

**THE GOVERNING COUNCIL**  
**REPORT NUMBER 99 OF**  
**THE PLANNING AND BUDGET COMMITTEE**

**November 10, 2004**

To the Academic Board,  
University of Toronto.

Your Committee reports that it met on Wednesday, November 10, 2004, at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, with the following members present

Professor Avrum Gotlieb (in the Chair)  
Professor Miriam Diamond, Vice-Chair  
Professor Vivek Goel, Vice-President and  
Provost  
Ms Catherine Riggall, Interim Vice-  
President, Business Affairs  
Professor Safwat Zaky, Vice-Provost,  
Planning and Budget  
Professor Donald Brean  
Professor Philip H. Byer  
Mr. Bruce G. Cameron  
Mr. P.C. Choo  
Professor Donald Dewees  
Mr. William R. J. Lumsden  
Professor Jane Gaskell  
Ms Shaila Kibria  
Professor Ian McDonald  
Mr. Timothy Reid

Professor Robert Reisz  
Professor Anthony N. Sinclair  
Professor J. J. Berry Smith  
Mr. Stephen C. Smith  
Professor Lisa Steele

**Non-voting Assessor:**

Mr. John Bisanti, Chief Capital Projects  
Officer

**Secretariat:**

Mr. Neil Dobbs  
Ms Cristina Oke, Secretary

**Regrets:**

Professor David Mock  
Professor Pekka Sinervo

**In attendance:**

Ms Sheree Drummond, Assistant Provost  
Professor Jonathan Freedman, Acting Vice-Dean, Graduate Education and Research,  
Faculty of Arts and Science  
Professor Lynn Hasher, Chair, Department of Psychology, Faculty of Arts and Science  
Professor Cheryl Misak, Vice-Principal, Academic and Dean, University of Toronto at  
Mississauga  
Professor Jeremy Quastel, Acting Chair, Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Arts and  
Science  
Professor Ted Relp, Associate Principal, Campus Development, University of Toronto at  
Scarborough  
Ms Elisabeth Sisam, Director, Campus and Facilities Planning  
Professor Mohamad Tavakoli-Targhi, Chair, Department of History and Classics,  
University of Toronto at Mississauga

ITEMS 4, 5, 6 AND 7 ARE RECOMMENDED TO THE ACADEMIC BOARD FOR APPROVAL.

ALL OTHER ITEMS ARE REPORTED TO THE ACADEMIC BOARD FOR INFORMATION.

The Chair welcomed members to the meeting and noted that a brief recess would be called at 5:00 p.m. to allow individuals to break their Ramadan fast.

### **Add to Agenda**

On motion duly moved and seconded, an item for information was added to the agenda:  
*Capital Project: Project Planning Committee to address Electrical & Mechanical Upgrades Phase 3: Cooling Towers at the University of Toronto at Scarborough.*

### **1. Report of the Previous Meeting**

Professor Dewees was added to the list of those present at the meeting of September 21, 2004. Report Number 98 of September 21, 2004 was approved as amended.

### **2. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting**

A member referred to the question concerning inclusion of members of representative student committees on Project Planning Committees, as reported on page 10 of Report 98. She reported that a meeting with Professor David Farrar was being arranged.

### **3. Senior Assessor's Report**

Professor Goel reported on five items.

#### **(a) Update on Overall Capital Plan**

Professor Goel informed members that an update on the University's Capital Plan was being prepared. The remaining debt capacity of the University was being analyzed and priorities were being examined in light of the debt capacity. The updated capital plan was scheduled to be on the agenda of the December 7 meeting of the Planning and Budget Committee.

A member asked whether the updated capital plan would include allocations for the entire amount of available borrowing capacity. Professor Goel replied that the approved borrowing capital was a range of a proportion of capital, not a fixed amount. A member asked for the definition being used by the University for borrowing capacity. Professor Goel replied that the target external borrowing capacity limit had been set at one-third of capital smoothed over five years, and the maximum external borrowing capacity had been set at 40 per cent of capital smoothed over five years.

A member asked whether the updated capital plan would include clearly enunciated criteria for the priorities that were identified in the plan. Professor Goel assured the member that the criteria would be included.

