

**UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO**  
**THE GOVERNING COUNCIL**

**REPORT NUMBER 114 OF THE PLANNING AND BUDGET COMMITTEE**

**October 17, 2006**

To the Governing Council,  
University of Toronto

Your Board reports that it held a meeting on Tuesday, October 17, 2006 at 4:10 pm in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall at which the following were present:

Professor Avrum Gotlieb (in the Chair)  
Professor Miriam Diamond (Vice-Chair)  
Professor Vivek Goel, Vice-President and  
Provost  
Ms Catherine J. Riggall, Vice-President,  
Business Affairs  
Professor Safwat Zaky, Vice-Provost,  
Planning and Budget  
Professor Stewart Aitchison  
Ms Diana Ali

Professor Philip H. Byer  
Mr. Kristofer Coward  
Professor Ellen Hodnett  
Professor Brad Inwood  
Professor David Mock  
Ms Carole Moore  
Ms Theresa Pazonis  
Professor Andrea Sass-Kortsak  
Mr. Stephen C. Smith  
Mr. Patrick Wong

**Regrets:**

Professor John Coleman  
Professor Jane Gaskell  
Professor Gregory Jump  
Mr. Timothy Reid  
Professor Pekka Sinervo

**Secretariat:**

Ms Cristina Oke

**Non-voting Assessors:**

Mr. John Bisanti, Chief Capital Projects  
Officer  
Ms Elizabeth Sisam, Assistant Vice-  
President, Campus and Facilities Planning

**In Attendance:**

Mr. Ray Desouza, Chief Administrative  
Officer, University of Toronto at  
Mississauga  
Professor David Klausner, Vice-Dean,  
Interdisciplinary Affairs, Faculty of Arts  
and Science  
Professor Anne Lancashire, Vice-Dean,  
Academic, Faculty of Arts and Science  
Ms. Helen Lasthiotakis, Acting Assistant  
Provost  
Ms Roseanne Lopers-Sweetman, Director,  
Special Projects, Office of the Vice-  
President and Provost  
Professor Cheryl Misak, Acting Vice-  
President and Principal, University  
of Toronto at Mississauga  
Ms Marny Scully, Director, Enrolment  
Planning and Statistics  
Professor Mark Stabile, Interim Director,  
School of Public Policy  
Professor Carolyn Tuohy, Provostial  
Advisor on Public Policy  
Professor Catharine Whiteside, Dean,  
Faculty of Medicine

ITEMS 4, 5, 7 AND 8 ARE RECOMMENDED TO THE ACADEMIC BOARD FOR APPROVAL.

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

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

Report Number 113 of the meeting of September 18, 2006 was approved.

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

### **(a) Governance Consideration of the new Budget Model**

The Chair reminded members that, at the September 18th meeting, it had been suggested by a member that the principles underlying the new budget model be considered by governance. After consultation with the Office of the Governing Council, it had been agreed that governance approval of the new budget model was not necessary. The administration had been delegated responsibility for the development of the budget, and the approach that had been taken was consistent with the intent of past practice.

The Chair explained that, in the past, various elements of the budget had been considered by the Committee for inclusion in the Budget Report, prior to consideration of the Budget Report itself. The intent of that process had been to ensure that the Committee was fully informed about the budget's components and background, and to provide an opportunity for input from members. Given the complexity of the budget, these steps had facilitated the Committee's work.

More recently, the process had evolved and had been refined, with the budget documentation becoming increasingly streamlined and clear. The Committee had considered the Budget Report, including the Revenue and Expense Assumptions, Long-range Budget Guidelines and Contractual Obligations and Policy Commitments (COPC) list, at a single meeting.

The Chair noted that the Vice-President and Provost had provided regular updates to the Committee as the University had moved towards the implementation of the new budget model. As well, an information session on the new model had been offered to members of the Committee, the Academic Board and the Governing Council. All of these occasions had been opportunities for members to comment on the new budget model.

The Chair stated that, in his view, the Committee would be well briefed for its consideration of the operating budget under the new model. The model was intended to be clearer and more transparent in providing the information relevant to governance, in the interests of accountability. He reminded members that, following normal practice, the Committee would be asked to approve the operating budget itself in the early spring.

### 3. Senior Assessor's Report

#### (a) Budget Model

Professor Goel expressed his agreement with the Chair concerning the approval of the new budget model. He undertook to include a description of the new administrative process for preparing the budget as part of the *Budget Report for 2007-08*.

