

**UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO**  
**THE GOVERNING COUNCIL**  
**REPORT NUMBER 55 OF**  
**THE PLANNING AND BUDGET COMMITTEE**

**November 18, 1999**

To the Academic Board,  
University of Toronto.

Your Committee reports that it met on Thursday, November 18, 1999, at 4:00 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, with the following members present:

Professor David Mock (In the Chair)  
Professor J. Robert S. Prichard, President  
Professor Adel Sedra,  
Vice-President and Provost  
Professor Michael Finlayson,  
Vice-President, Administration and  
Human Resources  
Professor Derek McCammond,  
Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget  
Professor Carl Amrhein  
Mr. Brian Burchell  
Dr. John Challis  
Professor Raymond Cummins  
Professor Ruth Gallop  
Professor Avrum Gotlieb  
Mr. Arvin Hariri  
Professor Susan Horton  
Professor Bruce Kidd  
Professor Michael Marrus  
Mr. Elan Ohayon

Professor Paul Perron  
Ms Nancy Reid  
Professor Fred Wilson  
Mr. Vilko Zbogar

**Non-Voting Assessors:**

Professor Carolyn Tuohy, Deputy  
Provost

**Secretariat:**

Ms Patti Seaman, Secretary  
Ms Susan Girard

**Regrets:**

Professor Ronald Venter (Vice-Chair)  
Ms Jacqueline Orange  
Ms Wendy Talfourd-Jones  
Ms Judith Wilson

**In Attendance:**

Mr. Chris Borst, Graduate Students' Union  
Mr. Louis Charpentier, Secretary of the Governing Council  
Professor Gail Donner, Dean, of the Faculty of Nursing  
Dr. Beata FitzPatrick, Assistant Provost  
Ms Rosanne Lopers-Sweetman, Assistant Dean, Faculty of Nursing  
Mr. Eamonn McKernan, Graduate Students' Union

THE MEETING WAS HELD IN OPEN SESSION. ALL ITEMS ARE REPORTED FOR INFORMATION.

1. Report of the Previous Meeting

The Chair noted that the sentence, "An allocation of \$14,515,647 for the University's OFRF/UIIF/ADF Infrastructure Plan for 1999-2000," as listed on page 2 under Business Arising, (a) Summer Executive Authority, would be removed from the report.

Report Number 54 (October 19, 1999) was approved.

2. Business Arising

Item 11: *Expanding Residence Capacity at the University of Toronto*

The Chair noted that he had discussed potential residence expansion on site 4, behind the Robarts Library, with Ms Carole Moore, Chief Librarian, as requested by a member. Ms Moore had responded to the Chair that a consultative process would occur and it was reasonable to anticipate that library needs would be part of the discussion and any eventual plans.

Professor Sedra added that he had met with Ms Moore, Professor John Browne, Director, Residence Development, and Professor Brian Merrilees, Acting Principal, Innis College, to discuss residence expansion. He noted that there were many attractive possibilities for site 4 that could include building residential space, library storage space, and a film viewing/lecture theatre. He would send a memorandum to the Committee reporting on this discussion.

A member noted that capital expansion at the University of Toronto had been debated in a public forum that he and other members of the Committee had attended. The University's community relations could potentially have a material effect on the success of capital plans. Another member underlined the need to have public consultation as part of the process of capital renewal. He emphasized that he did not advocate shared decision-making, but rather, open dialogue with interested parties. A third member noted that broad-based consultation was positive. He reminded members of past controversy over the Robarts Library.

3. Senior Assessor's Report

Professor Sedra reported on the following:

Provincial government relations report. Professor Sedra noted that an article in *The Toronto Star* on November 17 had stated that the provincial government planned to make further budget reductions to schools and universities. The President had been in consultation with the provincial government and would report on its plans later in the meeting.

