

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

REPORT NUMBER 137 OF THE PLANNING AND BUDGET COMMITTEE

May 5, 2010

To the Academic Board,
University of Toronto

Your Committee reports that it held a meeting on Wednesday, May 5, 2010 at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, at which the following were present:

Professor Wendy Rotenberg (In the Chair)
Professor Cheryl Misak, Vice-President
and Provost
Ms Catherine J. Riggall, Vice-President,
Business Affairs
Professor Denise Belsham
Mr. P.C. Choo
Professor Joseph Desloges
Ms Shirley Hoy
Professor Ronald Kluger
Professor Angelo Melino
Professor David Mock
Ms Carole Moore
Mr. Gregory Louis West

Non-voting Assessors:

Mr. Paul Donoghue, Chief Administrative
Office, University of Toronto
Mississauga
Ms Sally Garner, Executive Director,
Planning and Budget
Mr. Nadeem Shabbar, Chief Real Estate
Officer
Ms Elizabeth Sisam, Assistant Vice-
President, Campus and Facilities
Planning

Secretariat:

Mr. Anwar Kazimi, Secretary

Regrets:

Professor Parth Markand Bhatt
Mr. Ryan Matthew Campbell
Professor William Cluett
Professor Jane Gaskell
Dr. Avrum Gotlieb
Miss Tulika Gupta
Professor Scott Maybury
Mr. W. John Switzer
Dr. Sarita Verma

In Attendance:

Professor Cristina Amon, Dean, Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering
Professor Brenda Andrews, Director, Donnelly Centre for Cellular and Biomolecular Research
Professor Jutta Brunée, incoming Associate Dean, Faculty of Law
Ms Jane Kidner, Assistant Dean, Professional Legal Education, Faculty of Law
Ms Helen Lasthiotakis, Director, Academic Programs and Policy, Office of the Provost
Ms Shirley Roll, Director, Facilities Management and Space Planning, Faculty of Medicine
Ms Kathy Tam, Chief Administrative Officer, Faculty of Law
Ms Mae-Yu Tan, Assistant Secretary of the Governing Council
Ms Heather Taylor, Facilities Management and Space Planning, Faculty of Medicine
Professor Catharine Whiteside, Dean, Faculty of Medicine

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

1. Report of the Previous Meeting (April 12, 2010)

Report Number 136 (April 12, 2010) was approved.

2. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting

There was no business arising from the report of the previous meeting.

3. Senior Assessor's Report

Professor Misak reported on the University's campaign plans. The University remained under extensive financial pressures and it was hoped that these would be somewhat relieved with the assistance of the University's benefactors and friends. Professor Misak acknowledged that it had been a difficult year for both the University and its benefactors. As had been announced earlier, the University had been the recipient of two generous gifts - \$15 million for the Robarts Library and \$35 million for the Munk School of Global Affairs. The University hoped to build on the success of these efforts as it began its new campaign efforts with renewed optimism. The Office of the Vice-President and Chief Advancement Officer had workshops for Principals, Deans, Academic Directors and Chairs on advancement strategies. These workshops had been well attended and based on the positive response, it had been decided to extend the workshops in the autumn to include other administrative heads. Staff from the Office of the Vice-President and Chief Administrative Officer had been included in budget meetings with Deans to garner a sense of planning priorities. Through this exercise, it was hoped that themes would be identified to enable the University to define campaign priorities based on divisional plans. This would be a focus of the retreat in the Fall for Principals and Deans.

4. Faculty of Law and School of Graduate Studies: Proposal for a Global Professional Master of Laws

Ms Garner said that, if approved, the proposed Global Professional Master of Laws (G.P.L.L.M.) would begin in September 2011. It would be offered on a full-time basis in an alternative format on evenings and weekends due to the type of market to which it was being directed. The program would be attractive to practicing lawyers, and leaders in government and business, and a broad demand for the program was anticipated. The program would be taught by a combination of full-time faculty, and distinguished adjunct and visiting professors. The Faculty of Law had consulted with the Joseph L. Rotman School of Management regarding the proposal, and the School was supportive of the proposal as there was no significant overlap with the current or planned programs which it offered. The Faculty of Law had committed to providing all the resources needed for the program. The financial plan had been reviewed by the Planning and Budget Office and it was working towards final approval of the tuition fees with the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities (MTCU). It was anticipated that MTCU approval would be received by Fall 2010. The target for the tuition fees had been set at \$25,800. The resources required to offer the program would be provided by a combination of funding from tuition fees and the Basic Income Unit (BIU) revenue generated by student enrolment. An initial intake of 30 students had been projected, with a growth to 120 students within five years. With the student intake and BIU support, it was expected that the program would be self-funded within the first two years, and it would not draw on central University resources.

