

**THE GOVERNING COUNCIL**

**REPORT NUMBER 75 OF**

**THE PLANNING AND BUDGET COMMITTEE**

**November 13, 2001**

To the Academic Board,  
University of Toronto.

Your Committee reports that it met on Tuesday, November 13, 2001, 5:00 p.m. 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 Sedra, Vice-President and Provost  
Mr. Felix Chee, Vice-President, Business Affairs  
Professor Derek McCammond, Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget  
Professor Philip H. Byer  
Mr. Brian Davis  
Professor Ruth M. Gallop  
Professor Marc Gotlieb  
Professor Paul J. Halpern  
Professor Susan Horton  
Professor Bruce Kidd  
Professor Ian R. McDonald  
Professor Robert H. McNutt

Mr. Kashif S. Pirzada  
Ms. Heather C. Schramm  
Professor Victor R. Timmer

**Non-voting Assessors:**

Ms. Sheila Brown, Controller and Director of Financial Services  
Professor Ron Venter, Vice-Provost, Space and Facilities Planning

**Secretariat:**

Mr. Neil Dobbs  
Ms Susan Girard  
Ms. Cristina Oke  
Mrs. Beverley Stefureak, Secretary

**Regrets:**

Professor Carl Amrhein  
Ms. Shirley Hoy  
Ms. Francoise Ko  
Professor David Mock  
Mrs. Susan M. Scace

**In Attendance:**

Professor Sandford Borins, Chair, Division of Management, University of Toronto at Scarborough  
Dr. Luc De Nil, Acting Chair, Department of Speech-Language Pathology  
Professor Wayne Hindmarsh, Dean, Faculty of Pharmacy  
Dr. Sheldon Levy, Vice-President, Government and Institutional Relations  
Ms. Lesley Lewis, Assistant Vice-Provost  
Ms. Mary McGee, Assistant Provost  
Mr. Tom Nowers, Associate Principal, University of Toronto at Scarborough  
Miss Janice Oliver, Assistant Vice-President, Operations and Facilities  
Professor Helen Polatajko, Chair, Department of Occupational Therapy

**In Attendance** (cont'd)

Professor Edward Relph, Associate Principal for Campus Development, University of Toronto at Scarborough

Ms. Shirley Roll, Facilities Planner

Professor Jake J. Thiessen, Associate Dean, Faculty of Pharmacy

Professor Molly Verrier, Chair, Department of Physical Therapy

Dr. Catharine Whiteside, Associate Dean, Inter-Faculty and Graduate Affairs, Faculty of Medicine

**ITEMS 4 TO 11 INCLUSIVE ARE RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL.**

The Chair welcomed Professor Victor Timmer of the Faculty of Forestry as a new member. Professor Timmer had been appointed to the Committee by the Academic Board to replace Professor Nina Bascia who had resigned.

Professor Gotlieb informed the Committee that there had been a request to add to the Agenda a proposed allocation from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund for the construction of three additional floors to the Botany Soils Facility. On motion duly moved and seconded this item was added as a new number 10 following the other Capital Project items. Due to lack of time, it was later agreed to delay consideration of this item until the next meeting.

The Chair also welcomed a number of guests from the Faculties of Medicine and Pharmacy, and from the University of Toronto at Scarborough who were present to respond to questions about capital projects related to their areas.

**1. Report of Previous Meeting**

Report Number 74 of September 21, 2001 was approved

**2. Business Arising out of Report of Previous Meeting**

There was no business arising out of Report Number 74.

The Chair reported that it had been brought to the Secretary's attention that there was a factual error in Report Number 73 of June 27 which had already been approved by the Committee. He was informing the Committee that the Report had been amended as follows: Part of item 12, "Affiliation Agreement – Bloor MacMillan Centre" read "Dean Naylor explained that the proposed agreement was the result of two years of discussions that would see the merger of Bloorview and MacMillan Hospitals". This had been changed to read, "Dean Naylor explained that the proposed agreement was the result of two years of discussions that followed the earlier merger of Bloorview and MacMillan Hospitals".