Academic planning. Divisions were submitting their academic plans to the Provost's Office. Professor Sedra noted that he would be discussing these plans with deans in the next few weeks. A member asked why planning was going forward without budget allocations? Professor Sedra said that budget requests would be based on academic plans. Professor Sedra said that a member had suggested to him that an information session be

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

convened in order to clarify the planning process and framework. The Chair stated that an information meeting would be scheduled.

A member asked if the academic plans arriving in the Provost's Office had been approved by the various divisions' councils? Professor Sedra answered that the plans had been developed out of a comprehensive consultative process that in some cases involved the division councils. A member noted that the academic plan going forward from his college had been approved through the governance levels of his college council. The Chair noted that approval by the divisions' council was not a requirement.

A member understood that the academic plans for the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTS) were not going forward to the Provost's office at this time. Professor Sedra said that UTS, like all units, was required to do a self-study, and that he anticipated seeing the results of that study. He had agreed to delay the deadline for receipt of academic plans from the suburban campuses pending clarification of the issues surrounding enrolment expansion.

School of Continuing Studies (SCS). A merger, in which SCS would become a unit within the Faculty of Arts and Science, was currently under discussion. The financial situation for SCS was dramatically improved from the previous year. The Director of SCS was preparing a financial report for the Provost's Office with a plan to eliminate the SCS deficit within four years. It was important to start the merger process with a clear financial baseline. More information would be forthcoming at the next meeting.

A member noted that he had been under the impression that SCS would be phased out, not that it would merge with the Faculty of Arts and Science. Professor Sedra noted that SCS was not being phased out. SCS would become the continuing education arm of the Faculty of Arts and Science. The programming that would be offered would shift.

New Chair program. A member asked when the University would receive funds from the federal government initiative, *21<sup>st</sup> Century Chairs for Research Excellence*, and what the process for determining allocation of the chairs within this University would be? Professor Sedra answered that the federal government was working on the initiative and that more information was expected from the government in late December, 1999 or early January, 2000. Internal allocation of the chairs would be based both on academic plans, as well as strategic top-down planning. Since the academic plans were about to arrive in his office they probably would not take into account this recently announced program. A further process for allocating the chairs would be devised in due course.

Teaching assistant strike. A member noted that students and faculty colleagues were very concerned about a potential strike by University of Toronto teaching assistants. Professor Sedra explained that he had sent a letter to all faculty setting out the administration's position on the negotiations with CUPE 3902. This letter would be distributed to the Committee. Professor Sedra noted that at this juncture there was a strong possibility of a strike given that the parties were far from reaching agreement on some issues. The Union was requesting wage increases, tuition waivers, and new benefits totaling over \$12 million in base. To meet this demand would require a 4% base budget reduction for every academic unit in the University. The Union would be in a legal position to strike about December 2, 1999. In discussion with the deans who employed the majority of the teaching assistants, it was decided that if CUPE 3902 did go on strike, and a large majority of the teaching assistants were on strike, the University would refuse the offer of services by members of the bargaining unit. Academic and classroom procedures in the case of a strike, and procedures to follow if a disruption in the academic program

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

was declared, clarifying the procedures in the Grading Practices Policy, would be forthcoming.

A member suggested that the University's claims of poverty were not a credible basis for not meeting the demands of the teaching assistants. He believed that from his reading of the financial statements there were funds available to meet some of the demands of the teaching assistants. Professor Sedra said that he would be pleased to review the statements with the member. He also noted that the major item of contention was the demand for tuition waivers. It was not equitable to offer some graduate students tuition waivers and not others. The University was committed to providing improved support for all graduate students. The negotiations with the Union were intended to arrive at an agreement on a fair wage for teaching assistants. This was a separate issue from graduate student support.

4. Enrolment Expansion at the University of Toronto: Discussion Paper

The Chair noted that this item was for discussion and that no formal action was required of the Committee.