Professor Goel reiterated that the new budget model was intended to provide to governance increased clarity and transparency for budget allocations. He indicated his willingness to use one of the three meetings scheduled in February and March 2007 as an information session on the new budget model.

#### (b) Multi-Year Agreement for Universities for 2006-07 to 2008-09

Professor Goel explained that, as part of its *Reaching Higher* plan<sup>1</sup>, the provincial government had committed to providing base level operating grants to colleges and universities. The Multi-Year Agreement (MYA) had been introduced by the Ministry as a mechanism that would inform the government about the plans and the initiatives undertaken in post-secondary institutions to improve quality and enhance student experience. Each institution was responsible for developing its own priorities and the indicators by which the priorities could be measured.

Professor Goel reminded members that the University of Toronto had developed a number of performance indicators and annual reports as part of its accountability to Governing Council and to the public at large. He stated that the activities described in the draft MYA for the University of Toronto were based on the University's academic plan, and included divisional initiatives that had been prepared in response to *Stepping Up*.

Professor Goel noted the requirement for consultation in the MYA, and indicated that he would also be reporting on the agreement to the Academic Board at its November meeting.

A member asked if there had been consultation with student governments at the University to inform the development of priorities. Professor Goel replied that there were a number of ways in which student opinion was sought, including the National Survey on Student Engagement (NSSE), the Graduate and Professional Student Survey (GPSS), focus groups, and meetings with the leaders of student governments.

A member asked to what extent provincial funding would be based on the performance indicators. Professor Goel replied that the province was seeking a commitment from postsecondary institutions to transparency and accountability.

A member noted that the numbers shown on pages 8 and 9 as the result of indicators 3a, 3b, 4, 6, 6a, and 6b remained constant over the three years of the agreement. Professor Goel explained that this was a draft document that was being reviewed by the divisions. The cover transmittal letter for the MYA would explain that the results reflected what could be done

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.fin.gov.on.ca/english/budget/bud05/pdf/bke1.pdf>

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

#### **(b) Multi-Year Agreement for Universities for 2006-07 to 2008-09 (cont'd)**

over the three-year period given the resources that were available, not what the University would like to do in that time.

A member observed that the metrics concerning faculty did not reflect the quality of the faculty. Professor Goel recognized that the measures described were primarily input measures and not learning outcomes. These were the measures that were appropriate for a short time frame. The development of appropriate measures was ongoing.

A member asked whether the three-year plan would constrain the University from undertaking other activities. Professor Goel replied that the MYA would be reviewed every year, and that the University could take that opportunity to adapt to changing circumstances.

### **4. Framework for Graduate Expansion**

#### **(a) Introduction**

Professor Goel reminded members that a discussion paper on graduate enrolment planning had been presented to the Committee in November 2005. The principles stated on page 3 of *A Framework for Graduate Expansion 2004-05 to 2009-10 (Framework)* had resulted from that meeting. A preliminary plan for graduate expansion had been considered by the Committee in May 2006.

The *Reaching Higher* plan of the provincial government had provided for an expansion of graduate education by 14,000 students by 2009-2010. The government had assured both operating grant funding and capital funding for the first phase of the proposed expansion. In 2007-08, the University of Toronto would receive funding for up to 2140 additional student FTEs (890 Ph.D. and 1250 Masters) above enrolments in 2004-05. This was the estimated eligible portion of the full expansion target of 2330 in 2007-08, which would provide an operating grant of about \$39.4M. The associated capital funding, assuming these targets had been met, was a "notional" \$96.7M. The Government referred to capital funding as "notional" because it would be provided in the form of a stream of payments over 20 years whose present value at 6.5% interest was equal to the notional amount. The Ontario budget of 2005 had also provided funding for the second phase; however, the Government's plans and allocations to individual universities for that phase had not yet been announced.

Professor Goel noted that expansion had been front-loaded for 2007-08. The School of Graduate Studies (SGS) had mounted a significant recruitment campaign, while divisions had reviewed applications for the 2007-08 academic year. Further steps, such as increasing the admissions yield and identifying additional sources of financial support for graduate students, would now be addressed.

#### **4. Framework for Graduate Expansion (cont'd)**

##### **(b) Discussion**

The following points were raised in discussion.