**3. Senior Assessor's Report**

The Chair invited Professor Sedra to report.

Professor Sedra was delighted to report that, in the annual Macleans survey released on November 12, the University of Toronto had retained its first place rating among medical/doctoral universities. It also, again, captured the number one position in the overall reputational ranking among the 15 research-intensive universities in its category. It was evident that this University remained very attractive.

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

A member commended the Planning Department for a job well done in providing the excellent data that were necessary for decision-making to result in continued recognition as a first class institution.

Reporting on the enrolment, Professor Sedra said that the University had taken in 1,300 full-time undergraduate students above the target set for this year. He also indicated that the University had been successful in its objective of registering Arts and Science students in majors and specialists thus assuring their accurate count as basic income units (BIUs). On the St. George campus, the numbers of students not in programs had been reduced from 496 to 31 for the full-time, compared to a year ago, and from 539 to 64 for part-time. He recognized that the registrarial staff had worked very hard to accomplish this and, as a result of both higher intake and more registrations in programs, the University would count 2,100 more BIUs. That translated into an increase of \$6.7 million in operating grants for undergraduate students and \$1.9 million for graduate students.

Professor Sedra reported that the Working Group on Enrolment Expansion had defined and would be recommending appropriate intake numbers. The Group had suggested a modest increase in 2002 and greater increases in 2003 and 2004 over the span of the double cohort. Spreading the increase over two years would help maintain the quality of the admissions.

A member questioned how the increase in operating grants for graduate enrolment related to guaranteed funding for graduate students. Professor Sedra replied that it was not in balance; \$9.4 million in base funding had been committed for graduate students phased in over three years (2000-01, 2001-02, 2002-03) and that was more than the expected increase in funding over the three years.

Professor Sedra continued with a financial outlook. Although numbers were not yet firm, there had been some changes from the budget approved by the Governing Council last spring. The base Government grant had been \$6.4 million less than forecast due to lack of inflationary adjustment. On the positive side there had been \$1.2 million increase from the performance-based funding envelope. The University's share of the Enrolment Growth Fund was expected to be \$6.7 million out of the first-entry, undergraduate pool amount and \$1.9 million out of the second-entry and graduate pool. In addition, tuition revenue had increased by \$5.7 million for an overall increase in revenue of \$9.1 million.

Professor Sedra noted that the additional students meant increased expense in the form of \$7.5 million allocation to the Enrolment Growth Fund and \$3.1 to student aid, including graduate student funding. An expense saving of \$1.5 million had been realized as well as \$2 million worth of repairs and renovations that had been targeted to be expended from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund (UIIF) but had been funded by an increased grant. Overall, the change in revenue and expenses had resulted in a positive variance of \$2 million from the approved budget. However, last year there had been a deficit of \$1.3 million so the total outcome was a positive difference of \$.7 million.

A member asked if there had been changes in revenue from interest on investments. Ms. Brown replied in the positive but indicated that projections were being developed and she was not able to provide a report as yet.

The member further queried if there had been any changes in capital funding.

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

Professor Sedra and Dr. Levy replied that intense discussions continued with the Provincial Government and that every creative option was being explored.

There was further discussion relating to why the capital projects brought to this meeting were coming forward at a time when the funding was not yet secure. Professor Venter and Professor McCammond explained that it was critical to have the approval in principle of the Project Planning Reports in place so that if and when Government capital funding was announced the University could move quickly. The proposed projects were for buildings that were critical to enrolment expansion and there could be no unnecessary delay in proceeding with design and architect selection if funding made the projects feasible. This Committee's objective was to consider the scope of the project, the site, the cost and the sources of funding. Approval to proceed with the project was the responsibility of the Business Board, but approval from Planning and Budget Committee was required first.

A member spoke strongly in favour of proceeding, noting a similar concern but also a realization that plans must proceed expeditiously to meet enrolment growth targets. If the University were unable to meet its commitments to enrolment expansion, there would be enormous consequences to the entire University.