Professor Sedra introduced the discussion paper by noting that over the next decade the University of Toronto would be facing pressure to expand enrolment. This was an important issue and the University's response to it would have long-term effects. The University wished to respond to these pressures in a manner that would enhance its mission and preserve its essential character. It was necessary to consider carefully the conditions under which it would and would not be appropriate for the University to expand. The discussion paper on enrolment expansion was intended to provide the basis for a full discussion of the issues. No course of action was being proposed at the present time.

Professor Tuohy explained that the current discussion was taking place with a view to establishing a broad framework from which planning could ensue. She noted that there were three requirements for expansion. The University could expand only where expansion was funded, at the very least, through a commensurate increase in provincial operating grants on a full average cost basis and through capital funding for the necessary facilities. Second, expansion must be undertaken only in those areas in which it allowed for an improvement of the education experience. Third, the pattern of expansion must not yield large distortions in the overall balance across levels and areas of study. In most areas funding for quality improvement was also a necessary condition. The recently announced federal *21<sup>st</sup> Century Chairs for Research Excellence* program was a welcome initiative that would allow the University to begin to make improvements in the student:faculty ratio. The student:faculty ratio in Ontario was the highest of all the provinces. Professor Tuohy noted that the administration supported the approach adopted by the Council of Ontario Universities (COU) in developing models to project the operating funding necessary if Ontario universities were to meet the anticipated enrolment surge.

Professor Tuohy stated that adequate operating and capital funding was a necessary condition for expansion. It was also necessary that a plan be developed to ensure that the University of Toronto expand only in areas that could benefit from expansion and that the overall pattern of expansion did not distort the essential character of the University. The types of constraints to consider in developing a plan included what was termed "global optimization" problems. The scope of the individual disciplines could expand, which could lead to the establishment and maintenance of a critical mass. However, the overall effect of such disaggregated decisions could create diseconomies of scale leading to congestion,

4. Enrolment Expansion at the University of Toronto: Discussion Paper (cont'd.)

high density, and strains on service, and also lead to unintended changes in the balance across disciplines, programs, and campuses.

Professor Tuohy noted that at least three planes of possible expansion needed to be considered: expansion by campus, expansion by area of study, and expansion by level of program. Arguably, expansion on the suburban campuses could lead to significant improvements in regard to critical mass. Both the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM) and UTS were incomplete projects which the University could now be in a position to advance. The St. George campus was one of the largest campuses in North America; there might, however, be some space for partial expansion on the central campus as well. In broad terms the disciplinary divisions were evenly balanced at this time. It would thus be possible to make marginal changes without changing the essential character of the campus. These decisions needed to be made deliberately through discussions that took into account the consequences for centres, divisions, and programs. Expansion of the first-entry program enrolment on St. George, especially in the Faculty of Arts and Science, needed to take into account the implications for the college system. One of the central contributions of the colleges was to provide an academic community in the context of a large research-intensive university. The counseling and academic skills support, residential accommodation, communal student space, co-curricular activities, and other forms of support offered by the colleges would need to be expanded at least commensurately with the expansion of enrolment. Professional, second-entry, and graduate programs would also need to take such factors into account in any expansion.

Professor Tuohy drew members' attention to Table 6 which gave possible scenarios for (FTE) enrolment expansion. The first scenario assumed an expansion of UTM and UTS by 60% and the second scenario assumed expansion of 100%. Both scenarios assumed the University of Toronto took a share of projected enrolment increase proportionate to its 1997 share of Ontario undergraduate and graduate enrolment and distributed the increase across first-entry, second-entry and doctoral stream programs in proportion to current enrolments. These assumptions were provided for the purposes of discussion only.

The Chair said that he had given permission for Mr. Chris Borst, from the Graduate Students' Union (GSU), to address the Committee.

