

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL
REPORT NUMBER 56 OF
THE PLANNING AND BUDGET COMMITTEE
December 14, 1999

To the Academic Board,
University of Toronto.

Your Committee reports that it met on Tuesday, December 14, 1999, at 5:00 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, with the following members present:

Professor David Mock (In the Chair)
Professor Ronald Venter (Vice-Chair)
Professor Adel Sedra,
Vice-President and Provost
Professor Derek McCammond,
Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget
Professor Carl Amrhein
Mr. Brian Burchell
Professor Raymond Cummins
Professor Avrum Gotlieb
Professor Bruce Kidd
Mr. Elan Ohayon
Ms Jacqueline Orange
Professor Paul Perron
Ms Nancy Reid
Ms Wendy Talfourd-Jones
Professor Fred Wilson
Ms Judith Wilson

Mr. Vilko Zbogar

Non-Voting Assessors:

Professor Heather Munroe-Blum,
Vice President, Research and International
Relations
Professor Carolyn Tuohy, Deputy Provost

Secretariat:

Ms Patti Seaman, Secretary
Ms Susan Girard

Regrets:

Dr. John Challis
Professor Ruth Gallop
Mr. Arvin Hariri
Professor Susan Horton
Professor Michael Marrus

In Attendance:

Dr. Mary Barrie, Director, School of Continuing Studies
Mr. Louis Charpentier, Secretary of the Governing Council
Professor Ron Daniels, Dean, Faculty of Law
Ms Joan Leishman, Director, Gerstein Science Information Centre
Ms Cristina Oke, Assistant Vice-Provost, Professional Faculties
Mr. John Rawle, Chief Financial Officer, School of Continuing Studies
Professor Cecil Yip, Vice Dean, Research, Faculty of Medicine

THE MEETING WAS HELD IN OPEN SESSION. ITEMS 4, 5, AND 6 ARE RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL.

1. Report of the Previous Meeting

Report Number 55 (November 18, 1999) was approved.

2. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting

Item 2. *Expanding Residence Capacity at the University of Toronto*

The Chair noted that the Committee had received a memorandum from Professor Sedra with an attached memorandum from Ms Carole Moore, Chief Librarian, regarding residence expansion and the Robarts Library.

A member thanked Professor Sedra for the information. He asked for further details on the plans for expansion regarding Robarts Library. Professor Sedra thanked the member for bringing the issue to the Committee's attention. He explained that the block containing the Robarts Library and the surrounding area was designated as a development site but that no plans had yet been developed for the site's use. The memorandum from Ms Moore indicated the aspirations of the Library in regard to expansion; plans would come forward in the future.

Item 3. Senior Assessor's Report: Information Session - February 1, 2000,
4:30 - 5:00 p.m.

The Chair noted that the information session to explain the process of budget, and of the review of divisional plans and resource allocations to new Committee members, had been arranged for February 1, 2000 from 4:30 to 5:00 p.m. prior to the Planning and Budget Committee meeting.

3. Senior Assessor's Report

Professor Sedra welcomed Dr. Mary Barrie, Director, and Mr. John Rawle, Chief Financial Officer, School of Continuing Studies, and Ms Cristina Oke, Assistant Vice-Provost, Professional Faculties.

Professor Sedra reported that the budget revenue projected for the School of Continuing Studies (SCS) for 1999-2000 was \$7.5 million. The revenue received to date was \$7.2 million. This amounted to 94% of projected revenue. This was a major achievement for the School. In the previous year SCS had achieved only 56% of anticipated revenue. SCS had budgeted for 11,500 registrants in 1999-2000; up to December 13, 1999 they had had 10,800 registrants. At this time in the previous year SCS had had 8,000 registrants. Based on the number of registrants to date it was expected that in 1999-2000 there would be a total of approximately 14,800 registrants. This was a substantial increase over the previous year and was greater than planned.

The total accumulated deficit at the end of last year was \$2 million. SCS had a financial plan in place that would retire the debt and produce an accumulated surplus of \$350,000 by 2003-2004. A surplus of \$230,000 was expected for the current year. Assuming that registrations would grow to 13,800 per year by 2003-04, which was less than anticipated

3. Senior Assessor's Report (cont'd.)

for the current year, SCS would see a small surplus by 2003-04. The entire surplus in any given year would be used to pay down the accumulated debt. This left no funds to invest in new programs. As time progressed and the debt was alleviated the plan would be reassessed. These financial data would serve as a baseline position for the School of Continuing Studies as it entered into discussions with the Faculty of Arts and Science regarding becoming the continuing education division of the Faculty.

