

**UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO**  
**THE GOVERNING COUNCIL**  
**REPORT NUMBER 66 OF**  
**THE PLANNING AND BUDGET COMMITTEE**

**December 12, 2000**

To the Academic Board,  
University of Toronto.

Your Committee reports that it met on Tuesday, December 12, 2000 at 5:00 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, with the following members present:

Professor David Mock (In the Chair)  
Professor Carolyn H. Tuohy,  
Deputy Provost  
Professor Derek McCammond,  
Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget  
Professor Carl Amrhein  
Professor W. Raymond Cummins  
Mr. Brian Davis  
Professor Angela Hildyard  
Professor Susan Horton

Professor Bruce Kidd  
Professor Robert H. McNutt  
Professor Nancy Reid  
Professor Kenneth Sevcik  
Ms Wendy Talfourd-Jones

Secretariat:

Mr. Neil Dobbs  
Ms Susan Girard

Regrets:

Mr. Muhammad Basil Ahmad  
Mr. Brian C. Burchell  
Professor Michael G. Finlayson  
Professor Ruth M. Gallop  
Mr. Ljupco Gjorgjinski  
Professor Avrum I. Gotlieb

Mr. Fayez A. Quereshy  
Professor Adel S. Sedra,  
Professor Ronald D. Venter  
Professor Fred Wilson  
Professor Linda Wilson-Pauwels

In Attendance:

Professor Derek P. H. Allen, Vice-Provost and Dean of Arts, Trinity College  
Professor Joseph Boyle, Principal, St. Michael's College  
Professor John W. Browne, Director of Residence Development  
Mr. Ken Burke, Chief Administrative Officer, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education in  
the University of Toronto  
Mr. Louis R. Charpentier, Secretary of the Governing Council  
Professor David Clandfield, Principal, New College  
Professor David B. Cook, Principal, Victoria College  
Professor Frank A. Cunningham, Principal, Innis College  
Dr. Beata FitzPatrick, Assistant Provost  
Dr. James D. Friesen, Chair, Banting and Best Department of Medical Research  
Professor Michael Fullan, Dean, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education in the University  
of Toronto  
Professor Paul W. Gooch, Vice-Provost  
Dr. Glenn A. Loney, Registrar, University College  
Professor Robert MacGregor, Faculty of Pharmacy

In Attendance: (cont'd)

Ms Gail Milgrom, Senior Planning and Budget Officer, Space Analysis  
Professor David Naylor, Dean, Faculty of Medicine  
Miss Janice Oliver, Assistant Vice-President, Operations and Services  
Professor Edward Relph, Associate Principal, University of Toronto at Scarborough  
Professor Michael V. Sefton, Institute of Biomaterials and Biomedical Engineering  
Professor Mel Silverman, Special Advisor to the Vice-President - Research and International Relations  
Professor Rod C. Tennyson, Director, Government Research Infrastructure Programs  
Professor Cecil C. Yip, Vice-Dean - Research, Faculty of Medicine, Chair of the Users' Committee for the Centre for Cellular and Biomolecular Research  
Ms Elizabeth Sisam, Director, Campus and Facilities Planning  
Ms Lynn Snowden, Assistant Vice-Provost, Arts and Science  
Mr. Jorge Sousa, President, Graduate Students' Union

THE MEETING WAS HELD IN OPEN SESSION.

ITEMS 4 TO 9 ARE RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL.

**1. Report of a Previous Meeting - Report Number 64 (October 18, 2000)**

Report Number 64 (October 18, 2000) was approved.

The Chair said that Report Number 65 (November 14) would be distributed before the next meeting.

**2. Business Arising from the Previous Meetings**

The Chair invited the Committee to raise (a) any matters of business arising from Report Number 64, which was in the agenda package, and (b) any matters members recalled requiring attention from the November 14 meeting. When Report Number 65 became available at the next meeting, the Committee would deal with any additional matters of "business arising."

**(a) Capital Project: Users' Committee Reports on the New College and Mississauga Campus Residence Expansion**

The Chair reported that a member had given notice of a question concerning the relative costs of the two projects. While the Committee had been told that it was more expensive to build downtown, a member stated that the estimated cost per foot of the New College residence exceeded the cost of the Mississauga residence.

Professor McCammond referred to a table he had distributed at the meeting, comparing costs in recently approved residence projects. The data were separated into the residential building costs and a total cost that included all costs such as those arising from the secondary effects of the projects. The residential building costs per gross square foot of the two projects on the St. George campus were within \$1 of each other. The same cost at the suburban campuses was \$5-10 less. Using the total project costs, which included secondary effect, the cost per gross square foot of the two St. George residences was separated by \$9, one reducing in cost and the other rising. New College's cost increased because of the relocation costs of the units that would be displaced by the construction. The U.T.Sc. cost remained essentially constant and the total project cost per gross square foot at U.T.M. rose \$6. The reasons for this increase were the cost of resurfacing a parking lot, the relocation of storage used by the drama program, and the need for a walkway.

A member was struck by how close the costs were.

**2. Business Arising from the Previous Meetings (cont'd)****(b) Academic Priorities Fund Allocations: School of Graduate Studies Centres and Institutes**

The Chair recalled that a member had enquired about an allocation to the Centre of Criminology and the Centre for Industrial Relations for a course in Statistics, and the member had asked about the role of the Department of Statistics. A letter from Professor Rosemary Gartner of the Centre of Criminology had been included in the agenda package to explain the need for a separate course. The Department of Statistics did not offer a course every year to students in other disciplines who were interested in applied statistics and who lacked a strong background in mathematics. Students in the two programs had previously taken statistics courses in cognate departments such as Sociology or Economics. However, because of resource constraints, the most popular of those courses had been closed to students from other programs.