Mr. Borst said that the issues of enrolment expansion were serious and the Graduate Students' Union would be providing further input on the matters. He supported the position that the essential character of the University of Toronto as a large public research-intensive university should remain. He agreed that full public funding was an essential requirement for expansion. It was important to assess the opportunities and effects of expansion on the college programs, co-curricular activities, services, the student:faculty ratio, and other concerns. He recommended that the University ascertain whether or not provincial funding would have any conditions attached to it, as in targeted, or matched funds. Should the government prove unwilling to fully fund expansion, then no expansion should take place. Mr. Borst expressed concern over what appeared to be a shift in emphasis to increased graduate enrolment in divisions III and IV (physical sciences and life sciences) at the expense of divisions I and II (humanities and social sciences). A shift in the undergraduate enrolment would effect shifts in graduate enrolment. He did not support the deletion of the fifth year of high-school as a reason for eliminating the 3-year degree. Further, he was concerned about the quality of the student experience if graduate enrolment was expanded on the suburban campuses. Mr. Borst noted that an increased demand for university spaces from undergraduate, second-entry, professional, and graduate students was the best argument in favor of expansion.

4. Enrolment Expansion at the University of Toronto: Discussion Paper (cont'd.)

A member noted that he was in agreement that the basic balance and mission of the University not be disrupted. Enrolment expansion was a three-campus issue. He raised the concern that doubling enrolment on the suburban campuses would lead to a requirement for new faculty. Those faculty would expect to have graduate students as an integral part of their teaching responsibilities. Would this lead to duplication of research on the three campuses? Critical mass, even with increased enrolment, would not exist on the suburban campuses. Would this result in fractured and divided programs and the necessity of students and faculty travelling back and forth between campuses? Increased enrolment on UTM and UTS would not maintain the balance of the University as it existed at present.

A member drew attention to the diseconomy of scale of the three campuses. If enrolment at UTS was doubled it would still lack the critical mass to offer the appropriate quality of student experience in its graduate programs. She also noted that due to the size of UTS, undergraduate programs had been scaled down, and course offerings were limited. She was concerned that social sciences, management, and the physical sciences were expected to increase enrolment equally and yet the budget would be distributed unequally among the three areas. Would additional requests for funding be made to the *SuperBuild Growth Fund* to accommodate capital expansion?

Professor Sedra stated that at this stage of the process the discussion was concerned with principles and not plans. The University's submission to *SuperBuild* was treated as a first round of submissions, not as the final total. The top five capital projects that the Committee had previously seen had been submitted to *SuperBuild*. Included in the original submission was a small project for the UTS campus. In the next competition the University's submission would be based on expansion plans. He noted that UTM was planning a collaborative project with Sheridan College and that more information on this project would be available at the next meeting. The \$440 million in provincial funding for all Ontario universities was considered to be the first stage. The University would not undertake expansion without adequate provincial funding.

A member noted his concern over the intent not to upset the essential character of the University. The character of the University had arisen not from careful planning but was derived from its history. He cited the relationship with the federated universities through the Memorandum of Agreement as one of the events that affected the character of the University. He stated that it might or might not be concluded that the current balance was the appropriate one. He was concerned that enrolment numbers not be used as a basis for representing the essential character of the University. All students were only counted once, although many were engaged in cross-disciplinary study. In the last decade the University had deliberately engaged in a process of academic planning. Enrolment targets should not be determined by the number of entering students. Admission standards should remain the highest priority. He agreed that the status quo of the three campuses was not sustainable given the concerns expressed by the administration and faculty. He outlined two options for the suburban campuses. In the first instance, the suburban campuses could offer undergraduate and graduate programs, which given their critical mass, would require that they specialize rather than offer a full range of activity. The second option was to have the suburban campuses offer undergraduate programs only and restrict graduate activity to the St. George campus. This would have a determining effect on faculty hiring for each of the campuses. Currently faculty on all three campuses were expected to fulfill the same teaching, research, and supervisory requirements. He gave examples of universities that shared graduate programs noting that some were more and others, less, successful.

