Kim
Mr. Chan-Soo Kim & Dr. Hong-Im Shim
Mr. Kwang Yun Kim & Ms. Jihee Chang
Mr. George F. King
Mr. Charles Wallis King
Mr. George Kitching & Ms. Torbjorg Tjensvoll
Mr. George W. J. Klein
Mr. Daniel B. Kolber
Mr. Patrick H. Kwan
Mr. Peter T. Kwok
Mr. Al-Amin Lalani
Mr. Wing Kzung Lam & Ms. Wai Kum Law
Mr. John S. Lancaster
Mr. Lee W. Larkin
Mr. William C. H. Lau
Mr. David Lavalley

Mr. Alfred K. M. Law & Mrs. Ivy Chan
Mr. Michael A. Law-Kun
Ms. Joanne Leatch
Mr. Peter A. LeCain
Mr. William A. Leckie
Dr. & Mrs. Edward Lee
Mr. & Mrs. Jimmy Y-C Lee
Mr. Yiu Wai David Lee
Mr. Loewe B. C. Lee
Mr. Andrew Q. X. Lee
Mr. Kevin D. Lee
Mr. & Mrs. Simon Leung
Mr. & Mrs. Tony Leung
Mr. Brian M. Leung
Mr. Peter J. Lewis
Mr. Christopher R. G. Lewis
Mr. Matthew R. Linton
Mr. Steve D. Lister & Dr. Margaret A. Rundle
Mr. Bruce M. Litteljohn
Dr. A. Brian Little
Mr. Brian W. Livingston & Ms. Michele Power
Dr. Donald J. Livingstone & Dr. Melanie Carr
Mr. Bruce H. Lloyd
Mr. & Mrs. Kenneth Lo
Mr. & Mrs. John C. Loewen
Mr. & Mrs. T. Michael Long
Mr. Hampton H. Long
Mr. Gregory KW Lui
Mr. & Mrs. Mark MacDonald
Mr. Peter MacGowan & Ms. Yvonne Penning
Mr. James P. Mackay
Mr. Richard C. A. Mackworth
Mr. John Sandford Fleming MacLean, Jr.
Mr. C. Gregory MacMillan
Dr. George C. Magee
Mr. Francois J. R. Magnant
Mr. Arnold M. Mahesan
Mr. Geoffrey P. Mann
Mr. Rajiv Manucha & Ms. Laurie Bellamy
Mr. & Mrs. Christopher R. Markwell
Mr. Adam R. Markwell
Mr. David C. Marsh
Mr. Ian R. Martin
Mr. Scott H. Mather
Mr. Timothy Matthews & Ms. Janet Laatonen-Matthews
Mr. David Matthews & Mr. Malcolm McGrath
Mr. Douglas C. Matthews
Mr. & Mrs. William J. McCurdy
Mr. James A. McDonald
Mr. Michael G. McKee
Mr. Kevin U. McLaughlin
Drs. Michael & J. E. McLean
Mr. John Ross McLean
Mr. David H. McMurtry
Mr. George G. McNeillie III
Mr. Ali I. Merali
Mr. Gregory P. Meredith

Mr. Jesse E. Mighton
Mr. Douglas A. S. Mills
Mr. Michael P. Milne
Mr. John Scott Mitchell
Mr. Paul J. Mitchell-Banks
Mr. Durwin Mok
Mr. David Morgenstern
Mr. James C. Morehead
Mr. Robert H. Morris
Mr. David E. D. Morris
Mr. Christopher J. Mudry
Mr. Robin H. S. Munro
Dr. & Mrs. John M. Murray
Dr. Alastair M. Murray
Mr. J. D. W. Murray
Mr. James R. Nairne
Mr. Andrew P. Nelson
Mr. & Mrs. Gordon M. Nixon
Ms. Lucia O' Neill
Mr. James M. O' Reilly
Mr. Tony Ormsby
Mr. Loudon M. Owen
Mr. Justin Pang & Ms. Kitty Chung
Mr. Kwangheon Park & Ms. Heechong Kim
Mr. Robert S. Parsons, Jr.
Mr. M. Scott Patterson
Mr. Rowan V. Paul
Mr. Brian C. Pel & Ms. Margaret Anne Smith
Ms. Elizabeth Philbert
Mr. & Mrs. Charles A. Pielsticker
Mr. William H. Pollitt
Dr. Colin Poon & Ms. Lok Kwok
Mr. & Mrs. Berzoor Popatia
Mr. V. Frank Pottow
Mr. John A. E. Pottow
Mr. David E. Powell
Mr. Joseph W. Pratile
Mrs. Christine Price
Mr. F. William Price
Mr. Brian D. Proctor
Mr. & Mrs. Fawad Quraishi
Mr. Simon D. N. Rankin
Mr. & Mrs. Vikram Rao
Dr. Nikhil K. Rastogi
Mr. Tyler B. Ravlo
Mr. & Mrs. David S. E. Reburn
Mr. John D. Reid
Mr. & Mrs. Jim Rennie
Mr. Mahmood Reza
Dr. Robert N. Richards
Mr. Benjamin F. Richardson
Mrs. Shaheda Rizvi
Mr. Vicar Rizvi
Mr. & Mrs. William J. Robertson
Mr. & Mrs. Ian L. F. Robinson
Mr. & Mrs. Edward S. Rogers
Mr. & Mrs. William P. Rosenfeld, Q.C.
Mr. Max C. Rosenfeld