**(c) The Campaign**

The Chair recalled that the Campaign had been cited at the previous meeting as the source of funding for the Bahen Centre and the 371 Bloor Street project. A member had given notice of a question concerning the extension of the Campaign and the further increase in its goal to \$1-billion. The Chair said that while fundraising was primarily in the responsibility of the Business Board, the Academic Board, on the recommendation of the Planning and Budget Committee, was charged to advise the Governing Council "with respect to the ranking of priorities for major fundraising campaigns." Professor Sedra had advised that consultations with the divisions were underway on objectives for the new leg of the Campaign, and a recommendation would be brought to the Committee in due course.

**3. Senior Assessor's Report**

Professor Tuohy informed the Committee that Professor Sedra was attending the investiture of President Emeritus J. Robert S. Prichard into the Order of Ontario. Acting for Professor Sedra, she reported on the following matters.

**(a) *Raising Our Sights Planning Process.*** Professor Tuohy reported that the *Raising Our Sights* process was continuing and that by the end of today's meeting, the academic plans of twenty divisions would have been considered. Those yet to come included Information Studies, Management, Law, Physical Education and Health, and the Library. Both the U.T.Sc. and U.T.M. plans would be reviewed in the context of enrolment expansion.

**(b) *Canada Research Chairs.*** Professor Tuohy noted that the University had submitted five more nominations for Canada Research Chairs in December, bringing the total nominations to 46, including 23 in medicine and the affiliated hospitals and 23 in the other divisions. The administration would be bringing forward in the new year recommendations for expenditures to support the Chairs program.

**(c) *Budget Report.*** The budget report would also be brought forward in the spring. The funding announcement from the Provincial Government was not expected for some time. In response to a member's question, Professor McCammond anticipated that the funding announcement would not be made until the Task Force on Investing in Students reported, maybe as late as April. The administration would bring forward the 2001-02 budget since other items such as fees and investment income would be known and an assumption on government funding could be used. A member said that he had been under the impression that the Task Force would report early in the new year. Professor McCammond stated that since

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

the submissions were due mid-December and would be considered in January, it might be optimistic to expect that the report would be dealt with earlier than April.

**(d) Capital projects.** Professor Tuohy said that an updated capital plan was part of the agenda today and early next year the Committee could expect to see the Users' Committee report on the new Faculty of Pharmacy building and a revised master plan for U.T.Sc.

### 4. Academic Priorities Fund and Academic Transitional Fund: Allocations

The Chair recalled that the Committee's role was to consider and, if appropriate, recommend approval of expenditures from the Academic Priorities Fund and Academic Transitional Fund. Recommendations were based on the new academic plans for each division. At its July meeting, the Committee had recommended allocations to several divisions including Arts and Science; Engineering; Social Work; Music; Architecture, Landscape, and Design; Forestry; and the Transitional Year Program. At the November meeting, the Committee recommended allocations to Dentistry, Medicine, Nursing, Pharmacy, the School of Graduate Studies, the Student Recruitment effort, and an OTO allocation for the University of Toronto at Mississauga, pending the consideration of its full academic plan.

Professor Tuohy said that since this was the third set of academic plans and recommended A.P.F. allocations to come to this Committee, members were undoubtedly aware of the three steps in the *Raising Our Sights* process - self-study, external review and development of a plan. The Provost's review of the Colleges' plans had been comprehensive and comparative. It had also been very instructive, highlighting the distinctive positive attributes and challenges of each College. The plans and recommended allocations reflected that distinctiveness.

Documentation for this item is attached hereto as Appendix "A".

#### (a) Innis College

Relevant Base Budget 2000:	\$861,163
Proposed Allocation:	\$124,782 base \$50,000 OTO

Professor Tuohy noted that Innis College was in a strong phase of improvement, as indicated by its entering student average. The improvement was attributed to the new residence and its attractiveness to students. It had enhanced student recruitment potential. The College now wished to concentrate on academic community activities and strengthening its alumni base. In particular, it planned to rejuvenate its Town Hall and a \$50,000 allocation from the Academic Transitional Fund was recommended for additional technical support of this facility.

Principal Cunningham did not wish to add any comments.

#### (b) New College

Relevant Base Budget 2000:	\$1,295,197
Proposed Allocation:	\$161,500 base

Professor Tuohy said that the challenge faced by New College was to improve its recruitment of the best students and to provide support in terms of merit-based scholarships. The Provost was recommending support for admission scholarships and for initiatives in support of improving academic skills, a common theme in the Colleges' plans.

Principal Clandfield said that the summary provided spoke well of the College's directions.

**4. Academic Priorities Fund and Academic Transitional Fund: Allocations** (cont'd)

A member recalled that a ministry guideline required that 30 percent of the increase in tuition fee revenue be re-invested in student support. She asked if this was mainly need-based support or was there an opportunity to support merit. Professor Tuohy said that the tuition fee revenue was invested in need-based student support.

**(c) University College**

Relevant Base Budget 2000:	\$1,180,124
Proposed Allocation:	\$59,400 base \$10,000 OTO
University-wide initiatives	\$185,000 base \$200,000 OTO

Professor Tuohy said that University College was the oldest and most well-established of the constituent colleges. In its academic plan, it too focused on academic skills support. There was an emphasis on university-wide activities such as the Art Centre and the Writing Workshop which were based at the College. The Provost had recommended separate allocations to support both types of initiatives.

Dr. Loney did not wish to add anything further.

