

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL
REPORT NUMBER 103 OF
THE PLANNING AND BUDGET COMMITTEE

May 10, 2005

To the Academic Board,
University of Toronto.

Your Committee reports that it met on Tuesday, May 10, 2005, at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, with the following members present:

Professor Avrum Gotlieb (in the Chair)
Professor Vivek Goel, Vice-President and
Provost
Ms Catherine Riggall, Vice-President,
Business Affairs
Professor Safwat Zaky, Vice-Provost,
Planning and Budget
Professor Donald Brean
Mr. P.C. Choo
Professor Donald Dewees
Professor Jane Gaskell
Ms Shaila Kibria

Regrets:

Professor Philip H. Byer
Mr. Bruce G. Cameron
Professor Miriam Diamond
Mr. William R. J. Lumsden
Professor Ian McDonald
Professor Robert Reisz
Professor Pekka Sinervo

In attendance:

Ms Susan Addario, Director, Student Affairs
Professor Ragnar Buchweitz, Vice-Principal (Academic) and Dean, University of Toronto
at Scarborough
Mr. Paul Carson, Faculty of Physical Education and Health
Professor David Clanfield, Principal, New College
Professor Donald Cormack, School of Graduate Studies
Professor David Farrar, Deputy Provost and Vice-Provost, Students
Professor Jonathan Freedman, Vice-Dean, Faculty of Arts and Science
Ms Helen Lasthiotakis, Director, Policy and Planning, Office of the Vice-President and
Provost
Professor Scott Mabury, Chair, Department of Chemistry, Faculty of Arts and Science
Mr. Christopher Sparks, Director of Business Services, New College

Professor David Mock
Mr. Timothy Reid
Professor Anthony N. Sinclair
Professor J. J. Berry Smith
Mr. Stephen C. Smith
Professor Lisa Steele

Non-voting Assessors:

Mr. John Bisanti, Chief Capital Projects
Officer
Ms Sheila Brown, Chief Financial Officer
Professor Ronald D. Venter, Vice-Provost,
Space and Facilities Planning

Secretariat:

Mr. Neil Dobbs
Ms Cristina Oke, Secretary

In attendance (cont'd):

Ms Kim McLean, Assistant Principal (Business and Administration) and Chief Administrative Officer, University of Toronto at Scarborough
Professor Edward Relph, Special Advisor on Campus Development, University of Toronto at Scarborough
Ms Elisabeth Sisam, Director, Campus and Facilities Planning
Mr. Ron Swail, Assistant Vice-President, Facilities and Services

ITEMS 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14 AND 15 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.

1. Report of the Previous Meeting

Report Number 102 of March 8, 2005 was approved.

2. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting

There was no business arising.

3. Academic Initiatives Fund: Allocations for 2005-06

The Chair reminded members that the Committee was responsible for recommending to the Academic Board for consideration the allocation of general University Funds established in the Operating Budget.

Professor Goel explained that the second call for Submissions to the Academic Initiatives Fund (AIF) had resulted in thirty-seven proposals from fourteen University divisions totaling \$8.9 million of base funding and \$60 million of OTO support. The allocation decisions were based on advice from a committee that included representatives from Principals and Deans and the Provost's office. Initiatives were assessed against the five *Stepping UP* priorities:

- Enhancing the student experience at the University.
- Enhancing interdisciplinary, interdepartmental, interdivisional and cross campus collaborations.
- Bringing together undergraduate and graduate activities with research opportunities.
- Connecting the University with the broader community (locally, nationally or internationally) through terms of public policy and outreach.
- Improving equity and diversity.

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the Second Round of Academic Initiative Funds be allocated as per the table (Appendices 2 and 3) attached to the Memorandum from the Vice-President and Provost dated May 2 for May 10, 2005, and attached hereto as Appendix "A".

4. Capital Project: Varsity Centre for Physical Activity and Health - Project Planning Report

The Chair welcomed students and staff from the Faculty of Physical Education and Health who were present for consideration of this item. He explained that the Agenda Planning Group had agreed that it would be useful for members to receive information of funding for capital projects, before considering the Project Planning Reports that were on the agenda for the meeting.

The Chair invited Ms Sheila Brown, Chief Financial Officer, to make a brief presentation.

Presentation on Use of Operating Funds for Capital Projects

Ms Brown explained that the presentation was intended to answer two questions:

- What proportion of the Capital Plan was operating funds?
- What operating funds had been spent on capital infrastructure as a percentage of operating fund revenue and how did this compare to other Ontario universities?