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

#### **(b) Varsity Development**

Professor Goel reminded members that the University had decided not to proceed with the Varsity development project in partnership with the Toronto Argonauts' Football Club and the Canadian Soccer Association. The University would now plan a facility that focused on the University's needs. A revised set of recommendations would be developed in the next few weeks, and broad consultations would be undertaken with the University community, internal and external neighbours, and potential users. A Project Planning Committee Report was scheduled to come forward to the Planning and Budget Committee in March 2005.

#### **(c) Academic Plan**

Professor Goel reported that a document was being prepared for governance that would synthesize divisional plans in the *Stepping UP* plan.

#### **(d) Academic Initiatives Fund**

Professor Goel indicated that the first set of recommended allocations from the Academic Initiatives Fund, for the current budget year, would come to the December 7 meeting of the Planning and Budget Committee. Submissions for allocations in 2005-06 had been invited for February 2005.

The member asked about the timing of the call for submissions for the Academic Initiatives Fund (AIF), and expressed his concern at the need for quick response by the divisions in light of the time that was being taken to make decisions on the first round of allocations from the AIF. Professor Goel explained that Deans were currently being given advice and direction on the need for revision and resubmission of requests for allocations from the AIF.

#### **(e) University of Toronto Submission to the Rae Review**

Professor Goel encouraged members to become involved with the Rae Review of postsecondary education, by attending the Town Hall meetings that had been scheduled, and by completing the workbook that was available on the Review's website (<http://www.raereview.on.ca/en/default.asp?loc1=home>). He reported that the principles and directions of the University's submission to the Rae Review had been approved by the Governing Council on November 1, 2004, and the submission was being finalized.

### **4. Capital Project: Centre for Biological Timing and Cognition – Interim Project Planning Report**

The Chair welcomed Professor Lynn Hasher, Chair, Department of Psychology, Faculty of Arts and Science, and Professor Jonathan Freedman, Acting Vice-Dean, Graduate Education and Research, Faculty of Arts and Science, to the meeting. Professor Venter acknowledged the presence and contributions of Ms Elizabeth Sisam, Director, Campus and Facilities Planning, to the Project Planning Report.

Professor Venter explained that this Project Planning Report was an interim report, and that the recommendation was subject to the Committee's review at its December 7

meeting. It was essential, for reason of timing, to move the Department of Mathematics project forward through this cycle of Governing Council meetings. The

#### **4. Capital Project: Centre for Biological Timing and Cognition – Interim Project Planning Report (cont'd)**

Academic Board and Governing Council would be asked to approve the recommendations subject to the Committee's acceptance of the final project planning reports.

The proposed project had received funding from the Canada Foundation for Innovation (CFI) and the Ontario Innovation Trust (OIT). The proposed site, on top of the Ramsay Wright building, was a difficult site, but it had been chosen because of its proximity to the Sidney Smith Hall in which the Department of Psychology was located.

A member asked how this project would impact the long-term plans of the Faculty of Arts and Science. Professor Venter replied that the Faculty's long-term plan included the relocation of the Departments of Mathematics, Statistics, and Anthropology to provide additional space for the Department of Psychology and other departments that would remain in Sidney Smith Hall.

A member noted that the site was not a recognized building site, and asked whether it would be difficult to obtain the required building permits. Professor Venter replied that, although the amount of time required to obtain city building approval was unknown, he was optimistic that the approval would be forthcoming.

A member noted the absence of a representative from the Department of Zoology on the Project Planning Committee. Another member indicated that there was concern in the Department of Zoology that there had not been sufficient consultation concerning this project. Professor Venter undertook to add a representative from the Department of Zoology to the Project Planning Committee.

A member asked how the project would affect traffic flow and parking. Professor Venter replied that such points would be addressed in the final report. Mr. Bisanti added that traffic flow would be a sensitive issue during construction, because construction on the University College residence would also be in progress.

A member suggested that the Project Planning Committee Report include a paragraph about how this project would enhance undergraduate education. Another member asked whether private and corporate donations were being sought for this project. Professor Venter replied that in-kind support had been received for this project, and that the Faculty of Arts and Science had a set of priorities for fund-raising. Professor Goel added that this project was funded primarily by external sources. The infrastructure provided by the project would have a major impact on graduate students and on research. Professor Hasher noted that this would be a state-of-the-art facility which would benefit undergraduate students as well as graduate students. Professor Goel noted that CFI did not support educational space, and, therefore, classroom space could not be included in projects funded by CFI.