**(d) Woodsworth College**

Relevant Base Budget 2000:	\$4.1 million
Relevant Base Summer	\$2.9 million
Proposed Allocation:	\$77,500 base \$25,000 OTO
Summer and Evening	\$74,000 base

Professor Tuohy said that Woodsworth College was in a period of transition as it moved toward providing greater emphasis on its full-time enrolment while maintaining its traditional mandate to serve part-time students. Its new residence was a central part of its academic plan. The College has asked that its budget for summer and evening programs not be subject to a budget reduction. The Provost, in recommending an allocation for this purpose, has in effect forgiven the budget cut for this year on the understanding that the College and the Faculty of Arts and Science would discuss the best way to deliver the Faculty's summer and evening programs as the University contemplated a three-semester system. Another allocation would support students at risk.

Principal Hildyard said she was pleased to be part of this period of change.

A member asked for clarification concerning the summer and evening programs. Professor McCammond explained that the evening and summer programs of the Faculty of Arts and Science were managed by Woodsworth College but delivered by the Faculty. The College bought the teaching resources. It became very difficult to take a budget cut in this area as less resources meant fewer courses could be offered and tuition revenue would accordingly be reduced. In other divisions, the summer program might be part of a large budget; at Woodsworth, it was a large part of a small budget.

**(e) St. Michael's College**

Proposed Allocation:	\$35,625 base \$325,000 OTO
----------------------	-----------------------------

Professor Tuohy noted that the federated colleges received their funding from the University under the Memorandum of Agreement. The recent revision to the Memorandum had made it

**4. Academic Priorities Fund and Academic Transitional Fund: Allocations** (cont'd)

possible for the federated colleges to apply for support from the A.P.F. for projects related to student academic skills and for study space.

At St. Michael's College, the Provost was recommending half the funding for a recruitment officer for five years and base funding for a director of the writing lab.

A member asked if this ability to apply for A.P.F. support was a new venture under the Memorandum of Agreement. Professor Tuohy confirmed that it was. Dean Amrhein responded that the Faculty had an instructional activity fund which was used to support initiatives like the one proposed by St. Michael's. That budget had been subject to budget reductions and therefore it was appropriate that the three colleges have the opportunity to compete for A.P.F. allocations.

Principal Boyle did not wish to comment.

**(f) Trinity College**

Proposed Allocation:           \$215,000 OTO

Professor Tuohy said that the focus at Trinity was to seek A.P.F. funding for the writing lab and for math aid programs. The Provost was supporting these requests and providing matching funding for a student levy directed toward the new John W. Graham library.

Dean Allen had nothing further to add.

**(g) Victoria College**

Proposed Allocation:           \$164,000 OTO

Professor Tuohy indicated that the Provost was recommending OTO allocations to support student computer equipment in the Pratt library, the writing lab and for 24-hour study space.

Principal Cook thanked the Provost for his support and did not wish to make any additional comments.

In closing the discussion of the federated colleges, Professor Tuohy said that she had recently had a tour of the east campus to see the new accommodation provided by St. Michael's and Victoria for a number of the language departments and she had been very impressed.

A member wished to return to the question of the funding arrangements for the federated universities. As he understood the previous comment, the Faculty of Arts and Science had had funding for instructional activities which had been subject to budget cuts but which now had been ameliorated somewhat by the allocations from the A.P.F. Dean Amrhein said that the budget reductions had contributed to the A.P.F. and that the individual divisions were entitled to apply for funding. The Faculty was not receiving new funding dollars.

A member noted that the relevant base for the federated universities had not been supplied. Professor McCammond said that the funding was provided through the Memorandum of Agreement.

**4. Academic Priorities Fund and Academic Transitional Fund: Allocations** (cont'd)**(h) OISE/UT**

Relevant Base Budget 2000: \$8.5 million  
Proposed Allocation: \$800,000 base

Professor Tuohy recalled that the former Faculty of Education and OISE had merged in 1996 to form the new OISE/U.T. and the integration was proceeding well. The highest priority of the academic plan was improving graduate student support. The Task Force on Graduate Student Financial Support, chaired by Professor Orchard, had noted that OISE/U.T. was the division with the greatest shortfall in meeting the proposed target funding of \$12,000 plus tuition per year. The Provost's response to the OISE/U.T. plan was focused entirely on graduate student support. The Provost recommended \$400,000 in base unconditionally and a second \$400,000 allocation contingent upon a matching amount of new funds from the OISE/U.T. operating budget. In addition, the Provost would provide a dollar for dollar match in base funding for all new S.S.H.R.C. fellowship awards received by OISE/U.T. students in the next three years, above the current level. Over the long term, the division might wish to consider the optimal size of the graduate student population if they were to be fully supported.

Dean Fullan said that he would be pleased to respond to questions.

At the invitation of the Chair, Mr. Sousa commented on the OISE/U.T. plan. He said that the Graduate Students' Union, Graduate Students' Association of OISE/U.T., the International Students' Association of OISE/U.T., and the Canadian Union of Public Employees (CUPE), local 3907 (the local representing graduate assistants at OISE/U.T.) wished to express their support for the academic plan, and the request being put forward by Dean Fullan, for an allocation from the Academic Priorities Fund to increase graduate student funding. OISE/U.T. students had been calling for increased funding for a number of years. The student groups noted above had been working to raise awareness as to the state of funding available to OISE/U.T. graduate students, and the OISE/U.T. administration had been working very hard to improve the situation. Mr. Burke and Dean Fullan had worked with concerned graduate students, and the plan now before the Committee and the A.P.F. request reflected that consultation process. The increased funding that would come from the A.P.F. request would be welcome news not only for OISE/U.T. graduate students, but also for the entire OISE/U.T. community. Mr. Sousa presented 866 signatures on a post-card petition to affirm their support. Mr. Sousa said that the Graduate Students' Union was pleased with the commitment that the Provost had shown to improve graduate student funding. In the OISE/U.T. case, the matching fund scheme would go a long way toward improving graduate student funding and would affirm the University of Toronto as the leader in graduate studies.