The cost of capital projects at April 30, 2005 totalled \$898.4 million. Of that amount, \$527.6 million, or 59%, was funded by borrowing from the following sources:

- \$251.3 million: Ancillaries
- \$109.9 million: University Infrastructure Investment Fund (UIIF)
- \$ 54.8 million: Divisional funding (dedicated by division to project)
- \$ 49.9 million: Enrolment Growth Fund (EGF)
- \$ 38.7 million: Funding Gap – no funding source identified
- \$ 23.0 million: Student levies

Of those sources, the UIIF and EGF were operating funds, and were designated for specific purposes. Divisional funding would also likely be sourced from operating funds.

The remaining \$370.8 million, or 41%, was funded from the following sources of revenue:

- \$153.3 million: Government funding including Access to Opportunities (ATOP) and SuperBuild
- \$ 97.1 million: Canada Foundation for Innovation (CFI)/Ontario Innovation Trust (OIT)
- \$ 64.0 million: Donations
- \$ 23.7 million: Operating - funds from divisions
- \$ 14.0 million: UIIF allocations, some dating back several years
- \$ 11.2 million: Interest
- \$ 3.2 million: Ancillaries
- \$ 2.8 million: Student levies
- \$ 1.5 million: School of Continuing Studies

The majority of funding for capital projects was required to be spent on specific projects.

A member asked how much of the amount borrowed was external debt. Ms Brown replied that the University's approved borrowing strategy allowed external borrowing of up to 40% of net assets, smoothed over 5 years. That sum was currently set at \$585 million, of which \$565 million was specifically approved for borrowing. That sum included borrowing for capital projects and for other purposes.

Ms Brown explained that it was difficult to determine how the amount spent on capital infrastructure as a percentage of operating fund revenue by the University of Toronto

4. Capital Project: Varsity Centre for Physical Activity and Health - Project Planning Report (cont'd)

compared with other universities, as there was not a lot of comparable data. The closest approximation was determined by examining the actual expenditures by other universities on acquisition costs; land improvements and site preparation including landscaping, sewers and roads; building construction costs, fees and planning costs relative to the direct expenses as well as any costs such as utilities incurred during the period of construction. Ms Brown presented data for the percent of revenues spent on building, land and site services for the years ended April 30, 2003 and April 30, 2004 for Ontario universities with revenues greater than \$100 million. She noted that only a very small amount of operating funds were going into capital projects.

Review of Capital Projects

Professor Venter reviewed the information he had placed on the table concerning the status of capital projects.

Gold Projects	Claret Projects	Blue Projects	AFD Projects
<i>Approved by Governance with committed funding</i>	<i>Short term capital plan – November 8, 2004 to December 31, 2010; projects may receive a share of the limited borrowing available</i>	<i>Long-term capital plan; Require full external financing to proceed.</i>	<i>Under \$2 million</i>
<i>Approved November 2004 – April 2005</i>	<i>Funding allocations suggested in May 2005 update:</i>	<i>Recent approvals in principle to allow fundraising efforts to begin:</i>	<i>June 2005 approval:</i>
155 College Street Centre for Biological Timing and Cognition (CBTC) Department of Mathematics Phase 1 UTSC Food Services UTSC Cooling Towers	UTM Resident 8 adjustment - \$0.5 mil Medical Arts Building - \$6.0 mil Relocation of Dept. of Anthropology to Hughes Building - \$6.0 mil Upgrades to OISE/UT, 252 Bloor West - \$6.0 mil Ramsay Wright Building - \$3.0 mil St. George Infrastructure - \$16.0 mil UTSC and UTM Infrastructure - \$6.0 mil Bridge Financing for Pharmacy - \$10.0 mil	<i>April 2005:</i> Relocation of Faculty of Law <i>June 2005:</i> Relocation of University Art Centre	Humanities Centre in Medical Arts Building Lash Miller/McClennan Courtyard
<i>Proposed for Approval May-June 2005</i>	<i>Borrowing available for Claret Projects:</i> <i>\$89 million</i> UTSC Science \$20 mil Varsity \$14 mil Multi-faith \$3 mil		
Total Cost of all Gold Projects: \$898 million <i>Funds in Hand: \$370 mil</i> <i>Borrowing: \$528 mil</i>			

4. Capital Project: Varsity Centre for Physical Activity and Health - Project Planning Report (cont'd)

Varsity Centre for Physical Activity and Health

Professor Venter reminded members that the membership and terms of reference for the Varsity Centre for Physical Activity and Health had been approved in November 2004. The phased project plan that was being presented for approval addressed the needs of students, the University community, and the neighbouring community. The proposed facility also represented a major contribution in support of the *Stepping UP* initiatives of the University.