Before proceeding to the consideration of the capital project items, the Chair informed the Committee that five of the projects would be considered by the Academic Board in two days. This fast turnaround was unusual but measures had been taken to provide greater than normal support to the Board's decision-making in these circumstances. Documentation for the Committee had gone concurrently to the Board and an excerpt of the Committee's report would be available to members of the Academic Board a day before their meeting.

### 4. Capital Project: 500 University Avenue, Phase I – Revised Project Planning Report - University Infrastructure Investment Fund, Allocation

Professor Venter introduced the item, referring to his memorandum of November 1, 2001 and the attached Project Planning Report for the 500 University Avenue Building (Executive Summary is attached hereto as Appendix "A"). His memorandum reviewed the acquisition of the building, its intended purpose, the preliminary Users' Committee Report of May 2001, and allocations to date. Professor Venter noted the \$700,000 that had already been allocated accounted for the difference between the full cost and the proposed allocation now. He reported that an architect had been selected and that work on the project had begun.

A member noted the acquisition of this building included a garage and he asked where it was and if it was available for use by University employees. Professor Venter said that the three-storey garage, on Simcoe Street, was rented commercially. It was a distance from the building but the University occupants of 500 University Avenue would be able to park there.

A member thought that the estimates for renovation costs of this building seemed considerably higher than when the Governing Council had approved the purchase. Professor Sedra suggested that when the acquisition proposal went to the Business Board it would not have included a cost estimate of the renovations. It would have been presented as a great opportunity and the University would not have known at that time how much the renovations would cost. Professor Venter reported that the initial estimates for renovation had been in excess of \$19 million but the users had refined the project scope and reduced this to \$11 million.

**4. Capital Project: 500 University Avenue, Phase I – Revised Project Planning Report -University Infrastructure Investment Fund, Allocation (cont'd)**

A member questioned what seemed to be an unusual model wherein the total funding of the project relied on an interest free loan from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund (UIIF). Professor Venter said that following a great deal of discussion this approach was thought to be a creative and responsible way to fund the renovations. The member asked what would happen to the schedule of repayment by the Faculty of Medicine if a donor were found to support the project. Professor Venter said that the donation would reduce the capital amount the Faculty would repay; the length of the repayment period would stay the same.

A member remarked that the cost of renovations was approximately the same as the purchase price and asked whether this was considered a good deal. Professor Venter responded that it was less costly than building a new facility. The Centre for Cellular and Biomolecular Research (CCBR) would cost between \$7,000-8,000 per nasm (wet laboratory mixed construction) without factoring in the cost of the land. This renovation would be less than \$5,000 per nasm including the land -- \$5,000 per nasm was representative of office-type accommodation.

Referring to the building's current tenants, a member asked for what the rental revenue was used. Professor Venter explained that the building was operated by an external company and rents had approximately doubled since the University had acquired the building. Rental revenue accrued to the University and was used to cover the operating costs.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

**YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS**

THAT the Project Planning Report for the proposed space program and the necessary renovations identified to accommodate the Rehabilitation Sector in the Faculty of Medicine at 500 University Avenue be approved in principle;

THAT Phase I of the Project which represents a renovation of 4502 nasm be completed immediately at a cost of \$11,123,400, and that Phase II of the project which is an additional 2265 nasm be undertaken at a future date;

THAT an allocation of \$10,423,400 from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund to fund Phase I of the 500 University Avenue project be made, which is scheduled to be repaid by the Faculty of Medicine;

THAT the total capital allocation made, namely the sum of the allocation in c) above and the earlier \$700,000 approval in June, 2001 [total of \$11,123,400] will be repaid by the Faculty of Medicine to the University Infrastructure Investment Fund over a fifteen-year period, with no interest costs for a period of five years following the date of completion of Phase I [anticipated to be September, 2002]. The Faculty of Medicine will also assume responsibility for the interest charges on the outstanding balance after five years, starting on September, 2007; and,

THAT the interest costs on the total allocation of \$11,123,400 for Phase I will be carried by the Operating Budget of the University for the period through to September, 2007. Thereafter, all interest costs will be the responsibility of the Faculty of Medicine.