##### **i. Eligibility for Government Funding**

A member referred to the statement on page 4 of the *Framework* that, typically, 87% of the domestic students were eligible for funding, and noted that the cover memorandum had indicated that 2140 of the proposed 2330 additional students, or 92%, would be eligible for funding. Professor Zaky replied that eligibility for funding was governed by the number of years a student had been enrolled in a program. Students enrolled in Master's programs were funded for a maximum of two years, while students enrolled in a Ph.D. program were funded for a maximum of four years. The University estimated that, in the long-term, 86% of enrolled graduate students would be eligible for government funding.

##### **ii. Recruitment Campaign**

A member asked if more information could be provided about the recruitment campaign of SGS. Professor Goel undertook to have the Dean of SGS provide an update on the campaign to the Academic Board at its November meeting.

##### **iii. Framework Targets**

A member asked for clarification of what was being approved: the steady state increase, or the 2007-08 target increase. Professor Goel replied that the *Framework* presented graduate enrolment targets that were estimates of how graduate units across the University would respond to the opportunities and resources available with respect to graduate enrolment expansion. Specifically, approval of the 2007-08 targets was being requested at this time. Once allocations for subsequent years were made, the plan could be updated.

A member asked how much flexibility existed in the enrolment targets for doctoral stream and professional masters' programs. Professor Zaky replied that, for the purposes of graduate enrolment expansion funding, the two groups were interchangeable.

A member noted the proposed increase in graduate enrolment in the Faculty of Music, and asked if the increase was the result of reclassifying existing programs. Professor Zaky replied that the increase resulted from the development of new programs as well as reclassification of existing programs in the Faculty.

##### **iv. Maintaining and Enhancing the Graduate Student Experience**

A member asked how the principles of maintaining and enhancing the quality of graduate student experience and continuing to provide financial support for graduate students

#### **4. Framework for Graduate Expansion (cont'd)**

##### **(b) Discussion (cont'd)**

#### **iv. Maintaining and Enhancing the Graduate Student Experience (cont'd)**

would be upheld if there were fewer undergraduate students. Professor Goel replied that graduate enrolment expansion would enhance the undergraduate student experience with the opportunities of supporting more teaching assistantships.

A member commented that faculty within graduate Departments were aware of the risks of increasing graduate enrolment, and were resistant to increased enrolment if, in their view, the increase would weaken the graduate program of the Department.

A member asked whether the Graduate Students' Union (GSU) had been involved in the development of the *Framework*. Professor Goel replied that the GSU had provided substantial input on the *Framework*.

A member commented that changes to graduate programs, including the development of one-year Master's programs as an alternative to two-year Master's programs, had been introduced in response to budgetary restrictions. The changes in the quality of graduate programs were difficult to measure. Professor Goel replied that work was required on developing measures of quality for programs. One such measure of program quality would be the organization or institution to which graduates of the program moved, either for further study or for employment. He noted that some Departments were particularly good at tracking students after they had left the University. He agreed that work had to be done on the development of measures of perceived changes in the quality of programs.

#### **v. Availability of Resources to Support Graduate Enrolment Expansion**

A member observed that the proposed graduate enrolment targets included an increase of 3,000 students in Ph.D. and doctoral stream Master's programs, and asked whether there would be an increase in the number of faculty to accommodate the need for supervision of these students. Professor Goel replied that there would be an increase in graduate supervision. He noted that retiring faculty might not be at full supervisory capacity, while newly hired faculty would become more actively involved with graduate supervision. As resources for the graduate expansion were realized from all sources, there would be the opportunity to examine faculty complements.

A member asked what metrics were in place to assess whether appropriate resources were in place to support the graduate enrolment expansion. Professor Goel replied that data was available on admissions yield rates, financial support for graduate students, and quality of students. Faculty/student ratios could also be monitored.

The member asked whether the number of hours available for Teaching Assistants and the number of graduate students per office would be included as metrics to monitor the effects of graduate enrolment expansion. Funding of Teaching Assistantships was measured by the University, and graduate student space was reported to the Council of Ontario Universities (COU). Professor Goel replied that the Graduate and Professional Student Survey (GPSS) provided information about the graduate student experience.