Mr. Ian K. G. Russell
Mr. & Mrs. Raj Saini
Mr. & Mrs. Peter A. Salloum
Mr. & Mrs. Edward Samuel
Mr. Ian C. R. Sargeant
Mr. Fabio P. Savoldelli
Mr. Andrew E. Saxton, Jr.
Dr. & Mrs. Peter G. H. Schaal
Mr. & Mrs. H. J. P. Schaffter
Mr. Mark A. Schoeffel
Mr. Peter J. Schwartz
Mr. & Mrs. Thomas J. Scoon
Mrs. Deborah S. Scott
Mr. Hew F. Scott
Dr. Charles F. Scott
Reverend Dr. Graham A. D. Scott
Mr. William B. Scully
Mr. Wallace B. Seccombe
Mr. & Mrs. David R. Shaw
Dr. Charles Sheard III
Mr. Andrew D. Shoom-Kirsch
Dr. Peter A. Singer & Dr. Heather MacDonald
Mr. Frederick G. I. Singer
Mr. Alan Ian Skaith
Mr. & Mrs. Simon Smith
Mr. Philip Smith
Mr. John P. Spare
Ms. Marian Spence & Mr. David J. McFadden
Mr. Victor V. Spencer
Dr. W. Gordon Squires
Mr. Jordan T. St. John
Mr. J. Perham Stanley
Mr. James P. Stanley, Jr.
Mr. & Mrs. W. Connell Steers
Mr. Charles C. Steers
Mr. David B. Steinhauer
Mr. John D. Stevenson
Mr. & Mrs. Stanley W. Stevenson
Mr. & Mrs. Robert J. C. Stodgell
Mr. Patrick M. Stoker
Mr. Andrew T. B. Stuart
Mr. James M. K. Stuart
Mr. Cannon K. L. Sum
Mr. David Sun
Mr. Aziz Sunderji
Dr. & Mrs. James H. Swan
Mr. Palmer D. Swanson
Mr. & Mrs. Ryerson Symons
Mr. Zsolt Szabo
Mr. & Mrs. Peter Szirmak
Mr. Kenneth Kian Chong Tan
Mr. Leonard Yit Chong Tan
Mr. & Mrs. Raymond W. Tam
Mr. Donald H. Tapscott & Ms. Ana P. Lopes
Mr. & Mrs. Iain D. Taylor

Mr. Randolph D. Taylor
Mr. Youri Tessier-Stall
Mr. Michael H. Tettenborn
Mr. Edward Joel Thompson
Mr. Craig Thorburn & Ms. Cindy Caron-Thorburn
Mr. Trevor Thorne
Mr. Daniel A. C. Tkaczuk
Mr. John K. Tovell
Mr. Anthony H. D. Tremain
Mr. J. Andrew Turner & Ms. Lara Zink
Mr. David R. Turner
Mr. David Viljoen
Mr. Robert E. Waite & Ms. Karen M. Shigeishi-Waite
Mr. David J. Walker
Mr. Clarke Wallace
Mr. F. Ross Walpole
Mr. Alexander T. Walsh
Mr. Christian P. A. Walsh
Mr. Sung Ho Wang & Ms. Hyun Sil Oh
Mr. Thomas W. Watkins & Ms. Mary Rose H. McGuire
Mr. Matthew J. M. Watkins
Mr. Colin G. Watson
Mr. & Mrs. Donald C. Weaver
Mr. Duncan M. Webb, C.M.C.
Mr. Peter Wessel
Mr. J. Jeremy T. Whatmough
Mr. Carl H. Whicher
The Hon. Justice Peter A. Whitmore
Ms. Benedicte M. I. Wiggett
Mr. Ian C. Wildgoose Brown
Mr. Andrew N. Williams, C.F.A.
Mr. David V. Williams
Mr. & Mrs. Geoffrey M. Wilson
Mr. & Mrs. George A. Wilson
Mr. W. Alan C. Wilson
Mr. Paul M. Winnell
Mr. John Daryl Wolos
Mr. Stephen S. S. Wong
Mr. William S. K. Wong
Mr. & Mrs. Larry Woodland
Mr. Gerald M. Wood
Mr. Gordon Woods
Mr. Benson E. N. Wright
Mr. Rodger C. N. Wright
Dr. William F. Wulsin
Mr. Andrew Xia
Mr. Jun Yajima
Mr. D'Arcy M. Young
Mr. Aron N. Zaltz
Mr. Levant Zeytinoglu
Mr. Okan L. Zeytinoglu
Mr. Shawn L. Zeytinoglu
Mr. Matthew Zipchen

****Any errors or omissions are deeply regretted and will be corrected in future editions of this report. All individuals who are current or past UCC parents are listed as couples, regardless of whether they communicated as such***