In response to members' questions, Professor Brunée said that program was specifically tailored to professionals operating in a global legal environment. This would be a unique program, as there were few similar degrees offered elsewhere for professionals. With the anticipated growth of the program, additional full-time staff would be required.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR COMMITTEE CONCURS

With the prospective recommendation of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs

THAT the proposed Global Professional Master of Laws (G.P. LLM.) program, as described in the proposal from the Faculty of Law dated April 23, 2010, a copy of which is attached hereto as [Appendix "A"](#), be approved with enrolment commencing in September 2011.

5. Faculty of Medicine: Proposal to Establish the Donnelly Centre for Cellular and Biomolecular Research (DCCBR) as an Extra-Departmental Unit:A

Ms Garner said that this proposal was an evolution from the Centre for Cellular and Biomolecular Research (CCBR) building project which had commenced in 2000, to the opening of the Donnelly Centre for Cellular and Biomolecular Research (DCCBR) in 2005. The Faculty of Medicine had proposed the establishment of the Donnelly Centre for Cellular and Biomolecular Research as an Extra-Departmental Unit A (EDU:A) that would allow the Centre to have primary faculty appointments and offer programs. The establishment of the Centre as an EDU: A had been recommended by an external review in 2009 as a means of strengthening an already world-class teaching and research program. The partners in the original Centre had included the Faculties of Medicine, Applied Science and Engineering and Pharmacy. After further consultation among the Faculties and the Office of the Provost and Vice-President, agreements had been revised to establish the Faculties of Medicine and Applied Science and Engineering as primary partners, and the Faculties of Arts and Science and Pharmacy as associate partners. The Director of the DCCBR would report to the Dean of the Faculty of Medicine. The Director would be supported by an executive committee representing all of the partner faculties. Agreements had been reached on all funding responsibilities and there would be no impact on the University's central budget. The proposal to establish the DCCBR as an EDU:A had been approved by the Faculty of Medicine's Council in March 2010.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the Donnelly Centre for Cellular and Biomolecular Research (DCCBR) be established as an Extra-Departmental Unit:A (EDU:A) teaching and research entity, effective July 1, 2010.

Documentation is attached hereto as [Appendix "B"](#).

6. Capital Project: Interim Project Planning Report for the Faculty of Dentistry

Ms Sisam said that the Faculty of Dentistry was located in old facilities at 124 Edward Street.

The Project Planning Committee for the capital project had determined that 19,600 net assignable square metres (nasm) would be required to accommodate the Oral Health Science Complex whereas the current area at the Edward Street location provided 14,700 nasm and the building which was in poor condition could not be expanded any further. The Committee had studied three options in detail:

1. Renovation of 124 Edward Street

Renovations and additions to 124 Edward Street would be required to accommodate the basic academic and research programs of the Faculty. This would be required as the faculty would have to be located to another site and rental space would be required during the period of construction. Extensions to the building would require zoning permissions that would entail a change to the medical helicopter flight path to The Hospital for Sick Children.

6. Capital Project: Interim Project Planning Report for the Faculty of Dentistry (cont'd)**2. Construction of a New Building at 88-112 College Street (Site 14)**

Site 14 was well situated in the health sciences precinct to accommodate the Faculty of Dentistry. The Banting and Best Institute was presently located there. The approximate total project cost to construct a new building on Site 14 in 2010 dollars was \$325 million, exceeding funding probability.

3. Purchase and Renovation of an Existing Building

The Committee also considered the possibility of acquiring an existing building within the vicinity of the campus. If the University were to purchase a site with an existing building which could be modified to meet the needs of the Faculty of Dentistry, the range of the total project cost in 2010 dollars would approximately \$165 million. Acquisition costs would be in addition to that amount. It was expected that the annual operating costs would increase by approximately \$1.6 to \$2.0 million for the modified site. However, the operating costs would be less than those for a brand new building.

Ms Sisam explained that the purpose of the interim report was to outline the space requirements for the required facilities to allow for fund raising initiatives to commence. A final project report with the detailed capital costs would be brought forward for governance approval when funding sources were identified, prior to implementation

In the discussion that followed, Professor Mock concurred with a member's view that the project would bring the Faculty of Dentistry to a closer proximity to the University community. Professor Mock stressed that there were no plans to admit additional undergraduate students as a result of the project. The Faculty faced constraints in terms of admitting undergraduate students as there were no BIU increases expected. In the future, the additional space would allow the flexibility to add new programs. There were plans to expand the doctoral programs and the specialized graduate programs. The International Dentist Advanced Placement Program for Foreign-Trained Dentists (IDAPP), introduced in previous years, had been a success in providing revenue to the Faculty and meeting the needs of the government. It was the largest program of its kind in the country and there were plans to increase its enrolment. Additionally, in the Fall 2010, the Faculty planned to introduce a program for internationally trained dental specialists to train them to a point that would enable them to write the licentiate exam to practice in Canada. Primary discussions had also been held to establish collaborative programs with community colleges.