The new facility would contain an artificial surface, a regulation size football and soccer field, a competitive plus training level running track and seating for 5,000. A high tech air-supported structure (bubble) over the playing field would significantly extend the use of the field throughout the winter months. The proposed facility would also provide indoor training facilities, athletic support space, café/student meeting space and child-minding/babysitting space. The facility would be completely accessible.

The Varsity Centre for Physical Activity and Health would be built in four phases over a number of years and as funding for each subsequent phase was secured. The project would not require additional zoning approvals from the city, with the possible exception of the height of the bubble in phase 2. The four phases were:

- Phase 1: A Master Design
- B 5,000 seats, public washrooms, change rooms, media gondola, entrances
- C Field, track, lights, scoreboard, fencing, landscaping
- D Foundations and services as required below the field track for the bubble.

- Phase 2: A Bubble installation
- B Off-site track and field throwing events

- Phase 3:¹ New athletics facilities (3792 nasm)

- Phase 4: Varsity Arena renovation

Professor Venter explained that the first phase would provide visibility for the project. No external funding was required for the first phase.

Professor Goel thanked Professor Venter for the work involved in bringing forward the project report.

A member asked how the seating capacity of 5,000 had been determined. Professor Venter replied that studies conducted by the University had indicated that 5,000 seats would be the appropriate number for University athletic events. It would also be possible to bring in additional seats for an event.

A member expressed her appreciation for the respect given to students during the development of the project planning report. She noted that some wording had been

¹ Before starting Phases 3 and 4, it will be necessary to address the electrical infrastructure expansion on the Northeast campus to provide the required power needs for the new athletics facility and the arena renovation.

4. Capital Project: Varsity Centre for Physical Activity and Health - Project Planning Report (cont'd)

dropped from page 6 of the Project Planning Report. Professor Venter agreed to re-insert the wording that had been inadvertently omitted from the Project Planning Report.²

A member asked whether student levies would be required in subsequent phases. Professor Venter replied that the current focus was on Phase 1. It was possible that Phase 2 would be funded by external sources. All options remained open for funding for phases 2, 3 and 4.

The member noted that the Master of Massey College had been on extended leave during the development of the Project Planning Report. Professor Venter explained that Professor Fraser had been present at the Committee's early meetings, and that the Committee had kept Massey College informed of its work.

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

1. THAT the planned four phases Varsity Centre space and facilities program located on site 21, as described in the Project Planning Report which is attached hereto as Appendix "B", be approved in principle;
2. THAT the planned first phase of this multi-phased project for Varsity Centre be approved to allow for completion of the track and field plus the immediate support facilities at a total project cost of \$16,386,000 from the following sources:
 - (i) Contribution in the amount of \$14,000,000 to be acquired from a mortgage, amortized over twenty years, to be repaid from the operating budget of the University of Toronto, and
 - (ii) Contribution in the amount of \$2,386,000 to be acquired from a mortgage, amortized over five years to be repaid from the operating budget of the new facility.
3. THAT all subsequent phases, consistent with established policy, will require formal approval by Governing Council and will require that the Project Planning Reports for each phase be reviewed by either the Planning and Budget Committee or the Accommodations and Facilities Directorate.

5. Capital Project: Multi-faith Centre for Study and Spiritual Practice - Project Planning Report

The Chair welcomed Ms Susan Addario, Director of Student Affairs, to the meeting for this item.

Professor Venter recalled that, in 2002, the Koffler Institute for Pharmacy Management had been identified as the preferred location for the Multi-faith Centre. Locating the Multi-faith Centre on the two upper floors of the Koffler Institute would require the relocation of the Faculty of Pharmacy to the Leslie L. Dan Pharmacy Building upon its

² Secretary's Note: The final sentence in Section 8 Resources on page 6 of the Project Planning Report was revised to read: *There will be no student capital levy for Phase 1 and only a modest increase in student operating is proposed (under \$10 per term, to begin in 2008-09).*

5. Capital Project: Multi-faith Centre for Study and Spiritual Practice - Project Planning Report (cont'd)

completion in December 2005. It would also require the relocation of the Administrative Management Systems (AMS) and Human Resources (HR) training facilities to expanded facilities at 256 McCaul Street. The large lecture hall on the main floor would continue to be operated by the Office of Space Management (OSM), and would be available when needed for multi-faith events.