**5. Capital Project: Leslie L. Dan Pharmacy Building – Revised Project Planning Report**

Professor Venter recalled that the Users' Committee Report for this project had been approved by this Committee in June 2001. Subsequently, discussion with members of the Faculty of Pharmacy made it clear that changes to the academic space were necessary and that these would result in an increase of 230 net assignable square metres (nasm). Accordingly, the recommendation to the Academic Board to approve the Users' Committee Report had not gone forward and consultation and planning had continued.

Professor Venter's memorandum of November 1, 2001 and the attached Project Planning Report (Executive Summary is attached hereto as Appendix "B") outlined the changes proposed, namely the increase in nasm, the plans for the relocation of the entire Faculty within the new building and the Centre for Cellular and Biomolecular Research, and the total space program requirement. Cost of the project had not changed from \$70 million, details of which had been outlined in his November 1 memorandum.

Invited to comment, Dean Hindmarsh reported that there had been a further donation of \$5 million and the shortfall had now been reduced to \$12 million.

A member asked if any proposals to the Ontario Innovation Trust (OIT) had been submitted. Dean Hindmarsh responded that the Faculty had submitted one proposal already and that a second, larger proposal was being prepared.

A member had a series of questions concerning the location of the Institute for Drug Research, the terms of the Apotex donation and the configuration of the building. Dean Hindmarsh said some of the faculty members of the Institute would be housed in the new Dan building while others would be located in the Faculty of Medicine (within the CCBR). A good relationship with the Faculty of Medicine had developed. The Apotex donation carried no research implications but rather involved two namings within the building -- the Apotex Resource Centre and the Apotex Multi-Media Classroom. Professor Venter referred to the preliminary drawing of the building which was essentially one building with two integrated components, one 25 metres high, the other 19 metres high. The University was seeking adjustment from the City to increase the height of the taller.

A member remarked that this was a tremendous opportunity for the Faculty of Pharmacy to expand its enrolment and research facilities. He was pleased to hear of the new \$5 million donation. However, he was interested in the correlation between increased revenue and cost to operate the building. Professor Sedra explained the calculations, noting that, in the worst-case situation of no further donations, less than one-third of the increased BIU revenue would be needed to support the building. Another member asked about the prospects of meeting enrolment targets. Dean Hindmarsh stated that the Faculty received far more applications than there were spaces in the program. This University still had the only program in the Province at a time when demand for pharmacists continued to be very high. He believed the Faculty would have no problems in meeting its enrolment targets.

In response to a member's question about links between the buildings in that sector of the campus, Professor Venter said that there would be an underground link between the

CCBR and the Fitzgerald building, which in turn would link to the Dan Pharmacy building through a stairwell. With respect to servicing the buildings, Professor Venter said that the Dan Pharmacy building would be serviced off College Street. The member suggested that an underground dock be considered.

**5. Capital Project: Leslie L. Dan Pharmacy Building – Revised Project Planning Report (cont'd)**

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the revised Project Planning Report for the Leslie L. Dan Pharmacy Building be approved in principle,

THAT the revised project for the Leslie L. Dan Pharmacy Building with a project scope of 8,680 net assignable square meters, sited on College Street [near University Avenue], at a project cost of \$70,000,000 with funding as follows, be approved:

SuperBuild	\$28.800 million
SuperBuild interest	1.640 million
Herb Binder contribution	2.000 million
UIIF contribution	7.200 million
Apotex contribution	5.000 million
Future donations to be sought through the Campaign, including naming opportunities	
Research funding possibilities through CFI and OIT sources. Funding from increased student enrolments	17.360 million, and

THAT an allocation of \$7,200,000 from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund [UIIF] for the Pharmacy Building be approved.

