

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

REPORT NUMBER 74 OF

THE PLANNING AND BUDGET COMMITTEE

September 21, 2001

To the Academic Board,
University of Toronto.

Your Committee reports that it met on Friday, September 21, 2001, 12:00 noon in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, with the following members present:

Professor Avrum Gotlieb (In the Chair)
Professor W. Raymond Cummins (Vice-Chair)
Professor Adel S. Sedra, Vice-President and Provost
Professor Derek McCammond,
Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget
Professor Carl Amrhein
Professor Philip Byer
Mr. Brian Davis
Professor Marc Gotlieb
Professor Paul Halpern
Ms. Shirley Hoy
Professor Bruce Kidd
Ms. Françoise Ko
Professor Ian McDonald

Professor Robert McNutt
Professor David Mock

Non-Voting Assessors:

Ms. Sheila Brown, Acting Chief Financial Officer
Mr. Louis Charpentier, Secretary of the Governing Council
Professor Ron Venter, Vice-Provost, Space and Facilities Planning

Secretariat:

Mrs. Beverley Stefureak, Secretary
Mr. Neil Dobbs

Regrets:

Professor Ruth Gallop
Professor Susan Horton
Mr. Kashif Pirzada
Mrs. Susan Scafe
Ms. Heather Schramm

In Attendance:

Dr. Sheldon Levy, Vice-President, Government and Institutional Relations
Miss Janice Oliver, Assistant Vice-President, Operations and Services
Ms. Rivi Frankle, Assistant Vice-President, Alumni and Advancement
Ms. Mary McGee, Assistant Provost

ITEMS 5 AND 6 ARE RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL.

1. Report of the Previous Meeting – Report Number 73, June 27, 2001

Report Number 73 of June 27, 2001 was approved.

2. Business Arising from the Previous Meeting

The Chair was aware of no business arising from the previous meeting. For the information of the Committee, he noted that one item recommended for approval at the

3. Business Arising from the Previous Meeting (cont'd)

June 27 meeting would not be going forward to the Academic Board. The Project Committee for the Pharmacy Building would be submitting a revised report which took into account some changes in scope and funding. The revised recommendation was expected to come before the Committee at its next meeting or in November.

3. Senior Assessor's Report

Professor Sedra welcomed members of the Committee, saying that this would be a pivotal year for the University of Toronto and that the Planning and Budget Committee would play a key role in its review of a number of proposals critical to the University.

Professor Sedra distributed: (a) a memorandum of May 31, 2001 from Minister Cunningham to Executive Heads on the 2001-02 University Operating Grant Allocations; (b) tables illustrating Fall 2001 registrations compared to Fall 2000 and Enrolment Expansion Funding per full-time equivalent student; and (c) a monitoring report of direct entry intake. This was supporting documentation to a report on the Working Group on Enrolment Expansion. He recalled that the May provincial budget had revealed the Government's agreement to provide, allocated over a three-year period, full average funding for undergraduate enrolment growth. This had been seen as a positive response to the proposals put forward by the Council of Ontario Universities working group to cope with what was expected to be dramatically increased demand for spaces in the university system.

The University of Toronto had immediately struck a working group whose guiding document was "A Framework for Enrolment Expansion at the University of Toronto". The Working Group had met nine times up to the end of July and would begin meeting again next week. The University decided to move quickly to assert its interest in expansion, and to be in a position to actualize its appropriate proportion of the increased funding. The University saw its share as \$5 million of a total \$20 million for undergraduate funding and \$1.9 million of \$5.8 million designated for graduate funding.

Professor Sedra drew attention to Table 2, Direct Entry Intake, which reported the Faculty-by-Faculty intake of undergraduate students this Fall. Registrations to date, estimated at 10,529, had exceeded the target for November 2001 by 1,378. The Enrolment Expansion Working Group recognized that there would be a significant bulge in enrolment on the St. George campus, until the suburban campuses were ready to accept increased numbers.

Professor Sedra reported that international enrolment was climbing steadily. Further, he noted a need for careful planning for and critical monitoring of professional masters' programs and other graduate enrolment. He assured the Committee that it would be kept informed as the Working Group proceeds.

4. Calendar of Business

The Chair referred to the draft Calendar of Business circulated with the documentation for the meeting, noting that the Calendar was a living document which would be updated regularly throughout the year as realistic scheduling for business was determined and/or new business arose.

5. Allocations: Academic Priorities and Enrolment Growth Funds

5.1 University of Toronto at Mississauga

Professor McCammond referred to Professor Sedra's memorandum of August 31, 2001 (attached as Appendix "A") that explained sources of funding for the Enrolment Growth Fund and the Academic Priorities Fund and the principles underlying allocations from these funds. The allocations proposed in the memorandum were to support increased enrolment expected in the Communication, Culture and Information Technology program at the University of Toronto at Mississauga. Professor McCammond noted that the table outlining Start-up Costs of Enrolment Expansion included those related to administrative staff to recruit faculty and students, but it did not include funding for extra faculty positions. Costs anticipated in the "Student Recruitment" category included Web development and brochures.

In response to a question, Professor McCammond indicated that one-time-only funding was proposed now with the expectation that the proposal for base funding would come forward later this academic year.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the following one-time-only allocations be approved to enable the University of Toronto at Mississauga to meet enrolment expansion needs in 2001-02:

- (a) \$800,000 one-time-only from the Enrolment Growth Fund to the University of Toronto at Mississauga;
- (b) \$609,000 one-time-only from the Academic Priorities Fund to the University of Toronto at Mississauga.

The Chair reported that the motion had been carried unanimously.