Professor Venter noted that the Project Planning Committee had included representation from the Hindu Students' Association, the University of Toronto Buddhist Community, the Sikh Students' Association, the Muslim Students' Association, and the Campus Chaplains. He indicated that the Multi-faith Centre would provide the facilities and related services needed to support the religious and spiritual practices represented within the University community, and include resources, counseling and guidance to nurture spiritual development. It would represent and celebrate the diversity of the University of Toronto community. In addition, the Multi-faith Centre would establish another significant node in support of student activity, consistent with the initiatives outlined in the *Stepping UP* plan. It was anticipated that the Centre could be completed by May 2006.

Professor Venter informed members that discussions had been held with the Koffler family, who supported the location of the Multi-faith Centre in the Koffler Institute building.

Professor Goel thanked Professor Venter for his work in bringing the Project Planning Report for the Multi-faith Centre forward.

A member asked whether the prayer spaces that were currently available would be closed once the Multi-faith Centre had been completed. At the invitation of the Chair, Ms Addario replied that the Multi-faith Centre would provide additional prayer space. The current roster of prayer space would continue to be allocated according to present procedures.

A member asked whether the Multi-faith Centre was an approved fund-raising initiative. Professor Goel replied that the Centre continued to be a fund-raising priority.

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

1. THAT the Project Planning Report for the Multi-faith Centre for Study and Spiritual Practice, attached hereto as Appendix "C" be approved in principle. The Centre is to be located on the second and third floors of the existing Koffler Institute for Pharmacy Management at 569 Spadina Avenue and includes the renovation of 615 net assignable square metres of planned program space.
2. THAT the space program to accommodate expanded training facilities in support of the Administrative and Management Systems [AMS] and the Human Resources [HR] activities that is to be relocated to the ground floor at 256 McCaul Street be approved in principle;
3. THAT the funding for the project be approved at an estimated total project cost of \$3,389,400. The full cost of this project, in the amount of

\$3,389,400, to be acquired from a mortgage, amortized over twenty-five years, to be repaid from the operating budget of the University of Toronto.

6. Capital Project: Lash Miller / McLennan Courtyard - Project Planning Report

The Chair welcomed Professor Scott Mabury, Chair of the Department of Chemistry, to the meeting for this item.

Professor Venter explained that the project had been approved by the Accommodations and Facilities Directorate (AFD) in October 2003 at a cost of \$2 million. The current proposal was for phase 2, which would complete the project. The courtyard would be transformed into a vibrant and accessible green space that would enhance the quality of student space on campus and create an improved workplace environment for faculty and staff.

Professor Venter acknowledged the support for the project provided by Professor Mabury, and by Professor Farrar, the previous Chair of the Department of Chemistry. He also acknowledged the provision of funding for the project from the Students' Administrative Council Wheelchair Access Committee (SACWAC), and from the ZOOM funds from commercial advertisements located in washrooms that were directed by the Office of Student Affairs, with input from students, to specific projects.

A member asked why the project had been approved by AFD when the total project cost was anticipated to be more than \$2 million. Professor Venter replied that the first phase of the project was approved by AFD to contain costs. Professor Goel added that the project could have been divided into two components, each less than \$2 million, and each approved by AFD, but the entire project had been brought forward for governance approval.

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

1. THAT the Project Planning Report for the Courtyard in the Open Space between the Lash Miller Building and the McLennan Physics Laboratory, attached hereto as Appendix "D" be approved in principle.
2. THAT the funding in the amount of \$327,000 for Phase 2 of the Courtyard between the Lash Miller Building and the McLennan Physics Laboratory be approved with the support of the following funding sources:
 - (i) Contribution in the amount of \$58,500 from the Department of Chemistry,
 - (ii) Contribution in the amount of \$58,500 from the Department of Physics,
 - (iii) Contribution in the amount of \$100,000 from Zoom Funds,
 - (iv) Contribution in the amount of \$55,000 from SACWAC, and
 - (v) Contribution in the amount of \$55,000 from AFD.

7. Capital Project: Humanities Centre in the Medical Arts Building - Project Planning Report³

Professor Venter recalled that, in 2002, the University had purchased the Medical Arts Building located at the north west corner of Bloor and St. George Street. At the time of

³ At the request of the Agenda Committee this item was re-titled **Capital Project: Relocation of Four Humanities Departments in the Medical Arts Building - Project Planning Report**

purchase, the entire building was leased. Tenants were allowed, upon request, to renew their leases through to June 2006. As leases expired and were not renewed by the tenants,

7. Capital Project: Humanities Centre in the Medical Arts Building - Project Planning Report (cont'd)

vacant suites became available, and were cleaned, repainted, carpeted, and made available to accommodate faculty members within the Humanities, particularly faculty members of the Department of English.

