

**THE GOVERNING COUNCIL**  
**REPORT NUMBER 102 OF**  
**THE PLANNING AND BUDGET COMMITTEE**

**March 8, 2005**

To the Academic Board,  
University of Toronto.

Your Committee reports that it met on Tuesday, March 8, 2005, at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, with the following members present:

Professor Avrum Gotlieb (in the Chair)  
Professor Miriam Diamond, Vice-Chair  
Professor Vivek Goel, Vice-President and  
Provost  
Ms Catherine Riggall, Vice-President,  
Business Affairs  
Professor Safwat Zaky, Vice-Provost,  
Planning and Budget  
Professor Donald Brean  
Mr. Bruce G. Cameron  
Mr. P.C. Choo  
Professor Donald Dewees  
Professor Jane Gaskell  
Ms Shaila Kibria

**Regrets:**

Professor Philip H. Byer  
Mr. William R. J. Lumsden  
Professor J. J. Berry Smith  
Professor Ian McDonald  
Professor Lisa Steele

**In attendance:**

Professor Ron Daniels, Dean, Faculty of Law  
Mr. Bruce Dodds, Director of Utilities, Facilities and Services Department  
Ms Sheree Drummond, Assistant Provost  
Ms Rivi Frankle, Assistant Vice-President, University Advancement  
Ms Sally Garner, Senior Planning and Budget Officer  
Ms Judy McKenna, Manager, Budget Co-ordination  
Ms Marny Scully, Director, Enrolment, Planning and Statistics  
Ms Elisabeth Sisam, Director, Campus and Facilities Planning  
Mr. Ron Swail, Assistant Vice-President, Facilities and Services  
Mr. Howard Tam, Vice-President, University Affairs, Students' Administrative Council

Professor David Mock  
Mr. Timothy Reid  
Professor Robert Reisz  
Professor Anthony N. Sinclair  
Professor Pekka Sinervo  
Mr. Stephen C. Smith

**Non-voting Assessors:**

Mr. John Bisanti, Chief Capital Projects  
Officer  
Ms Sheila Brown, Chief Financial Officer  
Professor Ronald D. Venter, Vice-Provost,  
Space and Facilities Planning

**Secretariat:**

Mr. Neil Dobbs  
Ms Cristina Oke, Secretary

ITEMS 5 AND 6 ARE RECOMMENDED TO THE ACADEMIC BOARD FOR APPROVAL.

ALL OTHER ITEMS ARE REPORTED TO THE ACADEMIC BOARD FOR INFORMATION.

The Chair welcomed members to the meeting.

### **1. Report of the Previous Meeting**

Report Number 101 of January 25, 2005 was approved.

### **2. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting**

There was no business arising.

### **3. Senior Assessor's Report**

#### **(a) Federal Budget**

Professor Goel informed members that the recently released federal budget had provided only limited new funding for research. An additional \$75 million had been allocated to the three granting agencies. The increase in the indirect cost allocation was appreciated, but was falling behind the increase in research funds. The federal budget had contained no significant change in student aid. The University would continue to focus its federal advocacy efforts on higher education.

#### **(b) Postsecondary Review (Rae Review)**

Professor Goel reported that the University continued to be actively engaged in advocacy. The President had addressed the Canadian Club on March 7 on the topic *Universities Today: No More Myths, Just the Facts*. The University was monitoring the response of the provincial government to a number of elements in the Rae report, including the recommendation for a new legislative framework that would be 'founded on access for all qualified students to higher education, excellence and demonstrable quality in teaching and research, institutional autonomy within a public system, and the mutual responsibility of government, institutions and students'.<sup>1</sup>

#### **(c) Academic Planning Process**

Professor Goel advised members that recommendations for allocations from the second round of the Academic Initiatives Fund (AIF) would be brought forward to the April meeting of the Committee.

#### **(d) Varsity Site Project**

Professor Goel informed members that the project planning report for the development of the Varsity site would be brought forward to the April meeting of the Committee.