A member asked if the increased enrolment at SCS could be accounted for by the decrease in part-time enrolment at Woodsworth College. Professor Sedra noted that SCS courses were non-credit. As Woodsworth offered degree courses, the two units served different clientele. Dr. Barrie stated that she was not aware of any trend in that direction.

A member asked for clarification on the demographics of students attending SCS. In what direction was SCS programming anticipated to go in the future? Professor Sedra noted that the University did not track the demographics of SCS students with the same comprehensiveness that degree students were tracked; however, Dr. Barrie would be able to provide some information. Dr. Barrie noted that as she understood the SCS student profile, the students held a variety of degrees, and the population was moving in the direction of life-long learners. The SCS students were generally of two groups: the first attended to pursue an interest, and the second attended to obtain skills enhancement for their careers.

The Chair asked if there would be a philosophical change in the program offerings at SCS after it became a division within the Faculty of Arts and Science? Professor Sedra stated that SCS might offer some specialized non-credit classes for the benefit of Faculty of Arts and Science students. Dr. Barrie noted that SCS would offer a larger array of subject matter.

A member noted that, historically, the registration volume at SCS had been cyclical in nature. Was SCS currently experiencing an upturn in registrations? Secondly, was the University providing any hidden subsidies to SCS? Professor Sedra said that there were no hidden subsidies provided to SCS. He noted that SCS paid overhead costs to the University in addition to paying off its accumulated debt. In regard to the cyclical nature of enrolment at SCS, he agreed that this was of concern. He noted that the low registration in 1998-1999 could have been due in part to the instability of the Asian economy. He stated that approximately 40% of registrants at SCS were in the English as a Second Language (ESL) program. He also noted the poor performance of the Canadian economy as a possible contributing factor. Professor Sedra said that the challenge was to work out a plan that incorporated the cyclical demand for SCS offerings.

A member asked how SCS compared to other continuing education programs in North America. Was there growth potential for SCS? Dr. Barrie affirmed that there was. She noted that it was difficult to determine which school of continuing studies in a North American university would provide the benchmark for such programs. The demographics of SCS would change with the demographic changes in the population. It was planned that SCS would expand geographically, with an extended presence on the suburban campuses.

In answer to a question Professor Sedra said that SCS was not eligible to apply for funding from the Academic Priorities Fund (APF) based on the terms of reference for the Fund. Professor McCammond noted that SCS did not contribute to the APF.

A member was concerned that the drop in registrations to the English as a Second Language program might indicate that the students who would normally participate were

3. Senior Assessor's Report (cont'd.)

unable to for financial reasons. He recommended that the administration consider including financial support for SCS in its future plans. Another member asked if the drop in ESL registrants might be a result of immigration policy? Professor Sedra noted that SCS did not compete with other ESL programs such as those offered by the Toronto Board of Education. The students registered in the SCS ESL program had come to Canada specifically to learn English.

A member was concerned over the suggestion that the University provide funding support for SCS. It was his impression that it was the University's policy that continuing education was provided on a cost-recovery basis. The professional faculties' continuing education programs were also cost-recovery. He recommended that until such time as there were sufficient funds to support degree programs, the University should not subsidize continuing education.

4. Capital Project: Gerstein Science Information Centre - Phase 2

The Chair welcomed Ms Joan Leishman, Director of the Gerstein Science Information Centre.

The Chair noted that under its terms of reference the Planning and Budget Committee was asked to consider major changes to the scope of, or sources of funding for, approved projects. In this case, the Committee was being asked to recommend approval of a change in the scope of Phase 2 of the Gerstein Science Information Centre, to provide more study space in the East Addition and Renovation.

Professor McCammond reminded members that in May 1999 the Committee had recommended approval in principle of a Users' Committee Report which described a significant expansion and refurbishment of the Gerstein Science Information Centre at an estimated cost of approximately \$20 million. The work was separated into seven phases with external funding to be sought from private and government sources. The first phase, renovation of the entrance hall and café, had just been completed; the remaining phases were to be implemented as funding was acquired.