Professor Mock said that the Faculty of Dentistry was capable of covering the additional operating costs of \$1.6 million associated with a move to a new location. The Faculty of Dentistry was the leading faculty in the country. However, that could not be sustained in a location that was inadequate for research and teaching purposes. The Faculty added a great deal of value to the University.

6. Capital Project: Interim Project Planning Report for the Faculty of Dentistry (cont'd)

The site that would be chosen would determine the schedule and final cost of the project – for the purposes of an approximate timeline, five years would be appropriate. Professor Misak said that the new fundraising campaign mentioned earlier would be a natural assessment point for the funds needed for the project. Professor Mock informed the Committee that the Faculty was unique because in addition to its academic component, it also ran a mini hospital. That brought health into the issue. Therefore, in addition to discussions with the MTCU, assistance would also be sought from the Ministry of Health.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the Interim Project Planning Report for an Oral Health Science Complex, dated April 26, 2010, a copy of which is attached hereto as [Appendix “C”](#), be approved in principle to accommodate the activities and functions described and to facilitate the necessary fundraising related to the proposed project.

7. Capital Project: Project Planning Report for the Relocation of the Department of Family and Community Medicine

Ms Sisam explained that the Department of Family and Community Medicine had been relocated to the fourth and fifth floors of 263 McCaul Street in 2005. Since that time, there had been a rapid growth in programs offered by the Department. In 2008, more space had been required and the Department had been temporarily assigned additional space in the Banting Building. The total space requirement for the Department was approximately 1,260 nasm. 500 University Avenue was deemed to be the most appropriate location for the Department because space was available in this location and the current occupants were the rehabilitation sciences departments with the Faculty of Medicine. The property had been purchased by the University in 1999. It was proposed that the vacant space be renovated at a cost of \$3.5 million for the relocation of the Department. Even with approval of this project, space at 263 McCaul Street would not be released. A small portion of activity with the Department would remain and the remainder of the space at that location would be used by the Faculty of Medicine. With the relocation of the Department, there would be an increase of approximately \$50,000 in the operating cost for the Faculty. Funding for the project was in place and would be provided by the Ministry of Health-Long Term Care and the Department.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

1. THAT the Project Planning Committee Report for the relocation of the Department of Family and Community Medicine to 500 University Avenue, dated April 15, 2010, a copy of which is attached hereto as [Appendix “D”](#), be approved in principle.
2. THAT the project scope as identified in the Project Planning Report be approved at a Total Project Cost of \$3,500,000 with funding as follows:

Ministry of Health – Long Term Care:	\$3,000,000
Department of Family and Community Medicine	\$ 500,000

8. Capital Project: University of Toronto at Scarborough Sports and Recreation Centre (SARC) – Project Planning Committee Terms of Reference

Members received, for information, the Terms of Reference and Membership for the Project Planning Committee for the University of Toronto at Scarborough Sports and Recreation Centre (SARC).

There were no questions.

9. Date of the Next Meeting

The Chair advised members that this was the final meeting of the Planning and Budget Committee for the current governance year. Meeting dates for 2010-11 would be posted on the Governing Council website in July 2010.

10. Other Business

(a) Thank you

On behalf of the Dr. Gotlieb and herself, the Chair thanked all members of the Committee for their contributions over the past year, especially that of the assessors and members of the Agenda Planning Group. The Committee had greatly benefitted from members' input, diligence, and commitment. The work of the Committee was crucial to the governance of the University, and members' efforts were much appreciated by the Governing Council. Professor Misak thanked Professor Rotenberg and Dr. Gotlieb for serving as Chair and Vice-Chair of the Committee.

(b) Committee Membership for 2010-11

The Chair noted that Governing Council membership of the Committees for 2010-11 would be considered for approval by the Governing Council at its May 13, 2010 meeting at the University of Toronto at Scarborough. Non-Governing Council membership would be considered by the Academic Board at its meeting on June 2, 2010. All members of the Committee for 2010-11 would receive information about the Committee during the summer. The Chair wished members a safe and restful summer.

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Secretary

Chair