### **4. Enrolment Projections, 2005-06**

The Chair reminded members that the Enrolment Projections for 2005-06 were a key component of the budget report. Professor Zaky explained that this report was the second of two that had been brought to the Committee this year: the first reporting actual enrolment for 2004-05, and this report projecting enrolment for 2005-06. No significant changes to planned enrolments were anticipated for 2005-06, although some adjustments had been made to the intake targets and the international/domestic mix in the Arts and Science divisions.

---

<sup>1</sup> [http://www.raereview.on.ca/en/report/frame\\_a1.asp?loc1=report&loc2=frame](http://www.raereview.on.ca/en/report/frame_a1.asp?loc1=report&loc2=frame)

#### 4. Enrolment Projections, 2005-06 (cont'd)

The University expected to admit 13,873 new students in all undergraduate programs in September 2005. The University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM) and the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC) had set their intake targets to be about the same as the actual intake level in 2004-05, which was a reduction of 273 full-time students for UTM and 152 full-time students for UTSC, from what had been planned. The intake level of the Faculty of Arts and Science at St. George had been maintained at the planned level, which was 152 full-time students below actual intake in 2004-05. Total undergraduate enrolment was projected to increase from 46,434 full-time equivalents (FTEs) in 2004-05 to 47,215 FTEs in 2005-06. The increase was a result of the flow-through of larger intake numbers since 2002.

In 2004-05, there had been a significant increase in undergraduate international intake. The 2005-06 projected enrolments included a further 344 FTEs (12%) increase in international enrolment in direct-entry programs.

Only a minor increase in graduate enrolment was planned because of the cap on funding of graduate students by the Ontario government. Graduate enrolment was projected to increase from 10,344 to 10,682 FTEs.

A member asked whether the University had established a long-term target for the mix of international and domestic students. Professor Zaky replied that enrolment targets would be revisited after the implementation of the recommendations of the *Postsecondary Review* (Rae Review). A member noted the projected 1.4% increase in undergraduate enrolment and the 2.8 % increase in graduate enrolment. He asked why graduate enrolment was being increased at this time, before the students in the double cohort had begun to apply to graduate programs. Professor Zaky replied that the University had a broad target for graduate student enrolment, rather than a specific number. The increase created by the double cohort would appear in 2007-08. One of the recommendations of the Rae Review was a substantial increase in the number of funded graduate students in Ontario.

A member asked for clarification of how 'head count' translated into 'full-time equivalent' in the enrolment report. He noted a significant variation in the relationship between "headcount" and the "FTE" count at UTM and UTSC. Professor Zaky explained that the translation of headcount to FTEs at UTM and UTSC was based on the number of courses taken by students. The variation between the two campuses reflected a higher average course loading of full and part-time students at UTSC. Professor Zaky added that eligible FTEs are the basis for BIU funding.

A member referred to paragraph 4 of the Enrolment Projection Report, which stated that the report *Update on Enrolment Expansion, April 2002* had called for FTE growth, in steady state, of 6,907 at the undergraduate level and 1,374 at the graduate level. Total growth on the St. George campus was to be limited to 3,313. The member asked how graduate enrolment for each of the three campuses was calculated. Professor Zaky replied that there was no distinction by campus for graduate student enrolment, and therefore the number of students registered did not accurately portray the number of students actually on each campus. All registered with the School of Graduate Studies. The member commented that it would help to have a clearer breakdown of the number of graduate students on each campus. Professor Goel indicated that members of his office were working with the Deans to identify graduate students with their supervisors, as well as the location where they conducted their research and received supervision. Eventually, that information would be reported to governance.

## **5. Budget Report, 2005-06**

The Chair explained to members that, in previous years, the Contractual Obligations and Policy Commitments (COPC) list had been considered at a separate meeting of the Committee, when it was reviewed and approved for inclusion in the budget. This year, the COPC list and the Long-Range Budget Guidelines were being presented at the same time as the Budget Report, and were being considered as part of a single item. The Chair invited Professor Goel to introduce the Budget Report, 2005-06.