A member raised the issue of overall planning noting that the discussion paper provided a useful opportunity to consider global strategy. He had two areas of concern. There was an

4. Enrolment Expansion at the University of Toronto: Discussion Paper (cont'd.)

urgent need to look at the relationship between the three campuses in terms of co-curricular and non-academic services. It was necessary to link services between the campuses and this was an opportunity to rethink and improve them. He also stated that the University needed a mechanism to address the issue of optimal resource use from a University-wide perspective. If the deans were assessing expansion as regarded their own divisions, who would look at the global issues for the University? He was referring not only to services such as athletics and Hart House, but also to such concerns as the open space plan, the learning environment, and community relations issues. What mechanism could be put in place to assess the optimum density and campus integrity?

A member noted that the expansion of the 1960s was slow to focus on library needs. The Robarts Library was built later in the expansion process. He noted that if undergraduate expansion was to occur, new library resources would be needed. He questioned whether college libraries could also expand. He noted that the suburban campuses were created as a result of the expansion plans of the 1960s and questioned whether the University should be creating new colleges during the current expansion. Additional colleges with additional registrarial services could provide a more humane and collegial environment.

A member noted that the college principals were engaged in a self-study regarding the services that they provided students particularly under the new Memorandum of Agreement. He suggested that the colleges did not have adequate resources to provide an optimum level of service. The question of creating new colleges had been raised. Concerns such as how many colleges were required, where to locate the colleges, and how to transform space in terms of study needs, classrooms, and services were addressed. They had devised a scenario for distributing increased enrolment but the federated universities were autonomous bodies with their own statutes and councils. He noted that the debate was ongoing.

A member stated that the colleges varied in size. If all the colleges were expanded to the size of St. Michael's College the anticipated expansion could be accommodated. As of yet, it had not been determined what the optimum size for the colleges would be.

A member noted that most of the expansion was being planned for the suburban campuses. She suggested that the graduate and undergraduate programs for those campuses be carefully planned and that they may need to be more selective than the St. George campus. Further, a doubling of enrolment at the suburban campuses along with the attendant increase in faculty would put a huge burden on the administration of the campus. The administrative structure of the suburban campuses would need to be reconsidered.

A member praised the discussion paper for providing an opportunity to address the problems that existed. He stated that the development of UTM had not been completed. Critical mass was essential to offer full academic programs. In one case, the merger of a number of disciplines into the Biology Group had led to an increase in the productivity of the learning environment. He was concerned that should expansion occur, better communication between campuses and increased transit be facilitated.

A member asked that information on expansion and how the various issues were dealt with at other North American universities be made available where possible. He stated that it was vital that graduate teaching and research be an integral part of the suburban campuses. Increasing the infrastructure of the three campuses might facilitate this. To have undergraduate teaching only would be detrimental to students. His third concern was that expansion could lead to tension between the enrolment levels and quality of education. How was quality of education determined at the University? If the University were to

4. Enrolment Expansion at the University of Toronto: Discussion Paper (cont'd.)

expand, how would teaching, the faculty:student ratio, and admissions be improved? He noted that accessibility was of critical concern. A member noted the University of Toronto's role as a world-class public research institution. In the Faculty of Medicine there were faculty in the medical sciences on campus and approximately 4000 faculty in the affiliated teaching hospitals. Many medical science courses were taught to students in the Faculty of Arts and Science. Which Faculty would be responsible for the costs of expansion? He said that he was in support of summer teaching but noted that many faculty made use of that time to do research. Professor Sedra responded that if there was an increase in student enrolment, a subsequent increase would be made in the number of faculty. A member responded that discussions were ongoing. As a particular example he noted that it appeared that the program in human biology in the Faculty of Arts and Science was not expected to expand.

A member stated that increased communication and transportation was important for the development of the suburban campuses. A growth area of graduate study was in interdisciplinary research. Should St. George be the flagship campus with the suburban campuses as satellites? Would dispersal of programs be the result, and was this a desirable attribute? It would be helpful to have more information on smaller campuses and universities and whether they sustained viable graduate programs. A member responded that the University's essential character was based in part on its offering of a huge number of course options at both the undergraduate and graduate level.