Dean Fullan commented that prior to the release of the Report of the Task Force on Graduate Student Financial Support, the division had identified graduate student support as the first priority and had started to increase the budget for this purpose. At the time of the merger, \$2.8 million had been earmarked for graduate student support; that figure had risen to \$4.8 million in the past four years. The Task Force report reinforced the problem that OISE/U.T. had already recognized.

The Chair indicated that this was the point at which questions raised under business arising could be addressed. A member asked for further clarification of the subsidy provided from the centre to the University of Toronto Schools (U.T.S.). He understood that it was composed of the use of the space free of charge, faculty teaching and the opportunity cost of the space. Dean Fullan explained that seven or eight years ago when the provincial government had ceased to provide public support to U.T.S., its funding had consisted of government support, tuition fee revenue and \$216,000 from the University plus free maintenance. Currently, U.T.S.

**4. Academic Priorities Fund and Academic Transitional Fund: Allocations** (cont'd)

was financed by the fees, \$216,000 and free maintenance. The member said that the use of the space was free as well. He asked why U.T.S. was not asked to pay for the space as was the School of Continuing Studies (S.C.S.). Dean Fullan suggested that U.T.S. was not like S.C.S. since it was part of OISE/U.T. and not a separate entity. It was integrated with the academic program of OISE/U.T. and not expected to be a separate unit. Professor Tuohy said that S.C.S. was a self-funded operation without a lab school dimension and she suggested that the analogy was not exact.

On the recommendation of the Vice-President and Provost,

**YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS**

- (a) THAT the following allocations from the Academic Priorities Fund be made in support of divisional plans, 2000-04:

	<b>Base</b>	<b>OTO</b>
Innis College	\$124,782	\$ 50,000
New College	\$161,500	
University College	\$ 59,400	\$ 10,000
University College for University-wide initiatives	\$185,000	\$200,000
Woodsworth College	\$ 77,500	\$ 25,000
Woodsworth College for Summer & Evening program	\$ 74,000	
St. Michael's College	\$ 35,625	\$325,000
Trinity College		\$215,000
Victoria College		\$164,000
OISE/U.T.	\$800,000	
Total	Base: \$1,517,807	OTO: \$989,000

and

- (b) THAT the following allocation from the Academic Transitional Fund be made:

	<b>OTO</b>
Innis College	\$50,000

**5. Woodsworth College: Discontinuation of the Certificate Program in Case Management**

The Chair stated that the Committee was responsible for making recommendations concerning the establishment and disestablishment of programs. Normally, such recommendations would require the approval of the Governing Council, but given the small size of the program and the limited budget implications, there was no need for approval at the highest level in this case.

Professor McCammond said that Woodsworth College had recently proposed revisions to two certificate courses which had been reviewed by the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs. The first, the Certificate in Human Resource Management, proposed a reduction in the number of courses from six to five and changed its admission requirements to include an undergraduate degree. There were no resource implications related to that change. The second program, the Certificate in Case Management, had also been revised, reducing the number of



5. **Woodsworth College: Discontinuation of the Certificate Program in Case Management** (cont'd)

courses from four and one half to three, again with no resource implications. In addition it was proposed that enrolment in this program be suspended. The Certificate program had begun two years ago but it had suffered from academic support problems and from lower than anticipated enrolment levels. The program was a joint one with McMaster University and McMaster proposed to continue to offer the program on its own. Students in the program at the University of Toronto would be able to complete the program. Since the program was self-funded, the only resource implication would be the loss of the central overhead charge of \$25,000.

In response to a member's question, Principal Hildyard explained that McMaster University had the faculty with expertise in this area and they want to continue to offer the program including the use of distance education. The University also had the expertise in packaging distance education.

On the recommendation of the Vice-President and Provost,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT admission of new students to the Certificate Program in Case Management at Woodsworth College be suspended indefinitely, effective with the 2001 summer session.

Documentation for this item is attached hereto as Appendix "B".

6. **Capital Plan 1997-2002: Update**

Professor McCammond said that the Capital Plan, 1997-2002, had been approved in May 1997 and had been updated several times since then. The revised plan now before the Committee reflected the changes made in the last twelve months, including the users' committee reports that have been approved and the users' committees that have been struck. There were two sections to the report. The first section described the projects that were fairly well along in the process or were actually under construction. The total estimated cost of these projects was \$488 million. Of the funding required, \$358 million had been secured and \$130 million remained to be found. The various sources of the funds were displayed. The second section showed the projects that were at earlier stages of planning. Some had users' committees, while others did not. None of the projects in that section had an associated project cost. He noted that the capital plan was updated regularly and at the end of the planning period in 2002 a new plan would be brought to Governing Council for approval.

On the recommendation of the Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the updated Capital Plan, 1997-2002, which is Schedule "A" to Appendix "C" hereto, be approved.

7. **Capital Project: Centre for Cellular and Biomolecular Research: Users' Committee Report**

The Chair reminded members that the Committee considered the reports of users' committees and made recommendations on: site, space plan, cost, and sources of funds. The Committee was asked to recommend approval in principle only. The project would, at two appropriate times, be taken to the Business Board, which had to approve appropriations before any

7. **Capital Project: Centre for Cellular and Biomolecular Research: Users' Committee Report** (cont'd)

spending could take place, apart from a maximum of \$50,000 for design work, which could be approved by the Vice-President - Administration and Human Resources. The Business Board was responsible to ensure that funding was in place, or realistically on the horizon, firstly, before authorizing spending on design work, and secondly before authorizing the commencement of construction.