### **Introduction**

Professor Goel began by acknowledging the work done by his colleagues Professor Zaky, Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget and his staff in the Planning and Budget Office; Ms Sheila Brown, Chief Financial Officer; and Ms Catherine Riggall, Vice-President, Business Affairs. He also thanked the staff in various parts of the University who had contributed to the Budget Report. He introduced the individuals who were present to answer any questions that members might have: Mr. Bruce Dodds, Director of Utilities, Facilities and Services Department; Ms Sally Garner, Senior Planning and Budget Officer; Ms Judy McKenna, Manager, Budget Co-ordination; and Ms Marny Scully, Director, Enrolment, Planning and Statistics.

Professor Goel highlighted the key points of the Budget Report.

The following points were made in the presentation.

### **Multi-year Budgeting**

- The process of multi-year budgeting used by the University allowed for planning.
  - It was manageable and fiscally responsible.
  - It provided an opportunity to close the gap between revenue and aspirations.
- 2005-06 would be the second year of the current six-year budget cycle.
  - considerable uncertainty remained:
    - the federal budget had not contained major new investments in post-secondary education;
    - the province had not yet responded to the recommendations of the Rae Review.
- The overall structure of the 2004-2010 budget cycle would be maintained.
  - No new revenues were being assumed as a result of the Rae Review, except those included in the 2004-05 Long-Range Budget Guidelines
    - Tuition-freeze compensation;
    - New revenue at least equal to the Quality Assurance Fund for 2005-06 and 2006-07;
    - Enrolment growth flow-through.
  - There would be minor changes from last year's revenue and expense projections.
  - The base budget reduction schedule would remain unchanged.
  - There would be reduced one-time-only (OTO) cuts as a result of improved financial market performance and increased enrolment.

## **5. Budget Report, 2005-06 (cont'd)**

### **Guidelines**

- Governing Council policy required that the annual budget variance be no more than 1.5% of gross operating revenue;
  - Over the past 15 years, the Governing Council had allowed the Long-Range Budget Guidelines to have larger variances than required by the policy as long as:
    - The University exited each cycle with a balanced budget, and
    - The accumulated deficit did not exceed 1.5% in the final year of the multi-year budget plan.
- The Long-Range Budget Guidelines had served the University well during the recent years of decreased provincial funding.
  - Without the Long-Range Budget Guidelines and multi-year budget plan, cuts of up to 30% would have had to be imposed in response to decreased funding.

### **University Funds**

- The University had four funds:
  - Operating Funds;
  - Capital Fund;
  - Restricted Funds; and
  - Ancillaries.

The Planning and Budget Committee focused on the operating funds and operating budget.

### **Assumptions – Revenue**

- Enrolment
  - No change in existing plans;
  - Some reduction in undergraduate intake as a result of the end of the double cohort;
  - No change in graduate enrolment.
- Government Operating Grants:
  - Accessibility program would continue;
  - Annual 2% increase in grant after 2006 – 07;
  - No increase in graduate funding was built into the budget model.
- Tuition:
  - Second year of tuition freeze;
  - 2% increase in subsequent years, for all programs, to cover inflation
  - increase in international tuition as proposed in 2004-05.
- Canada Research Chairs program would be renewed.
- Federal and provincial indirect cost of research programs would continue.

### **Assumptions – Expense**

- 2% increase in salaries and benefits to cover inflation;
- revised investment projections;
- no change in 15 year pension deficit amortization;
- no increase in debt beyond amount approved by Business Board;

- increased expenses related to increased enrolment.

## 5. Budget Report, 2005-06 (cont'd)

### Debt Reduction

- base reductions over 6-year period remained unchanged

Year	04-05	05-06	06-07	07-08	08-09	09-10
Base budget reduction	2%	2%	5%	2%	2%	3%

- OTO reductions had been reduced from the original schedule to 3% over two years from 6.7% over three years.