A member asked whether there would be any changes in access to the Ramsay Wright Building as a result of the project. Professor Venter replied that access to the building would remain unchanged.

**4. Capital Project: Centre for Biological Timing and Cognition – Interim Project Planning Report (cont'd)**

A member asked why approval of this project was being rushed. Professor Venter explained that the University had to report to CFI on the progress of the project by December 31, 2004. If the project was not approved by that time, the CFI funding might be lost. The member noted that there were a number of details that remained to be determined. Professor Goel replied that further details would be provided in the final report. If the final details were not in place to his satisfaction by the December 7 meeting of the Planning and Budget Committee, the administration would withdraw the project.

The Committee recessed for five minutes to allow individuals to break their Ramadan fast.

A member asked if students were usually members of a Project Planning Committee. Professor Hasher noted that there were no student members on this Project Planning Committee. Professor Venter undertook to try to add a student member to the Project Planning Committee. The member requested that a student be chosen from the Graduate Students' Union.

A member noted that the University had trouble paying for the operation and maintenance of the buildings that it currently had and asked whether the University would become 'house poor' with the proposed new construction. Professor Goel replied that while new space added operating costs, it was often more efficient than renovating existing space to bring it up to code and improve accessibility. Professor Freedman added that new equipment and an appropriate site for it was required to conduct cutting-edge research.

On motion duly moved and seconded

**YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS**

Subject to a review by the Planning and Budget Committee at its meeting on December 7, 2004 of the final Project Planning Report

1. THAT the Interim Project Planning Report for the Centre for Biological Timing and Cognition at the University of Toronto be approved in principle.
2. THAT the project scope as identified in the Project Planning Report which requires the construction of additional floors on the south section of the Ramsay Wright Building be approved at a cost of \$13,000,000 from the following funding sources:
  - i) A cash contribution in the amount of \$1,500,000 from the Faculty of Arts & Science,
  - ii) A contribution in the amount of \$5,750,000 awarded by the Canada Foundation for Innovation, and
  - iii) A contribution in the amount of \$5,750,000 awarded by the Ontario Innovation Trust and the Ministry of Economic Development and Trade.

**5. Capital Project: Department of Mathematics, Phase 1 – Interim Project Planning Report**

The Chair welcomed Professor Jeremy Quastel, Acting Chair, Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Arts and Science, to the meeting.

**5. Capital Project: Department of Mathematics, Phase 1 – Interim Project Planning Report (cont'd)**

Professor Venter explained that approval of this project was urgent because, if the space were available to the Faculty of Arts and Science by September 2005, it would be used to house the Department of Economics during the renovation of its space. Following the renovation of the space for the Department of Economics, the Department of Mathematics and its library would relocate to the renovated space.

Currently, the Department of Mathematics was housed in poor space and spread across a number of buildings. Relocation to the sixth floor of the Bahen Centre for Information Technology would place the Department close to the Departments of Computer Science and Electrical and Computer Engineering, as well as to the Fields Institute. This current proposal represented the first phase of the project, and not the entire plan. There would not be sufficient space on the sixth floor of the Bahen Centre to accommodate the entire Department of Mathematics.

A member asked what the opportunity costs were, resulting from the use of divisional operating funds to support capital projects and increased maintenance costs. Did the opportunity cost include increased faculty:student ratios? Professor Goel replied that divisions had to make trade-offs. In some cases, the cost of a capital project was offset by savings gained from not needing to pay for rental space.

A member asked whether the Mathematics library, if relocated to the Bahen Centre, would be accessible to all students, since access to many parts of the Bahen building was by key card. Professor Venter replied that he would take the matter under advisement.

A member asked what the current use of the sixth floor of the Bahen Centre was. Professor Venter replied that the sixth floor was currently shelled-in open space that was not being used.