#### **4. Framework for Graduate Expansion (cont'd)**

##### **(b) Discussion (cont'd)**

##### **v. Availability of Resources to Support Graduate Enrolment Expansion (cont'd)**

A member expressed his concern about the incremental effects of graduate enrolment expansion, and asked how the quality of graduate students and graduate programs would be maintained, and how the University could ensure that it had the resources necessary to cover students. Professor Zaky commented that graduate enrolment expansion was self-limiting because graduate admission decisions were made by individual graduate units that would accept students only when all the needed resources were available. A member observed that, while the admission of doctoral and doctoral stream students was dependent upon resources being available, enrolment increases in professional master's programs could be made by a division without consultation.

Professor Goel noted that the final paragraph of the *Framework* clearly stated that implementation of the graduate enrolment expansion plan was contingent upon the availability of adequate research funding and student support awards. Additional funding in those areas would ensure the new resources would support the expansion.

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the proposed graduate expansion as described in the *Framework for Graduate Expansion 2004-05 to 2009-10*, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "A", be approved.

#### **5. School of Public Policy and Governance: Establishment**

The Chair welcomed Professor Klausner, Vice-Dean, Interdisciplinary Affairs, Faculty of Arts and Science, Professor Stabile, Interim Director, School of Public Policy, and Professor Tuohy, Provostial Advisor on Public Policy, to the meeting for this item.

Professor Zaky reminded members that the Committee had recommended the approval of the Master of Public Policy (MPP) program at its September meeting. The program would be offered by the School of Public Policy and Governance (the School). In addition to offering the MPP program, one of the priorities for the School would be to organize seminars and events that engaged the School with the broader community and strengthened its influence on public policy. The proposal for the School had been approved by the Council of the Faculty of Arts and Science on October 3, 2006.

Professor Zaky explained that the School would be structured as an interdisciplinary, cross-faculty unit administratively housed in the Faculty of Arts and Science. The Director of the School would report administratively and financially to the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Science and academically to a Council of Deans, chaired by the Dean, Faculty of Arts and Science, and consisting of deans of the divisions participating in a substantial way in the graduate program offered by the School. The participating divisions had signed a Memorandum of Agreement regarding the governance and

## 5. School of Public Policy and Governance: Establishment (contd.)

administration of the School (Faculties of Applied Science and Engineering, Arts and Science, Information Science, Law, Medicine, and Social Work, the Joseph L. Rotman School of Management, the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto (OISE/UT), the University of Toronto at Mississauga and University of Toronto at Scarborough).

The School would be considered a modified Extra-Departmental Unit (EDU):2, under current criteria for the formation of EDUs. In addition to having its own budget and authority to administer research grants, the School would also have the authority to offer academic programs and to enroll students. The School would register students in the planned MPP program and provide them with financial support. The School would not make primary faculty appointments.

Professor Zaky informed members that, in addition to revenues from tuition and government grants, funding to support the initial growth of the School had been provided through the Academic Initiatives Fund. Additional sources of funding would be identified as the School developed. It was intended that the School would become self-sustaining over time, but it was recognized that it would take time for the School to achieve its complete revenue.

A member observed that the School could not make primary faculty appointments. Professor Goel explained that a primary appointment meant at least a 50% appointment to a unit that was also the tenure home for the faculty member. Few Centres and Institutes were permitted to appoint faculty.

The member asked what mechanism would be in place for faculty who were interested in public policy but who were not officially appointed to the School to become involved in its work. Professor Goel indicated that the School would have a number of advisory groups and many opportunities for participation in its activities. Professor Tuohy added that there would be opportunities for collaboration outside the formal governance structures.

It was noted that there was a minor error in the Budget Summary. Footnote 1 should refer to the 'Faculty' line, not to the 'Visiting Practitioner Stipends' line.

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the School of Public Policy and Governance be established as a new modified EDU:2 teaching and research entity, effective immediately.

Documentation is attached hereto as Appendix "B".

## 6. Capital Plan for Buildings and Projects in excess of \$2 million

Ms Sisam reminded members that the Policy on Capital Planning and Capital Projects required that an updated list of Capital Projects be presented for information at the appropriate meeting of

## **6. Capital Plan for Buildings and Projects in excess of \$2 million (cont'd)**

a Governing Council Board or Committee at which a capital project was being considered for approval.

Ms Sisam summarized the changes to the Capital Plan between April and September 2006. The borrowing requirements that had been identified in the April capital plan had totaled \$730.49 million, with \$30.11 million available for other initiatives. As of September 25, 2006, the total borrowing requirement was \$743.86 million with \$16.75 million available for other initiatives. The increase in required borrowing totaled \$13.4 million.