Professor McCammond explained that the University had received a private donation to fund 40% to a maximum of \$5.6 million, of the cost of Phase 2 of the project, the East Addition and Renovation. The Users' Committee report anticipated an addition of 23,600 gross square feet (gsf), the provision of 352 new study spaces and an increase in stack capacity of 4,939 shelves. The addition would act as an organizing element for the building to address way-finding issues and to provide vertical and horizontal connections. The cost of Phase 2 was originally estimated at \$8.24 million. On the advice of Library staff and after consultation with the donor, the University proposed an increased scope for Phase 2 to provide 31,000 gsf with a significant increase in study space to add an additional 400 user seats over what was originally proposed. The estimated cost of the revised Phase 2 was \$12 million.

The complete Gerstein Science Information Centre project had been submitted to the Government of Ontario's SuperBuild Growth Fund as a component of the Health Science Complex Phase 2 Project. Professor McCammond noted that the donor was keen that the University move forward with the project while it searched for other funds. Therefore, he was bringing to the Committee the proposal that any shortfall be allocated from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund (UIIF). Professor McCammond had distributed

4. Capital Project: Gerstein Science Information Centre - Phase 2 (cont'd.)

at the meeting, a table displaying the allocations approved by the Committee from the UIIF for 1999-2000, including the Flavelle House and the Gerstein Science Information Centre, together with the unallocated balance in the Fund to the end of the planning period.

Professor Sedra made note of the importance of increasing student study space on campus, which was currently inadequate. The *Raising Our Sights* planning paper identified study space as a priority. The administration was pleased to have the support of a donor for this initiative.

Invited to comment, Ms Leishman explained that this proposal provided not only for increased study space but also for upgraded study space that included wiring for computers. This would benefit students given the changing requirements of programs. She said that it was hoped that construction would begin at the end of the summer of 2000 with an anticipated one-year construction period.

A member asked if funding sources recognized a separation in funds allocated for libraries and those allocated for study space, or were they funded as one and the same? Professor McCammond answered that the SuperBuild Growth Fund was intended to fund academic space. The member asked for information on plans to improve study space across all three campuses. Professor Sedra stated that there was a recognized need for increased study space on the suburban campuses. He suggested that if enrolment expansion were to occur, particularly on the suburban campuses, an opportunity would be available to increase study space.

The member asked if study space could be included in the residence expansion plans. Professor McCammond said that the member's comment seemed to suggest that the cost of accommodation be used to fund study space. He noted that the prevailing impression was that study space should be centrally funded. A member asked if it was incompatible to include study space in residences. He also had concerns about accessibility to study space, in the Library, in particular. Ms Leishman noted that currently students did not have adequate accessibility to the "heritage stacks." She noted that accessibility to these stacks would be addressed in a later phase of the plan. Phase 4 of the plan would provide a new elevator and complete renovations to the historical stacks that would improve physical facilities and barrier-free access to all stack levels for all users.

A member asked if the costs were lower than anticipated, would the remaining portion of the 40% donation be lost. Professor McCammond answered in the affirmative.

A member asked if the plans to construct an extension to the Gerstein Science Information Centre included provisions to improve the quality of the environment for the preservation of books. Ms Leishman noted that there had been extensive upgrades to the HVAC system in the building bringing the environmental quality and control up to standard. It was planned that there would be further significant environmental improvements in the additional phases. She noted that the standards would not be of a quality to hold rare books, but to house the collection in use.

4. Capital Project: Gerstein Science Information Centre - Phase 2 (cont'd.)

On the recommendation of the Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the revised scope of Phase 2 of the Users' Committee Report for the Gerstein Science Information Centre approved on May 17, 1999 as described in Professor McCammond's memorandum dated December 2, 1999, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "A," at an estimated cost of \$12 million to be derived from the SuperBuild Growth Fund, private donations, and the University Infrastructure Investment Fund, be approved; and

THAT as funding is received from the SuperBuild Growth Fund and private donations, any shortfall be met by an allocation of not more than \$7 million from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund.

The Chair noted that the motion was carried unanimously.

5. Capital Project: Flavelle House - Interim Users' Committee Report

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

The Chair noted that the Committee considered reports of users' committees and recommended to the Academic Board approval in principle of projects. The four elements it made its recommendations on were: site, space plan, cost, and sources of funds. In the present case, the Committee was also being asked to recommend approval of expenditures from the UIIF.