Professor Venter explained that the proposed plan was to relocate and consolidate the Departments of English, Philosophy, Religion and Linguistics to the Medical Arts Building. The Department of English would be on floors 3, 4 and 5; the Departments of Linguistics and Religion on floors 6 and 7; and the Department of Philosophy on floors 8 and 9. The tenth floor would be used to accommodate other university activities as well as academic centers in which the humanities departments within the Medical Arts Building, and other units, could participate.

The immediate intent was to consolidate the Department of English on the third, fourth and fifth floors, starting with the fourth floor, which would house the departmental offices. The project planning report was being tabled for approval in principle. The project would proceed in small increments, with the approval of the Accommodations and Facilities Directorate (AFD) as each subsequent cluster of rooms or floor was identified for upgrading and reassignment to the relevant department. If the cost of any individual project exceeded \$2 million, it would be brought to the Planning and Budget Committee for approval.

A member asked what the cost per square foot was for the renovations. Professor Venter replied that the cost was approximately \$70 per square foot. The member asked how accessible faculty members with offices in the Medical Arts Building would be to students. Professor Goel replied that faculty members would be accessible to students, given the proximity of the Medical Arts Building to Robarts Library, Sidney Smith Hall, and the St. George subway.

A member asked whether a density transfer would be available for the Medical Arts Building. Mr. Bisanti replied that density transfers were no longer allowed by the City of Toronto.

A member noted that the relocation of the four departments would release the space they currently occupied.

A member noted that no student members had been included in the membership of the Planning Committee, and suggested that it would be beneficial to have student members on all committees. Professor Venter replied that the original committee membership had included students.

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

1. THAT the Project Planning Report to relocate and accommodate four Humanities Departments to the Medical Arts Building, attached hereto as Appendix "E", be accepted in principle.
2. THAT this approval in principle, consistent with policy, will allow the renovations to take place within the Medical Arts Building as approved independently by the Accommodations and Facilities Directorate.

8. Capital Project: University of Toronto at Scarborough – Science Building: Project Planning Report

The Chair welcomed Professor Buchweitz, Professor Relph and Ms McLean to the meeting for this item. He noted that a revised page 42 of the Project Planning Committee Report had been placed on the table – two columns had been missing from the documentation that had been distributed.

Professor Venter informed members that the Science Building had been identified as the highest priority for the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC), and one of the highest priority projects at the University. The Science Building was urgently required to support and provide the facilities for the development of the physical and environmental sciences as well as the life sciences research endeavours. The project was planned to be constructed in two phases. At this time, funding was available only for the first phase.

Phase 1 would include a new building of 2543 net assignable square metres (nasm), rectification of several deferred maintenance issues, and renovations to existing research facilities. It would house 16 laboratories designed as generic wet labs with a planned core of support areas, 16 faculty offices, 24 offices for graduates and post doctoral fellows, and a 150 seat classroom. The design and construction schedule required completion and occupancy in January 2008.

Professor Venter explained that the projected cost for phase 1 of the Science Building was \$31.5 million. Of that amount, \$20 million was projected to be borrowed. At this time, approval for \$3 million was being requested to allow for the design to proceed to the call for tender stage of planning. This would enable sufficient time, through to March 2006, to confirm the various sources of external funding that were required for the project. In April 2006, prior to the commencement of the construction of the Science Building, the availability of all funds would be reassessed by the Planning and Budget Committee. Professor Goel added that it was appropriate to take some risk for this project, as the Committee would have an opportunity to review the funding for the project at a later date.

A member asked whether the \$20 million would be a twenty-five year mortgage at 8 per cent, and what the annual amount would be. Professor Goel replied that the annual cost would be approximately \$1.8 million. The member asked whether the UTSC budget would be increased by that amount. Professor Goel explained that the Enrolment Growth Fund transfers had provided funds to meet capital requirements. Each capital project was examined separately.

A member noted that UTSC would carry any additional costs incurred as a result of delays, should the project not proceed according to the schedule outlined in the Project Planning Report, and asked whether the costs would be paid by carryforward funds or whether a levy would be required. Professor Goel replied that the recommendation being considered for approval by the Committee was the expenditure of \$3 million to pay for architectural drawings and would be paid for by funds UTSC would have in hand.