The President thanked the members for their valuable comments and encouraged further debate. Professor Sedra agreed that expansion, if properly funded, provided an opportunity to make the suburban campuses more viable. He noted that a unified Ph.D. program with different aspects being delivered on each of the three campuses could be coordinated as to programs and transport.

5. President's Report

The President noted that he would report on four items related to the provincial government to the Committee: the leaked provincial government document as reported the previous day in *The Toronto Star*; the announcement by the chair of the management board; the university capacity issue; and private universities.

(a) Leaked provincial document.

The President noted that he did not have a copy of the document that had been reported in *The Toronto Star*. He did not know to what degree the claims of a new massive reduction to post-secondary education spending were accurate. If the cuts that had been cited were in fact introduced it would have devastating consequences for the University. However, given the nature of recent interactions with the Minister and senior officials within the Ministry, the leaked document was inconsistent with the information the Minister had given to the university Presidents.

(b) Announcement by the Management Board.

The government had announced earlier in the day that it would cut \$300 million in expenditures across various ministries to meet the government's goal of balancing the budget. The Minister stated that there would be a further reduction in the next year. In a conference call between the Presidents and the Deputy Minister, the President had received a strong message that universities and other transfer partners should negotiate collective



5. President's Report (cont'd.)

agreements with its employees that reflected those given to provincial government employees. The government would reduce payments to the universities by 0.2% in the coming year, 2000-2001. This would mean an \$800,000 reduction to the University of Toronto in the next funding year. The stated intention of the reduction was to encourage administrative efficiencies.

The provincial government was making the following changes to the Ontario Student Assistance Program (OSAP):

- **Default rate.** Currently if an institution's students had a default rate on their OSAP loans of more than 33%, the institution was required to contribute to the shortfall. Default rates at the University of Toronto were 8 to 9%; no university was above 20%. The default rate was now being lowered from 33% to 28.5%. The lowering of this threshold did not affect the University of Toronto given the University's very low default rate. This measure was being directed at other sectors of the post-secondary education community such as vocational schools and institutions where the default rate was considerably higher.
- **Income verification.** The province would verify student income claims with Revenue Canada. If there was a discrepancy between the student's reported income on their application to OSAP and that with Revenue Canada, such a discrepancy would trigger an investigation.
- **Credit Screening.** The province would tighten the screening of students' credit history. Students' credit ratings would influence their eligibility for OSAP. This point was worrisome to the President and would need careful monitoring in light of the University of Toronto's student aid policies.

The provincial government was reducing funding for specific training programs that did not have an effect on any universities. In addition, certain institutional grants would come to an end. In the University's case it was confirmed that the OISE/UT integration grant would be eliminated. This grant was coming to a natural end and this measure was not unexpected. As well, the Four Motors initiative launched ten years ago by the Province was being terminated.

(c) *Working Group on University Capacity.*

The President emphasized that the *Group* was focusing on the truly important issues that were the core concern of the University: quality education, multi-year funding, increased research support, and accessibility. The members had met with the Ministry to present the first phase of the plan. The University was awaiting a response from government regarding the transfer payment announcement in December 1999 and then further support in the spring budget in 2000. The President reiterated that the successful outcome on this file would negate any adverse impact from the 0.2% reduction announced by the government earlier in the day.

(d) *Private universities.*

The government was considering allowing private universities to operate in the province; this was currently denied under statute. The Smith Commission in 1996 recommended that not-for-profit private universities be allowed under strict conditions. The University took no stand on this matter in its submission before the Smith Commission. The conditions stated by the Smith report were as follows: the private universities should be required to be not-for-profit; they should receive no government funding; they should not exploit student assistance funds; and they should be required to undergo quality reviews at levels existent in the public universities. The University voted at the COU to support the conditions

5. President's Report (cont'd.)

outlined in the report of the Smith Commission. The President noted that electronic and web-based learning programs were already in existence, and cited federal government support of one such initiative in New Brunswick. The President noted that as long as the strict conditions were adhered to the University should focus its attention on the key issue - strong public funding for public universities.