Professor McCammond said that the proposed building would be one of two to make up the new Health Sciences Complex I. The second building was to accommodate the Faculty of Pharmacy and to enable it to double its enrolment. It would be located at the northwest corner of College Street and University Avenue, south of the Tanz Neuroscience Building. The Users' Committee for the Faculty of Pharmacy Building would report early in 2001. The Centre for Cellular and Biomolecular Research (C.C.B.R.) would accommodate approximately sixty principal investigators from the Faculty of Medicine, the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering, and the Faculty of Pharmacy, and their research groups, along with ancillary equipment rooms, research offices, and meeting rooms. The Centre would house more than 400 research workers (technical staff, graduate students, and postdoctoral fellows) within five interactive research programs: Proteomics and Bioinformatics, Protein Structure, Animal Models and Mechanisms of Human Diseases, Cellular and Molecular Engineering, and Cellular and Molecular Functional Imaging. The proposed facility would provide 10,370 net assignable square metres (n.a.s.m.) or 20,740 gross square metres of new state-of-the-art research facilities. Full implementation of the facility, including design and construction, would take approximately 50 to 54 months, with a planned opening in the summer of 2005. The new building would form a link between the existing Medical Sciences Building, the FitzGerald Building and the Rosebrugh Building, and it would draw on existing support facilities and services. It was to be located on Taddle Creek Road fronting on College Street, and it would create a new, visible and prominent entrance and address to the University's academic health science complex.

Professor McCammond said that the total project cost for the C.C.B.R. was estimated to be just over \$105-million. Funding would be provided by various research infrastructure funds. The Canada Foundation for Innovation (C.F.I.) had awarded a grant for the project which included \$24-million for the building. That had been matched by the Ontario Innovation Trust (O.I.T.), which would provide \$25.6-million. The administration proposed that the Committee recommend: (a) an allocation of \$10-million to the Health Science Complex I Capital Project, of which \$2.8 would be used for the C.C.B.R., and (b) a \$2-million allocation from the I'Anson Fund. That would leave a funding shortfall of \$50.7-million to be sought from two sources. First, the University would apply to C.F.I. and O.I.T. for a supplemental award to reflect the extraordinary cost escalation between the date of the original application and the tender date of 2002. That cost escalation was estimated to be as high as 33%, the outcome of the high level of demand in the local construction market. Second, the C.C.B.R. was a top priority of the fundraising Campaign. Professor McCammond anticipated that significant support would be forthcoming from benefactors. Among other things, the C.C.B.R. presented attractive naming opportunities, both for the building as a whole and for its individual components. Such opportunities had proven to be very helpful in attracting support for the Bahen Centre for Information Technology. When funding sources for the shortfall were identified, the administration would propose to the Business Board approval of appropriations for detailed design work and implementation.

Invited to comment, Professor Yip, who had chaired the Users' Committee, said that planning for the project had begun early in 1997. He paid tribute to the work of Dr. Friesen, who had been the primary leader in putting forward the proposal, and whose name had appeared as the principal investigator on the grant applications to the C.F.I. and the O.I.T.

7. **Capital Project: Centre for Cellular and Biomolecular Research: Users' Committee Report** (cont'd)

The fundamental concept put forward had not been so much for a building as for a new centre to enable the study of biological sciences in an entirely new way: using genome sequencing to permit the comparison of species at the molecular level; characterizing the working components of the human biological system - the proteins expressed by the genome; and learning how the genome and its protein expressions affected disease. That way of studying biological science was the way it should now be studied. It involved more than the biological and medical science disciplines. It required as well the talents of mathematicians, computer scientists, engineers and others. While there was risk involved because of the uncertainty of part of the funding, it was essential that the project proceed as soon as possible. The University of Toronto, along with its affiliated teaching hospitals, had emerged as one of the world's leading centres for biomolecular research. If the University did not proceed with the proposal, it would fall behind. In both the United States and the United Kingdom, major research centres were being put into place. Very often, such centres were being devoted to only one of the five areas proposed for the C.C.B.R. and yet they matched or exceeded the scope of the entire C.C.B.R. proposal. There was every reason for optimism that there would be practical spin-offs from the research in this area. This research would contribute to the understanding of the disease process and would eventually lead to new medical interventions. The proposed centre was, however, to be one for basic, curiosity-driven research and not applied research.

Among the matters that arose in discussion were the following.

**(a) Site location and service-vehicle traffic.** A member pointed out that the location of the proposed C.C.B.R. and Pharmacy buildings would have the effect of requiring truck service traffic to use the southern part of King's College Road to gain entry to those buildings and to the Medical Sciences, Mining, Haultain, Rosebrugh and Mechanical Engineering buildings. Even before the new construction, truck traffic was very heavy, as the member had personally observed. However, the University also planned to proceed with the next phase of its open-space plan involving King's College Road and Convocation Hall Plaza. King's College Road was to be redesigned to become a ceremonial entryway for the centre of the Campus with reduced vehicular traffic. The member said that the University could not have King's College Road serve both functions, as a beautifully landscaped, ceremonial entryway and as a major truck route to supply several high-traffic buildings. He urged that approval of the proposal be made subject to reconsideration of the site of the project to ensure that King's College Road would not be required as a truck route.