The Chair reported that the motion had been carried unanimously.

**6. Capital Project: Faculty of Arts and Science – Economics Building – Project Planning Report**

The Chair noted that this item would not be going forward to the Academic Board as part of the group being considered on Thursday.

Professor Venter reviewed the highlights of his memorandum of October 31, 2001 and the attached Project Planning Report for the Department of Economics Building Expansion and Renovation at 150 St. George Street (Executive Summary is attached as Appendix "C"). He indicated that the project was not a high priority but approval of the Users' Committee Report was required so that the Department could proceed with fund-raising. He informed the Committee that the Dean of Arts and Science was supportive of this project but that it would not proceed unless all funding was in place.

There was discussion about why this should be approved when there was no funding in place, when economic conditions were difficult and when it seemed that this commitment from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund (UIIF) might put other projects in jeopardy. Also, the concerned member thought that sources for fund-raising were not limitless and, in this respect, the project could jeopardize others of higher priority.

Other members spoke in favour. The Department of Economics was tremendously supportive of this project and should be given approval to commence fund raising. A member had the view that fund-raising was not a zero-sum game, and developing that mindset could be counter-productive.

**6. Capital Project: Faculty of Arts and Science – Economics Building – Project Planning Report (cont'd)**

Responding to a question, Professor Venter confirmed that discussions with Innis College had already taken place with respect to cooperation in maximizing the space currently occupied by Innis College and the Department of Economics.

Professor Sedra assured members that an allocation from the UIIF was conditional on successful fund raising. In response to a question about setting priorities for capital projects, he said that the Capital Plan, which would come to the Committee in January would reflect the priorities.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the Project Planning Report for the Department of Economics be approved in principle; and,

THAT the project scope of 1880 net assignable square metres (nasm) of new space and 450 nasm renovated space be approved at an estimated total project cost of \$14,300,000 (May 2004), with funding as follows:

- (i) external funding raised by the Department of Economics; and,
- (ii) a contribution from the University Investment Infrastructure Fund [UIIF] for the classroom, estimated at \$980,000, to be assigned once the full funding has been realized.

**7. Capital Project: University of Toronto at Scarborough – Student Centre – Project Planning Report**

The Committee had received the Project Planning Report for the University of Toronto at Scarborough, Student Centre, together with a memorandum from Professor Venter dated October 31, 2001 (Executive Summary is attached as Appendix "D"). Professor Venter noted that the funding model subsequently had been revised. A new page three to his memorandum, giving details of the new model and a revised proposed resolution, had been distributed at the beginning of the meeting.

Professor Venter noted that UTSC might be one of only two universities in Canada that had no student centre. Students had been requesting a facility of this kind since the UTSC had opened and a referendum last spring supported the construction of this project by a significantly increased student levy. The project was supported by the Provost through a 50% match to the student levy and there had been a \$1 million contribution from UTSC. A further \$975,000 would be provided by the University Infrastructure Investment Fund (UIIF). To make the project feasible, the matching funding would be paid as soon as required to meet the cost of the project, rather than year-by-year to match the proceeds of the levy.

Professor Venter described the project as the result of an outstanding initiative by the students of UTSc and acknowledged the remarkable leadership of the current and past Presidents of the Scarborough Campus Student Council.

## 7. Capital Project: University of Toronto at Scarborough – Student Centre – Project Planning Report (cont'd)

In response to a question, Professor Venter noted the funding model for the project had been under frequent refinement, and he invited Ms. Brown to provide the specific funding sources contained in the final model:

UTSC fundraising	\$1.000-million	
Student levy (available for construction)	1.183-million	
Provost's matching funds	3.749-million	
University Infrastructure Investment Fund	0.975-million	
Interest income	0.473-million	
Loan (repayable from student levy and Student Centre rentals)	<u>6.271-million</u>	
Total		<u>\$13,696</u>

A number of members expressed their strong support for the project. In response to questions, Professor Sedra and Professor Venter said that the plans for the project had taken into account the planned increase in enrolment at UTSC. The loan, to be repaid from the student levy and retail rentals, was to carry an interest rate of 8%. The University was not providing the loan at a lower rate because the University support for the project took the form of the matching funds and the UIIF grant rather than an interest rate subsidy and because the University was unable to provide a lower rate for the 25-year amortization.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

### YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the Project Planning Report for the Student Centre at the UTSC be approved in principle.