5.2 Victoria College Programs

Professor Sedra referred to his memorandum of September 4, 2001 (attached as Appendix "B") and explained that this was a proposal to complete the transfer of tenure/tenure-stream faculty members from the Federated Universities to the Faculty of Arts and Science. It involved two faculty members who, once resident in the Faculty, would contribute to graduate teaching and supervision in their Departments.

A member asked why the University would receive two-thirds of the faculty members' salaries rather than one hundred percent. Professor Sedra said this was a precedent set during earlier transfers and it was appropriate to follow the same formula but, more importantly, it respected the terms of the Memorandum of Agreement which vested the hiring and tenure of faculty members with the Departments rather than with the Federated Universities.

5. Allocations: Academic Priorities and Enrolment Growth Funds**5.1 Victoria College Programs** (cont'd)

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT a base budget allocation of \$110,140 from the Academic Priorities Fund to the Faculty of Arts and Science be approved in support of the Victoria University Programs in Renaissance Studies and in Literary Studies.

The Chair reported that the motion had been carried with one abstention.

6. Allocation: Academic Transitional Fund

Professor Sedra spoke to his memorandum of September 4, 2001 (attached as Appendix "C") outlining three requests totaling \$1.07 million to support the Departments of Chemistry and Astronomy and Astrophysics in the Faculty of Arts and Science, and Campaign Support to Divisions.

A member asked why divisional campaign support would not come out of the budget of Vice-President Dellandrea, stating that funds in the Academic Transitional Fund should, in his view, support savings in academic transition. Professor Sedra responded by noting that this proposal did, in fact, support academic spending and that the source for campaign expenses, including divisional ones, was a central budget and not that of the Vice-President and Chief Advancement Officer. He further noted that all of this proposed \$950,000 allocation would go to divisional spending for fund-raising. At the invitation of the Chair and Professor Sedra, Ms. Frankle added that although the Vice-President's Office, together with the President and the divisions, carried out the fund-raising, there were no central priorities for the campaign. All were divisional priorities.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the following allocations be approved:

- \$60,000 to the Faculty of Arts & Science for the purchase of microscale equipment by the Department of Chemistry;
- \$60,000 to the Faculty of Arts & Science for upgrading observatories by the Department of Astronomy and Astrophysics;
- \$950,000 for additional support to Divisional Campaign expenditures

The Chair reported that the motion had been carried unanimously.

7. Capital Projects: Project Committees – Membership and Terms of Reference

- 7.1 University of Toronto at Scarborough – Science Building
- 7.2 University of Toronto at Mississauga – Science Building
- 7.3 University of Toronto at Mississauga – Library
- 7.4 University of Toronto at Mississauga – New Collegeway Access to Campus
- 7.5 University of Toronto at Mississauga – Kaneff Centre Expansion
- 7.6 University of Toronto at St. George – Institute for Child Study

7. Capital Projects: Project Committees – Membership and Terms of Reference (cont'd)

Professor Venter spoke to the six items as a group, saying that they were each before the Committee for information and that each project would come back for approval when its Project Committee had formulated recommendations. He undertook to forward to Committee members a copy of the newly approved Policy on Capital Planning and Capital Projects and assured the Committee that accessibility would be a consideration in each of these capital projects.

Professor Venter noted that of the six, four were of the magnitude that the Committee reports would need governance approval. The other two – the Kaneff Centre and the New Collegeway Access to Campus at the University of Toronto at Mississauga – were such that they might fall below the \$2 million specified in the policy as the limit for approval by the Accommodations and Facilities Directorate (AFD). If that were the case, they would come to this Committee for information.

He confirmed that there were other Project Committees underway that would be reporting to the AFD soon. A member noted that recent legislation could have implications for the Institute for Child Study; Professor Venter indicated this would be taken under consideration to ensure that any requirements under the legislation would be met.

8. Approvals under Summer Executive Authority

(i) Capital Project: Execution of Projects Funded by SuperBuild and Facilities Renewal Program Funds

The Chair reported that one approval had proceeded under delegated Summer Executive Authority and invited Professor Ron Venter to review the item.

Professor Venter informed the Committee that the University had received \$13.3 million from SuperBuild and \$5.3 million from the Facilities Renewal Program and had sought authority to execute projects recommended by the Accommodation and Facilities Directorate for allocations from these funds. The projects were identified after consultation with the Faculties and Facilities and Services. He drew attention to the list of projects, some of which were time-sensitive and had been undertaken immediately following approval in early August. He noted that over \$2 million had been allocated to areas that the Committee had discussed repeatedly: \$1.05 million to disabled access and \$1.06 million to plant renewal and deferred maintenance at the University of Toronto at Mississauga. A member added that the upgrade to classroom space in Arts and Science – accounting for another \$250,000 expenditure -- had also made those rooms fully accessible and suggested that, since accessibility was a critical area for attention, it might be appropriate to notate each project that significantly improved accessibility on campus.

In response to a question, Professor Venter explained the process that led to approval of a project under the Accommodation and Facilities Directorate (AFD) and informed the Committee of the AFD membership. He recalled that the AFD had been expanded to include the Chair of the Standing Committee on Barrier-Free Accessibility to ensure that this was given due consideration in the allocation of funding and approval of projects.

The discussion closed with a member's comment that the process whereby Facilities and Services had worked with Arts and Science in identifying these projects had been very effective.

9. Date of Next Meeting

The Chair reminded members that the next regular meeting was scheduled for Tuesday, October 16, 2001.

10. Other Business

There was no other business.

The meeting adjourned at 1:45 p.m.

Secretary

Chair