Invited to respond, Professor Yip and Ms Sisam said that it was planned to use a part of King's College Road as the truck entry, with trucks turning right to proceed between the Medical Sciences Building and the Mechanical Engineering Building to a new integrated services area. However, consultants had completed a very careful traffic study for the area, filming and counting traffic for twenty-four hours a day over a period of three weeks. The level of traffic had been significantly lower than expected. The University's planning staff had considered the matter carefully and had concluded that it would be entirely possible to proceed with the plans for enhancing King's College Road while at the same time using part of the road as a service route. While the service area would be visible to passersby, King's College Road could still be narrowed and landscaped as planned. Moreover, the C.C.B.R project included very worthwhile landscape features to the south of the building, which would include an open plaza with an attractive water feature.

After discussion, it was AGREED that the details of the traffic study and the plans to accommodate truck traffic would be sent to the Academic Board along with the Committee's report and the users' committee report.

7. **Capital Project: Centre for Cellular and Biomolecular Research: Users' Committee Report** (cont'd)

**(b) Funding for the proposed new Pharmacy building.** In response to questions, Professor McCammond said that the proposed Pharmacy building would be funded by a grant from the Ontario SuperBuild Growth Fund, benefactions, and the proposed \$7.2-million allocation from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund. The grant from the SuperBuild Growth Fund had been provided largely to support the University's undertaking to double its enrolment in the Faculty of Pharmacy. In the planning for the Health Sciences Complex I, it had been intended all along to devote \$10-million of the University Infrastructure Investment Fund to the two-part project. The recommendation for \$7.2-million for the Pharmacy building had been the outcome of a calculation subtracting from the total cost of the project the other sources of funding available: the grant from the Ontario SuperBuild Growth Fund and the private funding. The remainder of the \$10-million was, therefore, available for the C.C.B.R. Professor McCammond noted that the grant from the SuperBuild Growth Fund had already been paid to the University, which was earning interest on the amount.

A member commented that it would be more appropriate for the Committee to consider the University Infrastructure Investment Fund allocation for the Pharmacy building when it considered when the Users' Committee report for that building. After discussion, Professor McCammond AGREED to withdraw from his recommendation the proposed U.I.I.F. allocation of \$7.2-million for the Pharmacy building.

**(c) Funding shortfall.** A member commented that it would be a substantial departure to recommend approval of a project with a funding shortfall in excess of \$50-million. Would approval of the recommendation have the effect of committing the University to find some or all of the \$50-million if the anticipated further government and donor funding failed to materialize? Professor McCammond replied that the Committee was being asked only to recommend approval of the project *in principle*, along with the use of the site, the scope, the total cost, the funding sources and the allocations from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund and the I'Anson Fund. No money, apart from a maximum of \$50,000 for design work, could be spent or committed until the Business Board approved appropriations for the project, and the administration would not seek appropriations until the shortfall was reduced substantially.

A member asked whether the University had any reason for optimism that its application for further government funding would succeed. Invited to reply, Professor Silverman said that the application was under active consideration. He noted that the problem of severe inflation in construction costs had affected other projects as well as the C.C.B.R. The Government would, therefore, have every reason to be aware of the problem.

A member commented that in the case of another project with a funding shortfall, the Bahen Centre for Information Technology, the occupants had been required to agree to service a mortgage loan if the anticipated private funding failed to materialize. There was not such condition in this case. The member expressed her unease at the Committee's granting approval with so large a funding shortfall in this case. She thought that the Committee should not approve the project at this time. The Chair, Professor McCammond and Miss Oliver stressed that the Committee was being asked only to approve the project in principle, specifying certain of its features: site, cost, space plan and funding sources. No money, apart from the maximum of \$50,000 for design, could be spent until appropriations had been approved by the Business Board. That Board was responsible for making the judgement about when an approved project was viable to proceed to design and later to construction. In the case of the Bahen Centre, that judgement had been made, the project had been undertaken, and there was still risk that a smaller funding shortfall would occur. At that stage, the academic units had agreed to assume responsibility for servicing a loan if further fundraising fell short. Professor McCammond added that Governing Council approval in principle of the project would likely be a prerequisite

7. **Capital Project: Centre for Cellular and Biomolecular Research: Users' Committee Report** (cont'd)

to success in the effort to secure further funding from the C.F.I. and the O.I.T. and from potential donors. There was at this time no reason for the Planning and Budget Committee to consider the project again. The Committee had all of the information required to decide upon the recommendation for approval in principle. Only if there was a change in the scope, site, or space plan of the project, or if it became necessary to request a further funding allocation, would it be necessary for the Committee to consider the project again. The Committee had approved other projects in principle before funding was secure, on the understanding that work would not begin on them until sufficient funding had become secure to satisfy the Business Board. That was the basis of the Committee's action, for example, with respect to the project to renovate 371 Bloor Street West, which would not proceed until OISE/U.T. and the University of Toronto Schools had raised money through their fundraising efforts.

**(d) Opportunity cost: value of the site.** A member asked whether the University had determined the cost of the real estate upon which the project would be built or whether it had looked into using this land for other purposes and locating the proposed C.C.B.R. elsewhere. Professor McCammond replied in the negative. It had become clear that the University would require all of its land on the St. George Campus to accommodate its academic activities.

**(e) Effect on other projects of the requests for further government funding.** A member noted that the University had urgent need of further government capital funding for other purposes including the expansion of enrolment at the Mississauga and Scarborough campuses. Would the request for further funding for the C.C.B.R. put at risk the requests for funding for other projects? Miss Oliver replied in the negative. In this case, the application was being made to the Government of Canada for further research-infrastructure support from the Canada Foundation for Innovation, which funding would, if provided, be matched by the Ontario Innovation Trust. The requests for funding for enrolment expansion had been made to the Government of Ontario through its SuperBuild Growth Fund.