A member stated that the University should not emulate the provincial government employment policies. He continued by noting that the changes to OSAP were problematic. The penalty for default shifted the responsibility from the government to the institution. He was concerned that institutions would be penalized for attempting to assist disadvantaged students. As to the issue of private universities, he noted that they were likely to create a two-tiered educational system and recommended that the report of the Smith Commission be reexamined carefully prior to commenting officially on this issue.

A member commented on the reduction of funding to promote administrative efficiencies. He stated that the administrative staff in his division worked very hard with dwindling resources.

A member asked for clarification of the "75% rule" on quality measures and program elimination.

The President responded to the members' questions and comments. He noted that at the time of the Smith Commission, consultations had taken place on all three campuses regarding private universities. A brief was circulated through the various levels of Governing Council. The University's focus at this time was not on the potential consequences of private universities but on maintaining adequate levels of public funding for public universities. As to the perception of the need for more administrative efficiencies, the President noted that regardless of previous funding reductions, the provincial government was of the view that reengineering and rethinking administrative operations required constant attention and improvement. The provincial government had redefined its commitment to healthcare and classroom funding. The President noted that more performance-based indicators had been introduced for the colleges. The public image was that the University was slow to move funds from low-demand to high-demand programs. The President did not agree that this was the case and anticipated that future performance assessments and quality measures would support his position.

6. Items for Information

Faculty of Nursing: Post-Master's Nurse Practitioner (NP) Diploma Program - Resource Implications.

The Chair suggested that the order of the agenda be changed to ensure that the item on the Nurse Practitioner Diploma program would be addressed at this meeting. The Committee agreed.

The Chair welcomed Professor Gail Donner, Dean, of the Faculty of Nursing.

Professor McCammond noted that the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs had approved this program. It was a revision of the Post-Master's Acute Care Nurse Practitioner Certificate program which had been offered from 1994-98. It was a cost recovery program and as such did not require additional base budget resources. An institutional overhead charge was included in the expense budget.

6. Items for Information (cont'd.)

A member offered his support for the program, noting that it was a beneficial initiative, and the quality of the faculty was excellent.

7. Varsity Stadium and Adjacent Sites: Future Development

The Chair noted that this item was for discussion.

Professor McCammond noted that the current discussion paper established a context for an integrated planning approach to the development of the Varsity Stadium site and adjacent site on Bloor Street and Devonshire Place (Bloor-Devonshire precinct). It identified the main objectives of the planning exercise and the matters that should be considered as detailed plans were developed for future consideration. He noted that the new development was anticipated to have athletics facilities, student housing, and a modest amount of commercial space on Bloor Street. Dr. Jack Dimond, Secretary Emeritus of the Governing Council, had been engaged to coordinate the consultative process across the various constituents.

The Chair noted that he had agreed to Mr. Eamonn McKernan's request to speak to the Committee.

Mr. McKernan said that it was vital to have an open and pro-active consultation process. He reminded members that the community was interested in campus development and had an important contribution to make to the consultative process. On behalf of the GSU he reminded members first, that student housing was an urgent priority but cautioned that the development not move too quickly and that all aspects of the new development should be examined. Second, he reminded members that students were facing increasing costs for their education, in the areas of accommodation, fees, and incidental costs. Students would not be in support of paying additional costs or of development that resulted in a student levy. Even if the goal was to provide more student services, the students were not willing to carry the burden of additional costs.

The Chair, with the consent of the members, noted that the remainder of the discussion on Varsity Stadium and Adjacent Sites: Future Development, and the other agenda items, would be carried forward to the next meeting.

8. Date of Next Meeting - Tuesday, December 14 , 1999 at 5:00 p.m.

The meeting adjourned at 6:30 p.m.

---

Secretary  
November 18, 1999

---

Chair