Year	04-05	05-06	06-07	07-08	08-09	09-10
Proposed One-time-only reduction	0%	0%	0%	2%	1%	0%
Original one-time-only reduction	0%	0%	0%	2.5%	2.5%	1.7%

- In 2005-06, the deficit was projected to be \$17 million, and the accumulated deficit was projected to be \$55 million.
- As a result of the proposed 5% base budget reduction in 2006-07, a surplus of \$10 million was being projected.

### Sources of Operating Revenue – 2005-06

- 45%: Provincial Operating Grants
- 33%: Tuition Fees
- 11%: Divisional Income
- 3%: Indirect cost recovery on research grants and contracts
- 3%: Canada Research Chairs
- 3%: Endowment revenue for Chairs and Student Aid
- 1%: Investment income
- 1%: Other income (application fees, overhead fees)

### Breakdown of Operating Expenditures – 2005-06

- 65%: Academic (to divisions)
- 9%: Student Assistance
- 8%: Maintenance, Services and Utilities
- 6%: Central administration
- 4%: Academic Computing and Library Services
- 4%: General University Expense (Legal, Insurance, Fees)
- 2%: Campus and Student Services
- 2%: Library Acquisitions

## 5. Budget Report, 2005-06 (cont'd)

### Response to Rae Review Recommendations

- Assumptions and enrolment targets would have to be reviewed after the provincial government had responded to the recommendations of the Rae Review.
  - Graduate/undergraduate balance
  - Domestic/international ratios
- It was likely that new funding envelopes would be accompanied by accountability commitments.
- Advocacy remained important
  - Ontario was currently 10<sup>th</sup> of the ten provinces in FTE funding for post-secondary education
  - BIU value had not been increased by rate of inflation
  - Provincial funding to the University of Toronto per FTE student ranked 9th of 10 peer public Association of American Universities (AAU)
  - Total operating revenue per FTE student was \$18,400 at the University of Toronto, while it ranged from \$32,161 to \$58,248 at 9 peer public AAU institutions.

### Budget Report Summary

- The University's budget strategy was prudent.
- Expense projections were realistic and necessary.
- Revenue assumptions were not unduly optimistic, and were re-examined on an annual basis.
- The 2% base budget reduction for 2005-06 remained necessary.
- The outer year base reductions would be re-examined next year, but had to be planned for.

### Challenge

- Long-range budgeting served the University well, but made it more aware of funding gaps.
- The University had to focus on generating the revenues necessary to meet its needs and aspirations.
- Deep cuts would be necessary if new base resources were not made available.
- The University would have to be selective in choosing its priorities
  - Its priorities had to be clearly tied to development and advocacy.
  - New funding would likely be tied to specific accountability measures.
- The University would have to seek out efficiencies in its operations.

### Discussion

A member noted that total revenue was projected to increase to \$1151 million in 2005-06, not to \$1195 as shown in the cover memorandum. The member then asked why the maximum allowable accumulated debt of 1.5% was being projected for 2009-10. Professor Goel explained that a budget model that included an accumulated deficit that was less than the maximum allowable would require additional OTO cuts to be included in the budget. Ms Riggall added that the operating **deficit** was the difference between revenue and expense, while **debt** was a balance sheet item. Ms Brown explained that the deficit was on operating funds, not on external borrowings. The University's debt resulted largely from borrowing for capital projects. The University's deficit on operating funds was financed by internal borrowing from cash balances. This internal borrowing resulted in the

## **5. Budget Report, 2005-06 (cont'd)**

### **Discussion (cont'd)**

opportunity cost of not having funds available to invest. Professor Goel pointed out that an accumulated deficit of \$14 million on an operating budget of \$1.5 billion was equivalent to a rounding error, and would be covered by the University's cash float.

A member asked what the interest rate assumption was with respect to Table 6 – Capital Budget Cash Flow. Ms Riggall replied that the interest rate on the bulk of the financing was fixed for 30 to 40 years. Ms Brown added that \$360 million of the total debt was financed by two debentures, while the remainder of the debt was financed by a number of small loans at a range of rates.