**(f) Greenhouse relocation.** A member noted that the greenhouses attached to the Tanz Building would eventually have to be moved. He suggested consideration of relocating the greenhouses to 1 Spadina Crescent to leave unencumbered the area at the corner of University Avenue and College Street.

On the recommendation of the Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget

**YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS**

- (i) THAT the Users' Committee Report for the Centre for Cellular and Biomolecular Research, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "D", be approved in principle;
- (ii) THAT the Centre for Cellular and Biomolecular Research project scope of 10,370 net assignable square metres, site on Taddle Creek Road, project cost of \$105,143,000, and funding as follows be approved:
- |  |                |     |
|--|----------------|-----|
| Canada Foundation for Innovation   | \$24.0-million |     |
| Ontario Innovation Trust   | 25.6-million   |     |
| University Infrastructure Investment Fund  | 2.8-million    |     |
| I'Anson Fund   | 2.0-million    |     |
| Additional funding to be sought from the Canada Foundation for Innovation, the Ontario Innovation Trust and future donations to be sought through the Campaign | 50.7-million   | and |

7. **Capital Project: Centre for Cellular and Biomolecular Research: Users' Committee Report** (cont'd)

- (iii) THAT an allocation of \$2,800,000 from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund for the Centre for Cellular and Biomolecular Research be approved.

8. **Capital Project: Users' Committee Report for the Academic Resource Centre at the University of Toronto at Scarborough**

The Chair reminded members that once again, the recommendation before the Committee was for approval in principle of the project. The project would not proceed until the Business Board had authorized appropriations.

Professor McCammond said that the proposed Academic Resource Centre had a long history at the University of Toronto at Scarborough (U.T.Sc.), with the current Users' Committee Report representing an update and expansion of the report that had been approved by Governing Council in 1996. The Scarborough Campus was seriously deficient in library, study and classroom space - substantially below the C.O.U. average - and this situation had deteriorated since 1996 as enrolment had increased. When the SuperBuild Growth Fund became available, the revised proposal for an Academic Resource Centre had been submitted to the Provincial Government along with a suggestion that it could fund two programs with a single grant. Centennial College wished to establish a new campus on University property adjacent to the U.T.Sc. campus. If the Government was to fund the Centennial project under the SuperBuild Program, the University would use Centennial's payment for the land lease to erect the Academic Resource Centre at Scarborough. The Government had funded the Centennial proposal, and the University and Centennial College were currently negotiating the lease. The funding of \$9.3-million had been received and was being held in trust. The first call on the proceeds of the land lease would be the estimated \$1-million cost of cleaning up the site, leaving \$8.3-million. The full amount was currently earning interest, and Professor McCammond estimated that \$8.97-million would be available towards the \$18.4-million estimated cost of the project.

Professor McCammond said that the project would combine new construction and renovation of existing space. The Report recommended new construction of 2,935 net assignable square meters (n.a.s.m.) of which 1,402 n.a.s.m. would be an expansion to the existing library, and 1,533 n.a.s.m. would be for new classrooms and offices. It also recommended renovation of about 2,638 n.a.s.m., almost all of it existing library space. The expansion and renovation of the library into the Academic Resource Centre involved an imaginative reconfiguration of existing ways of using electronic information into a Teaching Learning Commons, combining and expanding several educational facilities, including: the Centre for Instructional Technology, the Writing Lab, Language Labs, the reference desk, multi-media labs, a video editing suite, audio-visual services, networked study spaces and project rooms. The facility would provide study spaces for 220 additional students, with all of the spaces networked. The project would include a much-needed 500-seat lecture theatre, allowing a reduction in multi-section classes, and two case rooms, each with a capacity of 60, to meet the specialized instructional needs of Management programs. Four small classrooms, two with capacities of 25 and two with capacities of 30 spaces, would be built to replace classrooms that had been converted to study rooms and other uses. Also included would be 320 n.a.s.m. to house facilities needed to accommodate the planned increase in Co-op programs at U.T.Sc. to 60 per cent of total program enrolment. Those facilities would include offices, interview rooms, and a flexible area for co-ordinators and administrative support.

Professor McCammond continued that the estimated total cost of the project was \$18.4-million, assuming a 2002 tender date. The total cost for the new construction was estimated at

**8. Capital Project: Users' Committee Report for the Academic Resource Centre at the University of Toronto at Scarborough (cont'd)**

\$13.9-million and the renovations at \$4.5-million. The funding available from the Centennial Lease for construction, net of the worst-case cost of site remediation, was \$8.97-million. A further \$1.1-million would be provided from the U.T.Sc. budget, leaving a shortfall of \$8.33-million. Funding for the shortfall was being sought through the Development Campaign. Professor McCammond said that if a sufficient sum of donations did not materialize for the entire project, the University would consider moving ahead with the project in phases. He stressed that the administration was requesting only approval in principle. The project would not move forward until the Business Board was satisfied that it was financially viable.

Discussion focused on the following topics.

**(a) University support for the project.** A member, who spoke strongly in favour of the project, said that while the Centre for Cellular and Biomolecular Research was to receive \$2.8-million of support from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund (U.I.I.F.), there was to be no central support for this project. Professor McCammond recalled that the U.T.Sc. remained, for the current year, on responsibility-centre management and budgeting. As a result, the pension contribution savings attributable to its faculty and staff had not been transferred into the U.I.I.F but had been allocated to U.T.Sc. That money was in fact the source of the \$1.1-million from the Scarborough budget to support the project.

**(b) Provision for inflation.** In response to a question, Professor McCammond said that the estimated cost of the project included a provision for inflation of 1% per month for the next six months and 0.5% per month for the remaining months until the anticipated 2002 tender date.