Professor McCammond reported that the Faculty of Law had been awarded funding from the Ontario Research and Development Challenge Fund (ORDCF) for the implementation of the Center for Innovation. This Centre aimed to be one of the top centres for inter-disciplinary research, analysis and policy advice on innovation law and policy, in the world. The Centre would serve as the focal point for collaborative research and debate on innovation law and policy that involved the world's leading academic experts, business managers, and professional advisers and policy makers. The funds for the Centre provided from the ORDCF and supplemented by private and university matching funds would provide the Centre with an internationally competitive resource base.

The Flavelle House attic, currently unfinished and unoccupied space, was proposed to house 12 faculty offices accommodating 14 workstations. Planned elevator upgrades, also included in this proposal, would make this space fully accessible. The project cost for the attic renovation was estimated at \$2,140,000. Partial funding had been provided from the ORDCF in the amount of \$600,000, and the University proposed to allocate \$600,000 from the UIIF. The Faculty of Law would provide the remaining \$940,000.

A member asked how this proposal coincided with the Faculty's future capital plans? Professor Daniels said that the recommendation of the Interim Report of the Users' Committee proposed that the Flavelle House be renovated to function as useable space to accommodate faculty. At the same time there needed to be accessibility modifications. The Faculty did not have final plans. However, at this point this proposal was consistent with the other space concerns the Faculty was addressing. The Faculty of Law would be

5. Capital Project: Flavelle House - Interim Users' Committee Report (cont'd.)

recruiting internationally for faculty for the Centre for Innovation. It was vital to have office space available to house them.

The member asked if there was a comparison done between the cost of renovating the Flavelle House and the cost of new construction. Professor McCammond said that the estimate for new construction was \$4000 per net square meter. Therefore, the cost of new construction for the equivalent space would be approximately \$2.4 million.

On the recommendation of the Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the Interim Report of the Users' Committee for the Attic Renovation, Flavelle House, dated December 2, 1999, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "B," be recommended for approval in principle at a cost of \$2.14 million, with the sources of funds as described in Professor McCammond's memorandum dated December 2, 1999; and

THAT an allocation of \$600,000 from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund, be approved.

The Chair noted that the motion was carried unanimously.

6. Capital Project: Heart and Stroke/Richard Lewar Centre of Excellence for Cardiovascular Research - Users' Committee Report

The Chair welcomed Professor Cecil Yip, Vice Dean, Research, of the Faculty of Medicine.

Professor McCammond reported that the total project cost was estimated at \$1,474,000. Funding for the project was already in hand and had been provided by donations from the Lewar family and the Ontario Heart and Stroke Foundation. In addition, the Centre was a component of an institutional proposal to the Canada Foundation for Innovation (CFI). Included in the budget of this proposal was 40% of the cost of renovation and equipment for the Centre. If the CFI approved the proposal, an additional 40% of the cost would be expected from the ORDCF, which would reduce the cost of the renovation to be borne by the Centre to 20% of the total estimated cost.

Professor McCammond noted that the Heart and Stroke/Richard Lewar Centre of Excellence for Cardiovascular Research (Lewar/HSFO Centre) would be housed on the first basement level of the FitzGerald building, located adjacent to the Medical Sciences building and the planned Centre for Cellular and Biomolecular Research (CCBR). The Lewar/HSFO Centre would be well situated to assist in the cross-fertilization of research and analysis with the health sciences complex.

Invited to comment, Professor Yip reported that the Centre had been successful in both its CFI and ORDCF funding proposals, which left only 20% to be funded by the Lewar/HSFO donation. From an academic and research perspective, this was the beginning of the physical and interdisciplinary links between CCBR and the Centres. The links built by these disciplines would have a major positive impact on the Faculty of Medicine. In answer to a question, Professor Yip noted that the Centre would be fully accessible at the street level.

6. Capital Project: Heart and Stroke/Richard Lewar Centre of Excellence for Cardiovascular Research - Users' Committee Report (cont'd.)

A member noted that the University had recently lost a donation that had been projected as part of the funding for the CCBR. Would this loss have any negative consequences for the Lewar/HSFO Centre? Professor Yip noted that the CCBR had received funds from other sources, including the CFI. Funding for the project was secure. The Lewar/HSFO Centre was a separate project from the CCBR and would go forward. He noted that the funding of the Lewar/HSFO Centre was likely to have a positive impact on funding opportunities for the CCBR. He noted that it was anticipated that the provincial government would make a commitment to the project.

The member asked if, that by accepting this funding, the University would be required to provide a match from the operating funds. Professor McCammond said that was not the case with the Lewar/HSFO Centre, which was a separate project from the CCBR. The funding for the Lewar/HSFO Centre was committed.