The member acknowledged the number of student members on the Project Planning Committee, and suggested that a representative from the Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students (APUS) be included on future committees. Professor Goel replied that the membership of Project Planning Committees was described in the Policy on Capital Projects and Capital Planning, and members could not be added on an ad hoc basis.

8. Capital Project: University of Toronto at Scarborough – Science Building: Project Planning Report (cont'd)

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

Subject to the project returning to Planning and Budget Committee for consideration of further funding sources when those can be identified,

1. THAT the Project Planning Report for Phase 1 of the Science Building at the University of Toronto at Scarborough, comprising a total of 5075 gross square metres, attached hereto as Appendix “F”, be approved in principle;
2. THAT a cash contribution in the amount of \$3,000,000 from the one-time-only fund identified in the 2004/05 operating budget for academic projects seriously restricted by shortcomings in infrastructure and deferred maintenance will be made available to UTSC to undertake the design [starting June, 2005 to March, 2006] through to the tender stage of the development.
3. THAT all subsequent phases of the Science Building, consistent with established policy, will require formal approval by Governing Council and will require that the Project Planning Reports for each phase be reviewed by the Planning and Budget Committee.

9. Capital Project: University of Toronto Art Centre - Interim Project Planning Report

Professor Venter informed members that this project required external funding in order to proceed. The Project Planning Committee had been established in November 2004 to explore the potential expansion and/or relocation of the University of Toronto Art Gallery which was currently housed within University College. The proposed location for the University of Toronto Art Gallery was the Lillian Massey Building, owned by Victoria University, and located at Bloor Street and Avenue Road. This would be an exceptional location for the Gallery, as it would be adjacent to the Gardiner Ceramic Museum and across the street from the Royal Ontario Museum.

The Lillian Massey Building was currently leased to two tenants – the Ontario Ombudsperson and Club Monaco. The lease to the Ontario Ombudsperson would terminate in 2011 and the lease to Club Monaco would expire in 2015. The capital cost required in 2011 to upgrade to exhibition quality space was estimated to be 21 million in 2011 dollars. The endowment required to operate the facility was estimated to be 35.5 million in 2011 dollars. An additional \$26.06 million would be required to renovate the space that would become available in 2015.

The Interim Project Planning Report was being brought forward for approval at this time to identify the Lillian Massey Building as the potential site for the University of Toronto Art Gallery, and to enable the University of Toronto, working in collaboration with Victoria University, to secure the external funds necessary to advance the project to the next stage of planning.

Professor Goel commented that this was an important project that fitted several *Stepping UP* priorities – enhancing the student experience, providing opportunities for interdisciplinary initiatives, and enhancing outreach to the community. The area surrounding Bloor and Avenue Road could become an Arts District similar to the medical discovery district that had been created at College and University Avenue.

9. Capital Project: University of Toronto Art Centre - Interim Project Planning Report (cont'd)

A member commended the proposal and suggested that it would generate donor interest, and could appeal to donors who might not want to support other projects.

A member asked if Victoria University would receive the income from the proposed endowment. Professor Goel replied that the endowment income would cover the rental income that Victoria University would forego when the leases were terminated. He observed that Victoria University used much of its rental income for student financial support.

A member asked for clarification of the basis for decisions concerning which capital projects could have access to borrowed funds. Professor Venter explained that the Capital Plan which had been approved earlier in the year identified projects as claret – those that were part of the short-term capital plan that might have access to limited borrowing capacity – and as blue – those projects that required funding from external sources in order to proceed. Professor Goel added that the Capital Plan was revisited every time a capital project was brought forward for approval.

A member asked how the priorities for University fundraising were set. Professor Goel replied that fundraising priorities came from the academic planning process.

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

1. THAT the Interim Project Planning Report for the University of Toronto Art Centre, attached hereto as Appendix “G”, be approved in principle for the provision of 4570 nasm to accommodate the activities and functions described for both phases of this project.
2. THAT the fundraising goal of \$56 million be established for the first phase of construction and to support the operating costs of the first phase.

10. Capital Project: Department of Mathematics Phase I: Project Planning Committee Report : Change in Scope

Professor Venter explained that there were two changes in scope to report to governance. Changes had been made to the space plan:

- the number of faculty offices had decreased from 31 to 29, with an increase of just under 10% in the size of the offices;
- the number of graduate student spaces had increased from 24 to 50;
- the Board Room had been reduced in size;
- the size of the dedicated seminar room had been substantially increased;
- the computer laboratory had been eliminated in favour of a computer room;
- storage space had been reduced.