THAT the project scope of 2418 nasm in total, on a site facing Military Trail and adjacent to the Recreation Centre as identified in the UTSC Master Plan 2001, be approved at an estimated cost of \$13.92 million (2003 dollars) excluding campus improvements, with funding as follows:

- (i) A mortgage, value \$6,270,885 million, to be amortized over 25 years at a 8% rate for an annual cost of \$580,796. Repayments to be made from the student levy as well as income derived from retail rentals within the Student Centre;
- (ii) A contribution of \$3,748,695 from the Provost. [50% contribution for each student dollar raised. The \$3,748,695 represents the present value of the student contributions which span a 25-year period];
- (iii) A one-time only contribution from the [UIIF] of \$975,000 towards the cost of the project to ensure that the financial integrity of the model which requires a 25-year payback at an 8% rate; and,
- (iv) A commitment from the University of Toronto at Scarborough [UTSC] to contribute \$1million dollars toward the Student Centre from fundraising activities.

## **8. Capital Project: University of Toronto at Scarborough – Classroom/Arts Building – Project Planning Report**

Referring to his memorandum of October 31, 2001 and the Project Planning Report for a Classroom/Arts Building at the University of Toronto at Scarborough (Executive Summary attached as Appendix “E”), Professor Venter noted that this building was one of many at the University of Toronto at Scarborough planned to accommodate enrolment growth by 2003-04. The building was proposed on a site that had been identified for expansion in the UTSC Campus Master Plan 2001. The first of those buildings which had been reviewed by the Committee was the Academic Resource Centre. The next two buildings, proposed for adjacent sites that had been identified for expansion in the UTSC Campus Master Plan, were on the current agenda: the proposed Classroom/Arts Building and the Management Building. Both would be of similar size and cost. The Classroom/Arts Building would provide urgently needed instructional space as well as offices. Approval in principle of the project was essential at this time in order to move forward rapidly upon the anticipated award of Provincial capital funding to have the building ready for occupancy to accommodate expanded enrolment in 2004.

A member recalled the proposal that there be an expansion of graduate study at the Mississauga and Scarborough Campuses and asked if the proposed buildings took this into account. Professor Venter replied that there had been active discussion both about projected overall enrolment and the desirability of expanded graduate enrolment on those campuses. That consideration was an especially important factor in the thinking about the proposed science building that was also currently being considered. A member added that expansion would enhance the attractiveness of the UTM and UTSC campuses by enabling them to offer a richer variety of academic programs.

A member asked for assurance that there would be no proposal to pay a part of the cost of the buildings by a student levy. Professor Venter replied that he could not give any assurances at this time. If Government capital support were less than needed, it would be necessary to consider whether the project could proceed and, if so, to consider various alternative sources of funding.

Several members expressed their serious concern about the possibility of the Scarborough or Mississauga campuses having to repay a mortgage loan on new academic buildings. The concept of mortgage loans had not appeared in other proposals, and the imposition of such loans would be a greater burden on UTM and UTSC than on other campuses. Professor Sedra and Professor Venter expressed their understanding of the members' concerns and agreed to amend the recommendation to replace the word “mortgage” with “loan.” Any loan that was required would be repaid by the University from the operating budget, and any implications for the operating budget of UTSC would be negotiated and approved in the usual manner.