A member asked if the University had a long-term space plan. Professor Goel replied that the long-term space plan would be included in the updated capital plan that was being brought forward in December. It was the general plan of the Faculty of Arts and Science to cluster departments in various buildings, which would release space in Sidney Smith Hall. Such clustering included the Departments of Computer Science, Mathematics, and Statistics in the Bahen Centre, and the humanities departments in the St. George Medical Arts Building. The member asked whether the space in the Medical Arts Building had been fully committed. Professor Goel replied that detailed renovation plans for the building would be brought forward as appropriate.

A member observed that the capital project concerning the Department of Economics had been approved by the Planning and Budget Committee. In order to renovate its existing space, the Department had to relocate, and it required seventy offices to accommodate faculty, staff and students. The space made available in the Bahen Centre as a result of the capital project for the Department of Mathematics was the only suitable space that had been identified as the interim location of the Department of Economics.

**5. Capital Project: Department of Mathematics, Phase 1 – Interim Project Planning Report (cont'd)**

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

Subject to a review by the Planning and Budget Committee at its meeting on December 7, 2004 of the final Project Planning Report,

1. THAT the Interim Project Planning Report for the Department of Mathematics, Phase I be approved in principle.
2. THAT the project scope as identified in the Project Planning Report, which requires the outfitting of the entire sixth floor of the Bahen Centre for Information Technology, be approved at a cost of \$5,500,000. The full funding for this project will be provided from the operating budget within the Faculty of Arts and Science.

**6. Capital Project: University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC) Food Services Revitalization - Project Planning Report**

The Chair welcomed Professor Ted Relph, Associate Principal, Campus Development, University of Toronto at Scarborough, to the meeting.

Professor Venter explained that, over the past year, five buildings had been completed at the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC). The number of cafeteria seats available for students at UTSC was 671. This project would provide an additional 161 seats. UTSC was continuing to search for space for students.

A member asked whether there was any policy or benchmark on how many food service seats per student should be available on a campus or within a division. Professor Venter replied that the number of seats per student varied greatly from campus to campus. On the St. George campus, there was a large number of restaurants near the campus where students could go, but that was not the case at UTSC. Professor Goel added that additional cafeteria seating would enhance student experience.

A member asked whether the operating funds to support the project would be required in a single budget year. Professor Venter noted that UTSC intended to use carryforward funds to support this project. The member asked whether the contribution from Aramark implied any commitment by the University to the company at the end of the current contract. Ms Riggall replied that the contract with Aramark required that the company invest a specified amount in food-service equipment. The equipment was to be amortized over a ten-year period. If Aramark's services were terminated in fewer than ten years, a proportion of the \$200,000 cash contribution would have to be returned to the company. The equipment would remain the property of the University.

A member expressed his concern at the use of operating funds in support of an ancillary operation, and the cost per cafeteria seat of the project, which, in his view, was high. Professor Goel replied that, while ancillary operations on the St. George campus were required to finance any renovation costs, at UTSC and the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM) there was a single budgetary unit that included both the operating budget and the ancillaries. Ms Riggall added that Aramark paid the University rent, the cost of such services as marketing and garbage disposal, and a percentage of its net income. The contract for food services was awarded after an open call for proposals.

**6. Capital Project: University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC) Food Services Revitalization - Project Planning Report (cont'd)**

A member requested a copy of the Aramark contract with the University. Ms Riggall replied that she would check the confidentiality provisions of the contract to determine whether it could be made available to members.

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

1. THAT the Project Planning Report for the Food Services Revitalization at the University of Toronto at Scarborough be approved in principle.
2. THAT the project scope identified in the Project Planning Report, to expand the food services at the University of Toronto at Scarborough, be approved at a cost of \$3,065,000 from the following funding sources:
  - i) A mortgage in the amount of \$1,460,000 to be amortized over a period of 20 years and to be repaid from the Enrolment Growth Fund at the University of Toronto at Scarborough.
  - ii) A cash contribution in the amount of \$200,000 to be provided by Aramark.
  - iii) A cash contribution in the amount of \$50,000 from the UTSC food services ancillary.
  - iv) A cash contribution in the amount of \$1,355,000 from the operating budget of the University of Toronto at Scarborough.

**7. University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM): Departmental Restructuring and Name Changes**

The Chair welcomed Professor Cheryl Misak, Vice-Principal, Academic and Dean, UTM, and Professor Mohamad Tavakoli-Targhi, Chair, Department of History and Classics, UTM, to the meeting.