Professor Munroe-Blum noted that approximately 75% of the funding for the CCBR project had been assured. The remaining small shortfall would be made up with donations through the Campaign, and/or research partnerships. A member noted that the Lewar/HSFO Centre was a stand-alone project that did not commit the University to the construction of the CCBR. Professor Munroe-Blum reiterated that the project could go ahead independently of the CCBR, although the University was equally committed to the CCBR.

On the recommendation of the Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the Users' Committee Report, dated December 1999, for the Lewar/HSFO Centre, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "C," be approved in principle at a cost of \$1.47 million, with funding to be provided by donations from the Lewar family, the Ontario Heart and Stroke Foundation, and funds obtained from the Ontario Research and Development Challenge Fund, and the Canada Foundation for Innovation.

The Chair noted that the motion was carried unanimously.

7. Varsity Stadium and Adjacent Sites: Future Development

The Chair noted that Professor McCammond had introduced this item at the November 18, 1999 meeting. Mr. Eamonn McKernan, from the Graduate Students' Union, had then addressed the Committee on the item. The item was being brought forward for further discussion.

A member commended the recommendations in the discussion paper. He suggested that an open discussion with the community adjacent to the University could yield some further suggestions for acquiring funding for the project. He did not support the inclusion of commercial property. He recommended incorporating public housing into the project as a means of drawing government funding. He expressed concerns that students would be asked to help fund the Varsity Stadium site project; he predicted that a referendum to that effect would fail. Athletic facilities were integral to student needs. The inclusion of cultural space in the project might draw public funds. Could the incorporation of study space in the residences qualify them for funding from the SuperBuild Growth Fund?

7. Varsity Stadium and Adjacent Sites: Future Development (cont'd.)

A member noted that the University was working to obtain funding from both public and private sources. He agreed that the government should assume the costs of the construction of the site. He said that the University community had expressed the importance of having athletic facilities on the site. There was a great deal of pressure to follow through on the development of the site and the Users' Committee would work with students, colleagues, and all members of the University community, to establish the priorities for the site. He stated that it might be required to seek support for a student referendum through the University Affairs Board (UAB); the preferred strategy, however, was not to seek a referendum. The Users' Committee members were sensitive to the financial needs of students. He strongly supported the establishment of the task force on graduate student funding. From his standpoint it was important to move forward with the first stages of the project rather than wait until all the problems were solved. He noted that the University had a very diverse student population. Some students supported users' fees while others strongly objected to them. It would be difficult to follow a policy that would appease all members of the student body.

A member noted that the Varsity Stadium project had a very high profile while the facilities on the suburban campuses, particularly at the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM), which had been sorely inadequate for twenty-five years, received little attention. Professor Sedra agreed that the athletic facilities at UTM were unsatisfactory. He noted that should the University move forward with enrolment expansion, an opportunity might arise to address the issue. Another member reiterated that there was a lack of facilities on the suburban campuses. He suggested that the administration focus on public funding and not create a two-tiered system to be decided at the user level.

A member asked for information on the planned time-line for the Varsity Stadium site proposal, and if the Users' Committee had been struck. Professor McCammond noted that a consultant would be hired to produce a conceptual design for the entire site that included Varsity Stadium and the Bloor-Devonshire Precinct. After that plan had been presented to the administration, a users' committee would be struck for the Varsity Stadium site.

Professor Sedra reminded members that Dr. John Dimond was the coordinator of the project integrating residences, athletic facilities and student activity space. It was intended that the resulting construction on the Varsity site would highlight Bloor Street as the northern border of the campus and provide an appropriate entrance. There were still many opportunities for consultation on the needs of the University community regarding the site. A member noted that he would be pleased to make available to members on request, a draft report on recommendations for athletic facilities.

8. Capital Plan: Submission to the SuperBuild Growth Fund

The Chair noted that the Committee was responsible for monitoring capital planning activities and recommended to the Academic Board on individual capital projects.

Professor McCammond reported that the Committee would be informed on all developments with regard to the SuperBuild Growth Fund. He briefly summarized the projects that had been included in the November 12, 1999 application to the Fund. These included the following:

- (i) The Centre for Information Technology would house the St. George campus component of the Access to Opportunities Program (ATOP) expansion in Computer Science and high demand areas in Engineering together with a number of

8. Capital Plan: Submission to the SuperBuild Growth Fund (cont'd.)

ORDCF/Ontario Innovation Trust (OIT)/CFI supported research programs. The research programs would constitute the Advanced Technologies Research Facility (ATRF).