There had also been a change in planned accommodation. The Department of Mathematics would move directly into the new space on the sixth floor of the Bahen Centre for Information Technology (BCIT) in August 2005. The Department of Economics would move into the space previously occupied by the Department of Mathematics, rather than moving into the sixth floor of the BCIT for eighteen months.

10. Capital Project: Department of Mathematics Phase I: Project Planning Committee Report : Change in Scope (cont'd)

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

1. THAT the changes in scope in the space plan for Project Planning Report for the Department of Mathematics Phase I at the University of Toronto, as described in the memorandum from Professor Venter which is attached hereto as Appendix “H”, be approved.
2. THAT the changes in scope related to the occupancy changes associated with the Project Planning Reports for the Department of Mathematics Phase 1 and the Department of Economics be approved.

11. Canadian Institute for Theoretical Astrophysics: Disestablishment in the School of Graduate Studies (SGS) and Reestablishment in the Faculty of Arts and Science

Professor Zaky informed members that the Canadian Institute for Theoretical Astrophysics (CITA) had requested to be transferred from the School of Graduate Studies into the Faculty of Arts and Science. The transfer would allow CITA to have greater interaction with members of the Departments of Astronomy, Astrophysics, Physics and Mathematics, as was consistent with the *Stepping UP* objective to strengthen linkages between research and academic programs.

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the Canadian Institute for Theoretical Astrophysics be disestablished as an academic unit in the School of Graduate Studies and reestablished as the Canadian Institute for Theoretical Astrophysics as an EDU-1 in the Faculty of Arts and Science, effective July 1, 2005.

Documentation is attached hereto as Appendix “I”.

12. Centre for the Environment - Faculty of Arts and Science and School of Graduate Studies: Proposal to Establish

Professor Zaky informed members that the Institute for Environmental Studies (IES), the Division of Environment (DoE), and Innis College’s Environmental Studies Program proposed to combine their resources to create a new graduate and undergraduate teaching and research entity, to be named the University of Toronto Centre for the Environment. This was intended to strengthen and highlight the wealth of environmental teaching and research at the University and to improve the collaboration among environmental units. The Centre would offer core, interdisciplinary courses and programs, building on existing curricula within the three units. The Director of the Centre would be jointly appointed by, and would jointly report to, the Dean of the School of Graduate Studies (SGS) and the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Science (A&S). Budgetary and academic arrangements between SGS and A&S were being reviewed and all arrangements would be finalized prior to planning for the 2006-07 academic year.

12. Centre for the Environment - Faculty of Arts and Science and School of Graduate Studies: Proposal to Establish (cont'd)

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the Institute for Environmental Studies (IES), Division of Environment (DoE) and Innis College's Environmental Studies Program combine resources to create a new graduate and undergraduate teaching and research entity, to be named The University of Toronto Centre for Environment effective July 1, 2005.

Documentation is attached hereto as Appendix "J".

13. Institute of Women's Studies: Change of Name and unit type

The Chair noted that a revised cover sheet had been placed on the table for this item.

Professor Zaky explained that the Institute, which had been founded in 1999 and was located in New College, had outgrown its institutional framework and the proposed change was part of the plan for its successful growth. As an EDU-1 unit, the Institute would be able to hire faculty and to enter into a direct reporting relationship with the Dean of Arts and Science. Budget allocations to the Institute would be made by the Faculty of Arts and Science and would no longer flow through New College.

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

1. THAT the name of the Institute for Women's Studies and Gender Studies be changed to the Women and Gender Studies Institute effective July 1, 2005, and
2. THAT the unit move from an EDU-2 to EDU-1 unit.

Documentation is attached hereto as Appendix "K".

14. Centre for Russian and East European Studies: merger and creation of new unit

The Chair noted that a revised cover sheet had been placed on the table for this item.

Professor Zaky explained that, as a result of the *Stepping UP* planning process, it was proposed that the Centre for Russian and East European Studies be merged with the undergraduate program in European Studies in the Faculty of Arts and Science to create a new unit, the Centre for European, Russian and Eurasian Studies (CERES). This would be a joint center of the School of Graduate Studies and the Faculty of Arts and Science.

The mandate of CERES would be:

- to provide education to graduate and undergraduate students in Russian, European and Eurasian studies;
- to provide a platform for research on these regions, including interdisciplinary and applied research; and
- to offer comprehensive, accessible and authoritative information and analysis to the world outside of the University.