Professor Goel informed members that the restructuring of two of the departments at UTM was the result of academic planning. The restructuring had been approved by the Erindale College Council, and no financial resources were required.

A member commented that, in his view, the removal of the words 'religion' and 'classics' from the departmental names might result in students being unaware of the courses being offered. Professor Goel replied that students applied to programs, not to departments. Professor Misak added that there was no difficulty in attracting students to the specific program.

A member asked why this proposal was being considered by the Planning and Budget Committee, rather than the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs. Professor Goel referred the member to the Terms of Reference of the Academic Board<sup>1</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> Section 5.2.7. of the Terms of Reference of the Academic Board states: *Changes in name that are part of a proposal for establishing, restructuring and/or merging units would be recommended to the Academic Board by the Planning and Budget Committee.*



**7. University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM): Departmental Restructuring and Name Changes (cont'd)**

Professor Tavakoli-Targhi explained to members that this restructuring brought together resources and offered education for twenty-first century Canada. Courses on religion were being expanded to include courses on Islam, Hinduism, Buddhism, and other world religions. Professor Goel observed that this restructuring reflected what was envisioned in the three-campus structure. Each campus would develop unique courses suitable to its academic plan and student body.

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the program in religion be moved from the Department of Anthropology and Religion to become part of the Department of History and Classics.

THAT resulting from the above change, the name of the *Department of Anthropology and Religion* be changed to the *Department of Anthropology*, effective January 1, 2005, and

THAT the name of the *Department of History and Classics* be changed to the *Department of Historical Studies*, effective January 1, 2005.

**8. Capital Project: OISE/UT – Project Planning Committee, Terms of Reference and Membership**

The Committee received for information the terms of reference and the membership of the Project Planning Committee to address the deficiencies and functionality of facilities at 252 Bloor Street West for the Ontario Institute for Studies of Education of the University of Toronto (OISE/UT).

A member asked if faculty members were included on the Project Planning Committee. Dean Gaskell replied that there were two faculty members of the Committee – Professor Glen Jones, Co-Chair, and Professor Janet Astington.

**9. Capital Project: University of Toronto Art Centre – Project Planning Committee, Terms of Reference and Membership**

The Committee received for information the terms of reference and the membership of the Project Planning Committee for the University of Toronto Art Centre.

A member asked whether direction would be given to the Committee with respect to item number 8 in the Terms of Reference: the identification of all proposed sources of funding. Professor Goel replied that the Art Centre would be responsible for the full funding of the project and for the operating costs through advancement.

**10. Capital Project: Varsity Stadium and Varsity Arena – Project Planning Committee, Terms of Reference and Membership**

The Committee received for information the terms of reference and the membership of the Project Planning Committee for the Varsity Stadium and Varsity Arena.

A member asked how the student members of the Committee had been selected. Professor Venter replied that three students were from the Faculty of Physical Education and Health, and the fourth student member was a Vice-President of the Students' Administrative Council (SAC). The member noted that a group of students was meeting with Professor David Farrar, Deputy Provost and Vice-Provost, Students, to discuss increased student involvement on Committees.

A member requested that savings and opportunity costs be provided in the identification of resource implications.

**11. Capital Project: University of Toronto at Scarborough - Electrical & Mechanical Upgrades Phase 3: Cooling Towers – Project Planning Committee, Terms of Reference and Membership**

Professor Venter explained that the recent construction of five new buildings at UTSC had resulted in the need for infrastructure improvements. A number of projects had been approved by the Accommodation and Facilities Directorate (AFD), since the cost of each project had been less than \$ 2 million. However, as the price of the cooling towers would exceed \$2 million, the total scope of the project was being laid out at this time. As a first step, the Planning and Budget Committee was receiving for information the Terms of Reference and Membership of the Project Planning Committee.

**12. Date of the Next Meeting**

Members were reminded that the next meeting of the Committee was scheduled for Tuesday, December 7, 2004 beginning at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber.

**13. Other Business**

There was no other business.

The meeting adjourned at 6:10 p.m.

---

Secretary

---

Chair

November 30, 2004