## **7. Capital Project: Project Planning Report: Medical Academy at the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM)**

The Chair welcomed Mr. Desouza, Chief Administrative Officer of UTM, Professor Cheryl Misak, Acting Vice-President and Principal, UTM, and Professor Whiteside, Dean of Medicine, to the meeting for this item.

Ms Sisam reminded members that the Committee had approved in principle the Interim Project Planning Report for the Medical Academy in July 2006. The Medical Academy at the University of Toronto at Mississauga (the UTM Academy) provided an opportunity to increase health science related teaching and research on the UTM campus.

Ms Sisam explained that the creation of the UTM Academy had implications for space, facilities, and infrastructure enhancements at the Medical Sciences Building (MSB) on the St. George campus, and the UTM campus. The increased number of medical students required expansion of the anatomy teaching laboratories and other teaching space in the MSB, while the distributed model of the UTM Academy would rely on videoconferencing and web-casting of lectures and seminars between the UTM and St. George campuses. This would necessitate facility and audio visual and information technology improvements of lecture theatres and the consolidation of Academic Computing and Computer Services in the MSB.

The UTM campus would require a number of space, facility, and information technology enhancements to accommodate both teaching and student service space for the medical curriculum and research space for three new faculty positions created in conjunction with the UTM Academy. The necessary teaching space included lecture rooms, seminar rooms, small-group teaching space, patient simulation (clinical skills) rooms, and associated administrative support space. Current utilization of UTM classrooms already had exceeded the Council of Ontario Universities (COU)-recommended utilization, therefore new teaching space had to be created to accommodate the delivery of the medical school curriculum.

Ms Sisam informed members that, because completed new facilities could not be fully available for the fall semester of 2007 when the UTM Academy was scheduled to open, an interim space program had been created based on the carefully identified requirements needed to support the first class in 2007/08. Permanent UTM Academy space would be completed in time for the 2008/09 academic year. The interim space program provided for the UTM-based teaching, videoconferencing /information technology, administrative,

## **7. Capital Project: Project Planning Report: Medical Academy at the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM) (cont'd)**

and student/social activities of the Academy in its first year, and was designed to minimize the amount of temporary construction that would later be removed for UTM's space development program. Most of the interim space would be located in the vacated library area of the South Building, adjacent to the future Academy site.

Ms Sisam stated that the total estimated cost of the project was \$20.107 million: \$5.308 million for enhancements at the MSB, \$11.799 million for enhancement at UTM, as well, the Medical Academy will set aside \$3 million as its contribution towards new research laboratories at UTM for faculty to be recruited as part of the Academy at UTM. Provincial funding for the capital project would be in the form of a stream of payments annually over 20 years. The present value of annualized payments was \$14.7 million. The balance of the funding required for the Academy, would be raised or equally supported by the participating Divisions. Contingent financing totaling \$5.407 million would be raised through advancement or financed as short term debt and carried by the two Divisions.

There would be other work to be completed in the same areas of MSB and UTM, not attributable to the Medical Academy, which should be designed at the same time. The cost of the work, to be subject to separate approval would be \$1.25 million for enhancements at the MSB, and \$10.74 million for enhancement at UTM.

Professor Goel observed that this was the first project planning report that had covered one capital project on two campuses.

A member asked whether the twenty-year funding stream was binding on future provincial governments. Professor Goel replied that it was not binding, but also highly unlikely that a future government would withdraw funding given the large number of stakeholders involved.

A member asked whether accessibility and environmental concerns had been considered by the Project Planning Committee. Ms Sisam confirmed that accessibility issues and environment concerns had been addressed.

A member commended those involved in planning exciting and innovative ways in which the programs would be delivered.

On motion duly moved and seconded

**YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS**

1. THAT the Project Planning Report for the Medical Academy at the University of Toronto at Mississauga, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "C", be approved in principle;
2. THAT space vacated in the South Building and including an adjacent addition be made available to the UTM Medical Academy;

**7. Capital Project: Project Planning Report: Medical Academy at the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM) (contd.)**

3. THAT improvements and renovations at the Medical Sciences Building to support the distributed learning model of the UTM Medical Academy be approved in principle;
4. THAT the project scope of 3415 nasm for the Academy having a total project cost of \$20.107 million be approved; and
5. THAT \$20.107M funding required for the UTM Medical Academy comprise:
  - a) provincial funding in the form of annualized payments having a present value of \$14.7 million, and
  - b) \$5.407 million short term debt carried by the Faculty of Medicine and the University of Toronto at Mississauga

**8. Declaration of Property as Surplus to the University's Requirements**

The Chair informed members that, before the University could dispose of or develop University property, the property had to be declared surplus to University requirements on the advice of the Planning and Budget Committee.