A member was concerned about proceeding with approval when funding for the project was uncertain and proposed, instead, that the Committee should proceed to approve the design only. Professor Sedra, Dr. Levy, Professor McCammond and Professor Venter responded noting the following important points. The role of the Planning and Budget Committee was to consider whether the proposed building should be approved in principle, considering the appropriateness of the site, space plan, overall cost and funding sources. In the absence of approval in principle, it was normally not permissible to spend any money on a project, including money for design. Approval in principle did not trigger any spending. The project would have to receive the approval of the Business Board, which made a decision about whether it was appropriate to proceed with design work at a given time and with given funding and later whether it was appropriate to begin

---

**8. Capital Project: University of Toronto at Scarborough – Classroom/Arts Building – Project Planning Report (cont'd)**

construction. What was important was that the process of approval in principle be complete in order to be able to proceed quickly when and if Government funding was announced. Finally, it was highly unlikely that the Government would fund the full cost of a project and it was not realistic to think that any of these projects could proceed without borrowed money.

Another member appreciated that there were steps elsewhere in governance to be taken before the project proceeded, but he requested that the Provost report back to the Committee for information. Professor Sedra replied that there were numerous reports on capital projects made to the Business Board, and members of the Committee could request copies. In addition, the Planning and Budget Committee would receive the update to the capital plan in January.

A number of members spoke strongly in support of the proposal. The University had made a strategic decision to accommodate most long-term growth at the UTSC and at UTM, and it must now proceed toward implementing that strategic decision. If Government capital funding proved to be inadequate, it would then be necessary to rethink the strategic decision and to scale back enrolment expansion. While there were risks of proceeding with new buildings at the UTSC and UTM campuses, there would be a huge cost for not proceeding - a lost opportunity for the development of the campuses that would not arise again in the foreseeable future. The academic plans of both campuses depended on the development of the new buildings, and failure to develop them would be the source of regret for decades to come.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the Project Planning Report for the Classroom/Arts Building be approved in principle; and,

THAT the project scope of 2372 net assignable square metres (nasm) in total on a site extending from the existing Humanities Wing be approved at an estimated cost of \$15.5 million (2003 dollars) excluding campus improvements. A mortgage will be required to advance this project with funding sources as follows:

- (iii) Ontario Government support to be negotiated;
- (iv) external contributions through donors; and,
- (v) increase student enrolments on the UTSC campus.

**9. Capital Project: University of Toronto at Scarborough – Management Building – Project Report**

Professor Venter's memorandum of November 1, 2001 and the attached Project Planning Report (Executive Summary attached hereto as Appendix "F") outlined the need for and anticipated usage of the proposed Management Building at the University of Toronto at Scarborough. The proposed building would address an urgent need for expansion of classrooms and office space for the Division of Management, but the classroom capacity would be used by all parts of the Campus. Total cost of the project in 2003 dollars was estimated to be \$15.4 million. The issues with respect to this building were the same as

---

**9. Capital Project: University of Toronto at Scarborough – Management Building – Project Report (cont'd)**

those for the Classroom/Arts Building. The motion would be changed to replace the word “mortgage” with the word “loan.”

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the Project Planning Report for the Management Building be approved in principle; and

THAT the project scope of 2436 net assignable square metres (nasm) in total on a site adjacent to the existing Humanities Wing be approved at an estimated cost of \$15.4 million (2003 dollars) excluding campus improvements. A loan will be required to advance this project with funding sources as follows:

- (i) Ontario Government support to be negotiated;
- (ii) external contributions through donors; and,
- (iii) increased student enrolments on the UTSC campus.

**10. Faculty of Medicine: Proposed Medical Radiation Sciences Program**

Professor McCammond reviewed his memorandum of October 22, 2001 and its attachment, proposing a revision and renaming of the B.Sc. (Radiation Science) program as the B.Sc. (Medical Radiation Sciences) Program (attached as Appendix “G”). The former had been self-funded and revenue was insufficient to continue a quality program. The revised, renamed program would be submitted to the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities for approval as a program eligible for operating grant funding and when that funding has been obtained, he would bring a proposal to the Committee for an allocation from the Enrolment Growth Fund.