A member commended the administration for the transparent and well-presented budget report. He expressed his concern that, although approximately 65% of the undergraduate FTEs were enrolled in the Faculty of Arts and Science, UTM and UTSC, those divisions received only 37% of the University's operating funds. He commented that it would be useful to see the percentage of operating revenues that flowed to academic divisions. Professor Goel replied that Professor Zaky had been chairing a budget review group that was reviewing the presentation of revenue and expense in the budget report. The relationship between divisional revenue and expense was a complex one. The relative weighting of basic-income unit (BIU) grants had evolved over many years and did not necessarily correspond with program costs. There was also a great deal of cross-divisional teaching. Professor Zaky's group was working on ways in which the University's information systems could be improved to generate information about such matters. However, the alignment of revenue and expense was quite close.

A member noted that more detailed calculations indicated that the Faculty of Arts and Science, UTM and UTSC received a percentage of operating funds that was close to the number of undergraduate FTEs registered in the three divisions. The fundamental problem was the amount of funding per student received from the provincial government.

A member asked whether the projected operating revenues in Table 1 reflected the recent increase in the research overhead payments. Professor Zaky replied that the increases were not included in the revenue projections.

On motion duly moved and seconded

### **YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS**

THAT the "Budget Report for 2005-06" dated March 8, 2005, including the revisions to the long-range budget assumptions and the Contractual Obligation and Policy Commitments list, be approved.



## **6. Capital Project: Faculty of Law: Preliminary Project Planning Report**

The Chair welcomed Professor Ron Daniels, Dean, Faculty of Law, to the meeting.

### **Introduction**

Professor Venter explained that, normally, a project planning report being considered by the Planning and Budget Committee would include a space plan, sources of funding, and a site. In this case, however, approval in principle was being sought for a relocation of the Faculty to allow fundraising efforts to proceed.

In October 2001, a Project Planning Committee had been formally established to assess the space requirements of the Faculty of Law. The results had indicated that the space available to the Faculty of Law was approximately 1,321 net assignable square metres [nasm] below that recommended by the Council of Ontario Universities [COU] guidelines. In addition, following site visits to other campuses in North America, and peer analysis, the Faculty had determined that approximately 3,871 nasm of additional space above the COU allocation was required in order to accommodate the requirements of the Faculty to maintain its position among peer institutions.

It would be difficult to add any additional space for use by the Faculty of Law on its current Queen's Park Crescent site. The two buildings occupied by the Faculty - Falconer Hall and Flavelle House - were listed by the City in the inventory of heritage properties. In addition, the sites were bounded by Philosophers' Walk where encroachment would not be appropriate.

In April 2004, a comparison of the possible options and solutions for the creation of new space had been prepared by the Campus and Facilities Planning Office for the Faculty of Law. Four options had been identified:

- Re-development of Flavelle House and the Bora Laskin Library. This option had been studied in 2001/02, and the estimated cost had been in the range of \$70-80 million;
- Relocation of the Faculty of Music that could provide the Faculty of Law with additional space within the E, Johnson Building. This option was very expensive; the cost to relocate the Faculty of Music alone would exceed \$90 million;
- Development of additional space for the Faculty of Law within the redevelopment of the Royal Ontario Museum (ROM) Planetarium site. Relocation of part of the Faculty of Law.
- Relocation of the entire Faculty of Law.

Site 12 on Devonshire Place had been identified as a potential location for the Faculty of Law, and preliminary studies on the cost of the relocation had been completed. The tentative plan had been to increase the space available to the Faculty of Law from the 12,268 gross square metres [gsm] currently used to approximately 19,236 gsm at the new site.

