UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

REPORT NUMBER 146 OF THE PLANNING AND BUDGET COMMITTEE November 2, 2011

To the Academic Board, University of Toronto

Your Committee reports that it held a meeting on Wednesday, November 2, 2011 at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, at which the following were present:

Dr. Avrum Gotlieb (In the Chair)
Professor Miriam Diamond (Vice-Chair)
Professor Cheryl Misak, Vice-President and
Provest

Ms Catherine J. Riggall, Vice-President, Business Affairs

Professor Scott Mabury, Vice-Provost, Academic Operations

Mr. Don Andrew

Professor Elizabeth Cowper Professor Meric Gertler Mr. Peter A. Hurley Professor Henry Mann Professor Amy Mullin Mr. Manveen Puri Professor Yves Roberge

Professor Locke Rowe

Non-voting Assessors:

Mr. Paul Donoghue, Chief Administrative
Officer, University of Toronto Mississauga
Ms Sally Garner, Executive Director, Planning and Budget
Ms Gail Milgrom, Acting Assistant Vice-President, Campus and Facilities Planning

Secretariat:

Mr. Anwar Kazimi, Secretary

Regrets:

Professor William Russell Cluett Professor Philip H. Byer Dr. Chris Koenig-Woodyard Dr. Jim Yuan Lai Professor Andrea Sass-Kortsak Miss Ava-Dayna Sefa Ms Grace Carmen Yuen

In Attendance:

Dr. Sarita Verma, member, Governing Council, Acting Dean, Faculty of Medicine

Ms Judith Wolfson, Vice-President, University Relations

Ms Sheree Drummond, Assistant Provost

Dr. Jane Harrison, Director, Policy and Planning, Office of the Vice-President and Provost

Professor Charlie Keil, Director, Cinema Studies Institute

Professor Ito Peng, Associate Dean, Interdisciplinary and International Affairs, Faculty of Arts and Science

Ms Mae-Yu Tan, Assistant Secretary of the Governing Council

ITEMS 5, 6, 7 AND 8 ARE RECOMMENDED TO THE ACADEMIC BOARD FOR APPROVAL. ALL OTHER ITEMS ARE REPORTED FOR INFORMATION.

1. Chair's Remarks

The Chair welcomed members and guests to the meeting. He recalled that proposed revisions to the Committee's Terms of Reference had been presented for information and input at the Committee's meeting held on September 21, 2011. The revisions had been approved by the Governing Council at its meeting held on October 27, 2011. Consequently, the Committee would adopt the practice of Consent Agenda, when appropriate, for its meetings.

2. Report of the Previous Meeting (September 21, 2011)

Report Number 145 (September 21, 2011) was approved.

3. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting

There was no business arising from the report of the previous meeting.

4. Report of the Senior Assessor

Professor Misak provided members information on four key items that related to the University and formed the platform for the re-elected minority provincial government:

- It was proposed that sixty thousand new post-secondary spaces would be created in the province. Of these, six thousand would be for graduate students. This reflected the third, and possibly last, phase of graduate expansion in the province. The University intended to increase the graduate capacity at all its three campuses, where quality and divisional aspirations coincided. The government had announced that, effective January 2012, undergraduate students from Ontario who came from homes with annual family income of less than \$160,000 per year would be eligible to receive a 30% tuition-fee waiver.
- The provincial government had stated its intention to build three undergraduate campuses
 within the province. Even as further details on the location of these campuses were awaited, it
 is clear that any new campuses on the outskirts of the GTA would likely have an impact on the
 University of Toronto Mississauga (UTM) and University of Toronto Scarborough (UTSC).
 With the provincial government's capital resources in short supply, further details on this
 matter would be received with great interest.
- The provincial government had asserted its intentions to present a balanced budget by the fiscal year 2017-18. If this continued to be the aim of the government, it would have an impact on the public-sector funding in the province, including post-secondary institutions.

Professor Misak added that the two capital projects for the Committee's consideration at the meeting were examples of the provincial government's allocation of funds for specific one-off projects.

In the discussion that followed, a member asked whether the provincial government had provided any indication on its plans for the tuition-fee framework. Another member commented that minority governments were historically fragile and advised caution in planning for the University's long-term budgets.

Professor Misak said that the University had not been provided with any indication by the provincial government on its plans for the tuition-fee framework, and this topic would be brought forward in discussions between the two parties. Ms Wolfson added that, in all likelihood, it would take about six to nine months for the government to present its future plans on this matter.