Ms Sisam reminded members that, in 2002, the University had purchased property from the Toronto District Board of Education, including three buildings (155 College Street, 263 and 255/257 McCaul Street) and a parking facility at 240 McCaul Street. In early 2006, the parking structure had been converted to become a surface parking lot because of structural inadequacies. Since that time it had operated without full occupancy.

Ms Sisam explained that the site at 240 McCaul Street had been reviewed to determine institutional opportunity for expansion. Because of its limited zoning provisions (low density residential designation) and location in a low-rise residential neighbourhood, it had been assessed as having limited practical use for University activities, and being surplus to University requirements.

A member asked if the block between Beverley and McCaul Streets offered a possibility for development. Ms Sisam replied that there were many property owners in that block. Professor Goel added that in order for property to be useful to the University, it needed to be zoned for institutional use.

A member asked how many people currently used the parking facility. Ms Riggall replied that the lot was not fully utilized. Increased costs for gas and insurance had reduced the demand for parking on campus.

A member asked whether the University could transfer the density of the property. Ms Sisam replied that use and density were not transferable. A member asked whether the property could be used for student housing. Ms Sisam replied that student housing was considered institutional use, and the property was not zoned for institutional use.

**8. Declaration of Property as Surplus to the University's Requirements (contd.)**

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the property 240 McCaul Street be declared surplus to University requirements.

Documentation is attached hereto as Appendix "D".

**9. Student Experience Fund**

The Chair noted that the allocations from the Student Experience Fund did not require approval by governance, as the amount allocated to this Fund had not been established as one of the Operating Budget Special Funds in the 2006-07 Budget Report.

Professor Goel explained that the Student Experience Fund (SEF) had been created to support projects that enhanced undergraduate student experience. The fund supported a broad range of initiatives, with the key objective being that successful projects had an immediate and positive impact on the student experience for as many students as possible. The methodology for determining allocations from the Fund had been developed in consultation with Principals and Deans. It was intended that this fund support initiatives for students in first-entry programs – where the University's challenges were the greatest – and projects that were not normally funded by other sources. The following principles had been identified as criteria for the initiatives:

- 1) high potential for immediate impact on student experience (i.e., within an academic year);
- 2) link with either key learning objectives for our academic programs and/or co-curricular opportunities that enhance student experience;
- 3) ability to reach and benefit as large a number of students as possible; and
- 4) ability to leverage funds from other sources (where possible), and the sustainability of the initiative.

The process for allocation of funds had been strategic and, for planning purposes, funding envelopes had been distributed across key sectors for University-wide initiatives including library, computer network services, student services and athletics. Several broad themes had emerged from the initiatives, including student study space enhancements; student services and co-curricular support; academic programs and research; and student community engagement/outreach and research.

A total of \$20 million over the three years, 2006-2009 had been allocated to the fund in the 2006-07 Budget Report, with OTO allocations of \$3.3M in 2006-07, \$6.6M in 2007-08 and \$9.9M in 2008-09.

**10. Capital Project: Project Planning Committee Membership and Terms of Reference****(a) Student Commons on the St. George Campus**

Members received the Membership and Terms of Reference for the Project Planning Committee for the Student Commons on the St. George Campus

A member asked for clarification of the term 'anchor tenant', Professor Goel replied that an anchor tenant could provide food service or retail opportunities.

**(b) University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM) South Building Master Plan**

Members received the Membership and Terms of Reference for the Project Planning Committee for the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM) South Building Master Plan. A member noted that the Committee did not include a representative from the Health Sciences, although the South Building would include some facilities of the UTM Medical Academy. Ms Sisam undertook to add a representative from the Health Sciences to the Project Planning Committee.

**11. Date of the Next Meeting**

The Chair noted that the next meeting of the Committee was scheduled for Tuesday, December 5, 2006 beginning at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber.

The meeting adjourned at 5:55 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

November 16, 2006