Site 12 must be fully built out to ensure that maximum development occurred, given the limited number of building sites available on the St. George campus. However, the planned Faculty of Law requirements would account for only two-thirds of the available building envelope of approximately 29,133 gsm. Consideration had therefore been given to constructing the building in two sequential phases. The first phase would allow for the

## **6. Capital Project: Faculty of Law: Preliminary Project Planning Report (cont'd)**

### **Introduction (cont'd)**

relocation of the Faculty to the northern end of site 12, incorporating the existing building at 315 Bloor Street West. The second phase, to be conceptually designed concurrently with the facility to accommodate the Faculty of Law, would be located on the southern portion of site 12 and would be used to accommodate other University requirements. With the relocation of the Faculty of Law, Falconer Hall could be considered for use by the Faculty of Music.

The total estimated cost of the Phase 1 project was \$88 million. Consistent with the Capital Plan of the University of Toronto, approved by Governing Council in February, 2005, the Faculty of Law was required to raise \$55 million from external sources for the project to advance to the detailed planning stage. In addition, the University would be required to contribute an additional \$33 million to launch the project. The cost of the second phase, which could be completed at any time in the future was estimated to be an additional \$45 million.

It was moved and seconded

1. THAT this preliminary Project Planning Report for the Faculty of Law that requires the relocation of the entire Faculty of Law to site 12, including 315 Bloor Street West, be accepted in principle.
2. THAT this approval in principle is subject to the Faculty of Law identifying the external funding, and to the University identifying the internal funding for the renewal and reallocation of the spaces released by the Faculty of Law.
3. THAT this approval in principle is subject to approval by the Governing Council of a completed Project Planning Report which will identify the detailed space program of the Faculty of Law, the cost and all sources of funding.

### **External Speaker**

At the invitation of the Chair, Mr. Howard Tam, Vice-President, University Affairs of the Students' Administrative Council (SAC) addressed the Committee. Mr. Tam encouraged members of the Committee to refer back the Preliminary Project Report. It was the view of SAC that Site 12 was more suitable for student space, than for the relocation of the Faculty of Law. The site was located near three colleges – Trinity, Innis and Woodsworth – as well as the proposed Varsity Stadium. It was also the view of SAC that there was currently a shortage of student activity space. SAC had requested Site 12 for a student center, and would be holding a plebiscite to determine the level of student support for a student levy for a student center. Since the space required by the Faculty of Law was two-thirds of the space available at Site 12, SAC believed that it was appropriate for the site to be viewed from a broader perspective.

The Chair thanked Mr. Tam for his remarks.

## **6. Capital Project: Faculty of Law: Preliminary Project Planning Report (cont'd)**

### **Discussion**

A member asked what location was being considered for Admissions and Awards, which was currently located at 315 Bloor Street West. Professor Venter replied that no location had yet been designated for Admissions and Awards. He reminded the member that the relocation of the Faculty of Law was dependent upon successful fundraising by the Faculty.

A member emphasized the crucial need for student space. It was her understanding that 57 student clubs had applied for 20 available club spaces on Sussex Street. She did not believe that the relocation of the Faculty of Law to Site 12 fitted in with the needs of students, and suggested that a Town Hall be held on this topic.

Professor Goel replied that approval in principle of this proposal was to allow fundraising to begin. This did not preclude further discussion of the issue of student activity space. He explained that student activity space in the University was being reviewed under the leadership of Professor Farrar, Deputy Provost and Vice-Provost, Students. He reminded members that students were located in many places across the St. George campus. Relocation of the Faculty of Law would free up additional space that could be used for students. Professor Goel also commented that the project planning reports for a multi-faith center and Varsity project were scheduled to come to the April meeting of the Committee.

A member noted that the relocation of the Faculty of Law would be an optimum solution for both the Faculty of Law and the Faculty of Music. The current music building had been built specifically for the Faculty of Music, and included features that would be costly to replicate.

A member asked if the \$33 million contribution of the University included the costs of relocating Admissions and Awards. Professor Venter replied that renovating heritage space often was as expensive as creating new space. It was expected that the Faculty of Law would contribute to the relocation of Admissions and Awards, if site 12 and 315 Bloor Street West was the site to which the Faculty relocated.