- (ii) The Health Sciences Complex would include two new buildings adjacent to the existing Medical Sciences building. One of the new buildings would accommodate the five research platforms that made up the Centre for Cellular and Biomolecular Research (CCBR). The second building would provide expanded facilities for the Faculty of Pharmacy.
- (iii) The Health Sciences Complex Phase 2 would see enrolment increases in the Faculty of Nursing accommodated by the renovation of the existing Nursing Building. The Departments of Occupational and Physical Therapy would be relocated to the Banting Institute, with increased enrolments.

The Gerstein Science Information Centre, as the health science library for the faculties of Dentistry, Medicine, Nursing, and Pharmacy, would require expanded facilities to accommodate the increased enrolment in the health sciences.

- (iv) The Munk Centre for International Relations would provide a focus for the many activities in international studies at the University. Provincial government funding was still being requested for the project.
- (v) The Academic Resource Centre at the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTS) involved the expansion of the existing library, information commons and computing facility, and the construction of a suite of electronic classrooms at UTS.
- (vi) The Faculty of Arts and Science required classroom space for large lecture sections of courses. A new facility would alleviate the need to use Convocation Hall or the OISE/UT auditorium, neither of which was designed for use as a classroom.
- (vii) The Psychology Teaching and Research Centre would provide the Department of Psychology with needed facilities. The University was seeking the Ministry's support for the transfer of the Addiction Research Foundation (ARF) building to the University once it was made redundant to the needs of the ARF.

In answer to a question Professor McCammond noted that the University could expect to be informed of the results of its application early in 2000.

A member asked if users' committees had campus accessibility as part of their mandate. Professor McCammond noted that accessibility was included in the users' committees mandates; he drew particular attention to the committees for the CCBR and the CIT. The member requested that accessibility issues be formally identified in users' committees terms of reference. The Chair suggested that the member provide the Governing Council Secretariat with a document stating his recommendations, for consideration by the agenda planning group of the Planning and Budget Committee.

A member asked about the Physical Planning and Design Advisory Committee (PPDAC). Was there a general principle on accessibility that would inform decisions across all sites? The Chair noted that the member and he both sat on the Committee and they would ensure it was included in the mandate. Professor McCammond noted that all new buildings were required to be accessible and in all renovations accessibility was a prime priority. If

8. Capital Plan: Submission to the SuperBuild Growth Fund (cont'd.)

accessibility had not been included in a project it was likely the result of prohibitive cost in relation to the overall cost of the project.

A member asked if the Committee would receive a more detailed copy of the University's submission to the SuperBuild Growth Fund. Professor McCammond noted that the format of the application to the Fund was a formal template that required very precise yet limited information on such things as student demand, community impact, and a summary of costs. The member noted that the submission did not request funds for the support of student enrolment expansion. Did the University of Toronto know what comprised the submissions from other universities? Professor McCammond said that the University's submission was based on the current need for construction to accommodate the current student complement. The submission had addressed some potential enrolment expansion in the Faculties of Pharmacy and Nursing, the Departments of Occupational and Physical Therapy, as well as at University of Toronto at Scarborough, and University of Toronto at Mississauga. The government implied that this was the first installment for the SuperBuild Growth Fund. It was anticipated that the second installment would provide support for enrolment expansion. Professor McCammond noted that other provincial universities were making their submissions based on the same premise.

9. Items for Information

(a) Users' Committee - Membership and Terms of Reference

Professor McCammond informed the Committee that Mr. Julian Binks, rather than Mr. Jack Alexander, was a member of the Users' Committee for Student Residence Expansion at University College.

A member noted that the terms of reference included the following:

3. Identify effects to existing intramural and intercollegiate athletic facilities and in consultation with the Faculty of Physical Education and Health and Hart House, identify the space plan for the reconstructed facility.

The member suggested that the Users' Committee needed a member from the Faculty of Physical Education and Health. He proposed that Ms Liz Hoffman, Assistant Dean, Programs, of the Faculty of Physical Education and Health be included on the Users' Committee.