In response to a question, Professor McCammond confirmed that revenue from the program would exceed the additional cost to run the program. Dr. Whiteside added that if BIU funding were not received the program changes would not go ahead. She anticipated an enrolment of 390 over two years and cited the desperate need for individuals trained in radiation therapy, which would be one of the specializations in the program.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

Recognizing the need for the Committee to recommend appropriate further allocations from the Enrolment Growth Fund to fund the program,

YOUR COMMITTEE CONCURS

with the recommendation of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs

THAT the proposal for a revision and renaming of the B.Sc. (Radiation Science) program, as the B.Sc. (Medical Radiation Sciences) program, as described in the submission from the Faculty of Medicine dated October 2, 2001, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 90 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs as Appendix “A”, be approved effective September 2002.

### **11. University of Toronto at Mississauga: Communication, Culture and Technology Program**

Professor McCammond recalled that the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM) had planned to introduce a major honours program in Communication, Culture and Information Technology (CCIT) to be offered jointly by UTM and Sheridan College. His memorandum of October 22, 2001 (attached as Appendix "H") reviewed highlights and resource implications of this program that had been identified as a niche program in the *Framework for Enrolment Expansion* document.

There was lengthy discussion focusing on a member's concern that approval for this program was requested at a time when it seemed to him that not all of the required resources had been secured. Professor McCammond responded, as did Dr. Levy, noting that approval of the program was needed before grant funding could come forward from the Government. However, once the program was approved, full average funding was assured. Additionally, though this item related only to program approval, the member was assured that the University was committed to the capital project associated with the program by having accepted SuperBuild funding for it and that, in fact, much of the capital funding was in place.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

Recognizing the need for the Committee to recommend appropriate further allocations from the Enrolment Growth Fund to fund the program,

**YOUR COMMITTEE CONCURS**

with the recommendation of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs

THAT the proposal for a Major Honours program in Communication, Culture and Information Technology, to be offered jointly by the University of Toronto at Mississauga and Sheridan College, as described in the Faculty of Arts and Science (University of Toronto at Mississauga) submission dated April 13, 2000, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 79 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs as Appendix "A", be approved effective on the date to be determined upon the securing of the required resources.

The Chair reported that the motion had been carried unanimously.

### **12. Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto (OISE/UT): Proposed Diploma in Holocaust and Genocide Education**

Professor McCammond reviewed his memorandum of October 22, 2001 advising on the proposed Diploma in Holocaust and Genocide Education. The program would be totally self-funded, delivered on the basis of tuition revenue and there were no implications for the University budget. The item was for the information of the Committee only.

### **13. Report on Matching Programs**

Professor Sedra indicated that he had intended to provide a powerpoint presentation to accompany his report on matching programs. However, due to the lateness of the hour he referred members to the report which had been circulated with the Agenda. This was for the information of the Committee only and he would be happy to respond to questions now or at a later time.

**14. Capital Project: Project Committees – Membership and Terms of Reference**

Referring to the next five sub-items, the Chair said that, as Project Committees were established, the Planning and Budget Committee was informed and provided with the Terms of Reference and membership of the Committees. Five new Project Committees had been established and the relevant information on each had been distributed to the Committee for information. Four of the five were scheduled to report to the Planning and Budget Committee in March 2002; the fifth, Faculty of Law, would report in January 2002. Professor Venter was invited to add comments. There were no questions.

- 14.1 University of Toronto at Mississauga - Athletics Facility Wellness Centre**
- 14.2 University of Toronto at Mississauga - Child Care Facilities**
- 14.3 School of Continuing Studies - A Community Learning Space**
- 14.4 Faculty of Law**
- 14.5 University of Toronto at Mississauga - Library Building, Art Gallery**

**15. Date of Next Meeting**

The Chair reminded members that the next meeting of the Planning and Budget Committee was scheduled for December 12, 2001 commencing at 5:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers.

**16. Other Business**

There was no other business.

The meeting adjourned at 7:55 p.m.

---

Secretary

---

Chair

December 11, 2001  
(17110)