A member asked for clarification of what the Committee was being asked to approve. Professor Goel explained that the Faculty of Law would be given a full year, post the approval of the recommendations, to work to secure the external funding required for this project to proceed. This period of one year could be extended for an additional time period by the senior administration, however every effort would be made to reach clear and decisive conclusions as to the success of the project within the one year time period. It was also understood that, should this project go forward, the Faculty of Law would occupy two-thirds of the site, with the remaining one-third used for other University purposes.

A member asked whether the allocation of space above COU guidelines was being approved. Professor Goel replied that the approval in principle which was being sought at this time was subject to the approval by the Governing Council of a detailed space plan with identified costs and sources of funding for this capital project.

**6. Capital Project: Faculty of Law: Preliminary Project Planning Report (cont'd)**

**Discussion (cont'd)**

It was moved and seconded

THAT the Preliminary Project Planning Report for the Faculty of Law be referred back to the administration for reconsideration of the use of Site 12.

A member spoke against the motion to refer back, as there was no funding plan for a student center, and other sites were available for such a center. Professor Goel repeated that Professor Farrar was convening a group to examine student activity space, and that a student center would be an appropriate item for the group to discuss.

A member asked if parties other than SAC had expressed interest in Site 12. Professor Venter recalled that the site had once been considered for a student residence, but that was prior to the acquisition of 89 Chestnut Street and the recent construction of additional residences on campus. At this time, however, there were no other plans for the site.

A member spoke against the motion. He was not convinced that a single student center would best meet the needs of all students on the St. George campus.

A member spoke in favour of the motion. Space on the St. George campus was at a premium and a student center had been proposed numerous times in the past.

The question was called and the motion to refer back was defeated.

The main question was called.

**YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS**

1. THAT this preliminary Project Planning Report for the Faculty of Law that requires the relocation of the entire Faculty of Law to site 12, including 315 Bloor Street West, be accepted in principle.
2. THAT this approval in principle is subject to the Faculty of Law identifying the external funding, and to the University identifying the internal funding for the renewal and reallocation of the spaces released by the Faculty of Law.
3. THAT this approval in principle is subject to approval by the Governing Council of a completed Project Planning Report which will identify the detailed space program of the Faculty of Law, the cost and all sources of funding.

**7. Capital Project: Department of Italian Studies: Project Planning Committee, Terms of Reference and Membership**

The Chair commented that Professor Venter's memorandum of February 24 outlined the terms of reference and the membership of the Project Planning Committee for the Department of Italian Studies.

There were no questions.

**8. Capital Project: University of Toronto at Scarborough – Science Building: Project Planning Committee, Terms of Reference and Membership**

The Chair explained that Professor Venter’s memorandum of February 24 outlined the terms of reference and the membership of the Project Planning Committee for the University of Toronto at Scarborough – Science Building.

There were no questions.

**9. Capital Project: University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM) – Parking Garage Facility – Project Planning Committee, Terms of Reference and Membership**

The Chair noted that Professor Venter’s memorandum of February 24 outlined the terms of reference and the membership of the Project Planning Committee for the UTM Parking Garage Facility.

A member indicated that students at UTM were opposed to the building of an above-ground parking structure on Lot 4. Students had suggested building the parking structure on Lot 2, and had requested further study of parking at UTM. The member also stated her understanding that the underground parking garage within the Centre for Communication, Culture and Information Technology (CCIT) was not fully utilized. Students were meeting with representatives of Mississauga Transit and the Ministry of Transportation to discuss traffic issues, and were organizing a Town Hall on the issue.

**10. Date of the Next Meeting**

The next scheduled meeting of the Committee (Monday, March 28, 2005) had been cancelled due to lack of agenda items. The next meeting would therefore be held on Tuesday, April 19, 2005, beginning at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber.

**11. Other Business**

There was no other business.

The meeting adjourned at 6:15 p.m.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Secretary

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chair

March 31, 2005