A member suggested that an open forum on residence expansion at the University, to which community members were invited, could provide helpful suggestions for addressing issues. Professor Perron, Principal of University College, responded that wide consultation with community members was part of the planning process for the University College residence expansion. In answer to a question Professor Perron noted that the size of the residence had not yet been determined. The size of the residence building, which could provide approximately 350 beds, would be determined by taking into account the necessary critical mass and the effect on surroundings.

In answer to another question Professor Perron noted that underground parking was not in the terms of reference of this Users' Committee. He noted that in a meeting with Miss Janice Oliver, Assistant Vice-President, Operations and Services, the costs and feasibility of including underground parking in this residence plan had been discussed. A member asked if the terms of reference should necessarily include a provision to consider

9. Items for Information (cont'd.)

(a) Users' Committee - Membership and Terms of Reference (cont'd.)

parking. Professor Perron noted that in this case the cost of creating and maintaining underground parking would be considerably higher than the cost of maintaining the current surface parking. Professor McCammond suggested that there was a possibility that underground parking could be incorporated into other projects, such as the construction of large classroom facilities.

A member asked if student study space could be incorporated in the residence expansion. He said that this would allow for greater integration of students. He noted that other universities provided this type of facility. Another member noted that the need for student study space was implicit in the terms of reference.

A member drew attention to the needs of commuter students. There was a need to address the issue of campus services. Professor Perron agreed that improvements to campus services should be addressed. Student residence fees were based on the amortized cost of the building. He questioned how student services in residences could be funded without passing the costs on to the students living in the residence. He welcomed any suggestions as to ways to fund improvements to campus services. Another member noted that he was in support of separate funding sources for separate categories of student needs. Professor McCammond noted that parking facilities would not be funded from the same sources that funded residence expansion.

A member noted that classrooms and residences were academic space. This space should provide opportunities for increased government funding. He stated that there was public interest in housing students. Perhaps this could be used as a leverage to obtain government funding. Professor McCammond stated that the SuperBuild Growth Fund would not fund residences. He suggested that the government was in support of residence expansion, but had not contributed to it financially.

A member made two comments. Firstly, it was important to move forward with residence expansion, including other related issues, such as student study space and expanding potential funding sources, could bring a project to a halt. Residence expansion was an academic priority at the University of Toronto. Secondly, he recommended that the University guard its decision-making independence. He was reluctant to see a concerted call to bring a broadly-defined community group into the decision-making process of this independent institution. A member responded to his second concern by noting that while it was true that the University was an independent body, the University was also situated in the heart of a highly populated major urban centre. The University needed the cooperation of the city and the support of its neighbours for its expansion plans. Building impacted on the lives of people in the community and it was important to have a consultative process that kept interested parties informed.

A member noted that in a meeting with the Students' Administrative Council (SAC), the Graduate Students' Union (GSU) and the Association of Part-Time Undergraduate Students (APUS) the groups had expressed an interest in participating in the residence planning discussions. Professor McCammond noted that each users' committee had student representatives included on it. The member was concerned that student members of users' committees be representative of all the various students constituencies at the University. A member noted that Professor John Browne, Director, Residence Development would be addressing global issues and special needs. All users' committees would be informed by the overall framework and information provided by the advisory

9. Items for Information (cont'd.)

(a) Users' Committee - Membership and Terms of Reference (cont'd.)

committee on Residence Development, on which sat representatives of the various student governments.

(b) New Proposals - Resource Implications

1. Master of Science in the Biomedical Communications Program (MScBMC)
2. Master of Urban Design in the Faculty of Architecture, Landscape, and Design (MUD)
3. Master of Urban Design Studies in the Department of Geography/ Planning (MUDS)
4. New Field in Urban Design in the existing MScPl Program in Planning in the Department of Geography

Professor McCammond reported that there were no additional resource implications for these program proposals.

10. Date of Next Meeting - Tuesday, February 1, 2000 at 5:00 p.m.

11. Other Business

A member asked for information on the task force on graduate student funding. Professor Sedra noted that the task force was being assembled. The Provost's office had been in discussion with the GSU regarding the membership of the task force. The task force would assess the gap between current graduate funding, and the goal recommended two years ago in the report of the Task Force on Tuition and Student Financial Aid to provide all doctoral stream students with full support for four years. Some of the issues that would come under discussion would include post-program fees and whether or not to reinstate them, and the costs associated with the proposal. Professor Sedra would send out a memorandum upon the formation of the task force.

The meeting adjourned at 7:10 p.m.

Secretary
December 21, 1999

Chair