4. Report of the Senior Assessor (Cont'd)

Ms Wolfson said that the University, while looking at its own budget, was cognizant of the \$16 billion budget deficit faced by the provincial government. With this fiscal reality, the University would carefully assess its proposals to the provincial government for funding projects. It was important for the University to build partnerships with the government and its other benefactors. Professor Misak added that the 17-year freeze on the real (inflation adjusted) value of the basic income units (BIU) had resulted in post-secondary institutions in Ontario receiving funding per student funding that was below the national average. The \$16 billion provincial deficit was a matter of concern to the University.

5. Faculty of Arts and Science (FAS): Proposal to change the status of the Cinema Studies Institute from Extra-Departmental Unit: B (EDU: B) to Extra-Departmental Unit: A (EDU: A)

Ms Garner outlined the rationale for the proposed change of status of the Cinema Studies Institute, as presented in the appended documents.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the status of the existing Cinema Studies Institute be changed from an Extra-Departmental Unit: B (EDU: B) to an Extra-Departmental Unit: A (EDU: A) effective January 1, 2012.

Documentation is attached hereto as Appendix "A"

6. Renewal of Affiliation Agreements between the University of Toronto and the Toronto Academic Health Science Network (TAHSN)

Professor Misak outlined the importance of the updated affiliation agreements as presented in the appended documents. Dr. Verma added that the University had engaged in a comprehensive consultation process with the legal counsel of the nine affiliated hospitals. Major changes in the agreements addressed the standard of accreditation of the MD program.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

- (a) THAT the revised template for full affiliation agreements between the University of Toronto and the full member hospitals of the Toronto Academic Health Science Network be approved, effective immediately;
- (b) THAT the President, or designate, be authorized to sign such agreements on behalf of the Governing Council, provided that the agreements conform to the approved template; and
- (c) THAT the agreements signed under the provisions of this resolution be filed with the Secretary of Governing Council.

Documentation is attached hereto as Appendix "B".

7. Capital Project: Project Planning Report for Robarts Library Fourth Floor West Renovation of Library Research and Reference Services and the Centre for Teaching Support and Innovation

Ms Milgrom presented the highlights of the Project Planning Report, dated October 25, 2011, for the Robarts Library Fourth Floor West Renovation of the Library Research and Reference Services and the Centre for Teaching Support and Innovation.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

- (i) THAT the Project Planning Report for the Robarts Library 4th Floor West, dated October 25, 2011, a copy of which is attached hereto as <u>Appendix "C"</u>, be approved in principle.
- (ii) THAT the project scope as identified in the Project Planning Report be approved at a cost of \$2.6M with funding from the Graduate Expansion Capital Fund and donor funds.

8. Capital Project: Project Planning Report for University of Toronto Mississauga Teaching Laboratories Renovation in the William G. Davis Building: Phase 1

Ms Milgrom presented the highlights of the Project Planning Report, dated October 25, 2011, for the University of Toronto Mississauga Teaching Laboratories Renovation in the William G. Davis Building: Phase 1.

A member asked about the source of funds that would be required to outfit the renovated laboratories. The member was informed that the cost of outfitting the laboratories had been included in the project cost. Professor Mullin, Vice-Principal Academic and Dean, UTM, said that additional funds for the operation of the renovated laboratories would be provided through allocations in the UTM budget. Professor Mabury said that proposed laboratory renovations for the Department of Biology would be modeled on the successful renovations to the laboratories for the Department of Chemistry at UTM in 2010. Those renovations had enhanced the student learning experience.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

- (i) THAT the Project Planning Report for the UTM Teaching Laboratories Renovation in the William G. Davis Building: Phase 1, dated October 25, 2011, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "D", be approved in principle.
- (ii) THAT the project scope as identified in the Project Planning Report be approved in principle at a Total Project Cost of \$ 8.6M with funding as follows:

Provincial Government	\$ 5,400,000
UTM Operating Fund	\$ 3,200,000
Total	\$ 8,600,000

9. Date of the Next Meeting

The Chair reminded members that the next meeting of the Committee was scheduled for Wednesday, January 11, 2012, at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber.

10. Other Business

There were no items of other business.

In closing the Chair commended the efforts of the assessors in bringing forward detailed and comprehensive documentation for the Committee's understanding and consideration. This had allowed for the efficient utilization of the Committee's time

	The meeting adjourned at 4:49 p.m.	
Secretary	Chair	

November 3, 2011