14. Centre for Russian and East European Studies: merger and creation of new unit (cont'd)

CERES would operate as an EDU-2 unit from July 1, 2005 to June 30, 2010, and the Director would report to the Dean of the School of Graduate Studies and the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Science.

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

1. THAT the Centre for Russian and East European Studies be merged with the undergraduate program in European Studies in the Faculty of Arts and Science to create a new unit, the Centre for European, Russian and Eurasian Studies, and
2. THAT the Joint Centre operate as an EDU-2 from July 1, 2005 to June 30, 2010.

Documentation is attached hereto as Appendix “L”.

15. School of Graduate Studies: Discontinuation of the MEd/MA/EdD/PhD program in Teacher Development at OISE/UT

The Chair welcomed Professor Dennis Thiessen, Chair of the Department of Curriculum Teaching and Learning, for this item.

Professor Zaky explained that the Teacher Development program had undergone an appraisal by the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies (OCGS) in 2003 during which concerns had been raised about actual and projected enrolments and the viability of the program as a separate entity. It was now proposed that the Teacher Development courses be integrated into the Curriculum, Teaching and Learning program. This would provide students with greater depth and breadth of study in teacher development and access to other faculty involved in teacher development research.

Professor Goel congratulated Professor Thiessen for streamlining program offerings in a way that improved the quality of the program as well as the student experience.

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the discontinuation of the MEd/MA/EdD/PhD program in Teacher Development be approved.

Documentation is attached hereto as Appendix “M”.

16. Senior Assessor’s Report

Professor Goel commented that the number of items which the Committee had considered for approval at this meeting reflected several of the priorities that were being dealt with by his office.

He reminded members that the Provincial Budget was being released on May 11. It was anticipated that the budget would include increased funding for postsecondary education. However, the University would have to determine whether proposed increases included

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

amounts that had been previously committed, how much of the funding would be for colleges, and the University of Toronto's share of the funding for universities.

Professor Goel indicated that a report of the review of the internal budget model would come to the Committee in the fall before being implemented.

17. Annual Report: Design Review Committee

Members received this report for information. There were no questions

18. School of Graduate Studies: Restructuring of the MT program within the Department of Curriculum, Teaching and Learning, OISE/UT

Members received this item for information. There were no questions.

19. Ibero-American Studies Program: Change in Name to 'Latin American Studies'

Members received this item for information. There were no questions.

20. Diploma in Technical Education: Change in Name to the "Diploma in Technological Education"

Members received this item for information. There were no questions.

21. Date of the Next Meeting

The Chair noted that this was the final scheduled meeting of the Committee for this governance year. The first meeting of 2005-06 was currently scheduled for September 20, 2005.

22. Other Business

(a) Thank you

The Chair thanked the assessors, the members of the Agenda Planning Group, and Vice-Chair Miriam Diamond for their work over the past year.

On behalf of the Governing Council, he also thanked all the members of the Committee for their diligence and commitment over the past year. He noted that the work of the Committee was crucial to the governance of the University, and that members' efforts were appreciated.

The Chair also expressed his thanks to staff from the Office of the Governing Council for their support to the Committee throughout the year.

Professor Goel thanked Professor Gotlieb for successfully carrying out the work of the Committee.

The Chair reminded members that Professor Venter's term as Vice-Provost, Space and Facilities Planning ended on June 30, 2005. This was therefore his final Committee meeting.

The Chair noted that Professor Venter had served as both a member of the Committee, and as an assessor to it. In 2000-01, he had served as Vice-Chair, until he had been

22. Other Business (cont'd)

(a) Thank you (cont'd)

appointed to the newly-created position of Vice-Provost, Space and Facilities Planning on March 1, 2001.

While acknowledging that there would be other occasions at which the appreciation of Governing Council would be expressed in a more formal and material way, the Chair, on behalf of the Committee, thanked Professor Venter for his hard work and dedication to the University. Members applauded Professor Venter for his contributions.

(b) Committee Membership for 2005-06

The Chair explained that non-Governing Council membership of the Committee for 2005-06 would be considered for approval by the Academic Board at its meeting on June 2nd. Governing Council membership of the Committee for 2005-06 would be considered for approval by the Governing Council at its June 29th meeting. All members of the Committee for 2005-06 would receive information about the Committee, including a meeting schedule, during the summer.

There was no other business

The meeting adjourned at 6:15 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

May 31, 2005