On the recommendation of the Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget,

**YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS**

- (i) THAT the Users' Committee Report for the Academic Resource Centre at the University of Toronto at Scarborough, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "E", be approved in principle; and
- (ii) THAT the project scope of 2,935 net assignable square metres (n.a.s.m.) of new space and 2,638 n.a.s.m. of renovated space, project cost of \$18,408,000, and sources of funding as follows be approved:

Net proceeds of lease of land by Centennial College of Applied Arts and Technology	\$ 8.97-million
University of Toronto at Scarborough funds	1.10-million
Future donations to be sought through the Campaign	8.33-million

**9. University of Toronto at Mississauga Master Plan 2000**

The Chair noted that consideration of the proposed Master Plan for the University of Toronto at Mississauga was subject to the endorsement of the Master Plan by the Erindale College Council, which had met on Wednesday, December 6. Principal McNutt reported that the item had been approved by that Council. Approval had followed vigorous debate, most of which had focused on provisions in the Master Plan for parking and on the balance between surface parking and parking structures.

## **9. University of Toronto at Mississauga Master Plan 2000 (cont'd)**

Professor McCammond said that the proposed Master Plan represented an update to the plan approved by the Governing Council in 1994. Invited to present the plan, Ms Sisam noted that the 1994 plan had identified the principles of development and the sites where construction of new facilities could occur. Since the establishment of that plan, Phase VI of the Residences and the new Student Centre had been completed. What had not been contemplated, however, was the extensive growth now projected for the Campus. Page 11 of the proposed Plan contained space projections for development for 50%, 75% and 100% growth. The University was currently proposing enrolment expansion of 50% at the U.T.M. campus. According to the Council of Ontario Universities' space standards, the 50% expansion would require the construction of 62,000 net assignable square metres of academic and related support space or 111,000 gross square metres. There would also be need of 22,000 net assignable square metres of additional student residence space or 33,000 gross square metres. The outcome would be a dramatic change that would transform the Campus. The proposed Master Plan 2000 took a comprehensive approach, providing guidelines for new development and defining a vision for the physical expression of the campus which addressed built form, ecology, micro-climate, servicing, pedestrian and vehicular circulation and parking. With respect to ecology, there were three areas - the watershed, woodlot and pond - which would remain as "no-build" protected areas of the Campus. With respect to micro-climate, the plan included sheltered connections among key buildings. One of the main features of the phased development plan was that the campus was to appear complete at all stages rather than continually incomplete. To realize this concept, a "parcel plan" was proposed and illustrated on page 14 of the Master Plan. The parcel plan identified zones of development for academic use, mixed use, residences, landscape initiatives and parking (including parking structures). The academic-use parcels included low-rise academic buildings with court-yards connected by a series of internal and exterior routes. The mixed-use zone could include slightly higher buildings. The residential parcels were generally clustered near the existing residence buildings, but the thrust was to locate newer residences closer to the academic buildings. The landscape parcels were intended to knit the campus together in a manner similar to the St. George Campus Open Space Plan. They included a new south entrance to the campus with an entry plaza. The objective of the new entrance was to address the concern of the adjacent community about traffic backups on Mississauga Road. Parking parcels were identified to provide facilities that would be required for the additional development of the Campus. Page 44 of the Plan showed the location of the next phase of residence development and of the planned building to accommodate the proposed Centre for Communication, Culture and Information Technology. The proposal for that Centre, which had won funding from the Ontario SuperBuild Growth Fund, would be brought to the Committee in the new year.

Professor McNutt said that the Mississauga campus was a compact one, consisting of 224 acres. The plan could be characterized as a residential village on Mississauga Road, then a park or green-belt down the middle and then the academic zone. The Campus was bordered on two sides by the Credit River, which was the source of its beauty and the source of the severe traffic problems that had been the subject of most of the discussion with the campus' neighbours. The new entrance was a very important feature of the plan to alleviate the traffic congestion on Mississauga Road. Professor McNutt was very pleased with the plan, which would form a great basis for the future of U.T.M.

Discussion dealt with the following matters.

**(a) Parking structures and parking rates.** A member noted that a substantial part of the discussion of the proposed Master Plan at the U.T.M. Campus had focused on the need for parking structures to replace surface lots that would be lost to new buildings, causing a large increase in parking rates. While there did not appear to be any alternative, the large increase in



**9. University of Toronto at Mississauga Master Plan 2000 (cont'd)**

parking rates was certainly making the prospect of enrolment expansion and campus growth a less attractive one for many.

**(b) New campus entrance and traffic congestion.** A member commented that even with the current enrolment, there were very bad traffic backups on Mississauga Road, which was not designed to carry traffic to and from an institution. That made the need for a new entrance, notwithstanding its added cost, imperative.

Professor McNutt noted that U.T.M. was seeking to deal with the traffic problem in two other ways. First, the Principal had suggested beginning some classes at 8:00 a.m., partly in order to spread out the traffic flow. Second, U.T.M. was urging improvements in public transit service to the campus to encourage use of transit and reduced reliance on cars. A member commented that it would be entirely reasonable to argue for a subway extension to the campus, comparable to that to be built to York University.

**(c) Phased completion of additional construction.** A member expressed some caution about proceeding with the construction program over time. While it would be good to have some of the new facilities as soon as possible, there might be savings to be derived from waiting until full funding was available and completing all construction at the same time.

Invited to respond, Ms Sisam said that spreading the construction program out over time would be helpful in dealing with the secondary effects of construction. For example, provision would have to be made for parking before construction could proceed with particular residence and other buildings located on, or immediately adjacent to, current parking lots. It would be helpful to do this over time. Second, the buildings on the campus were currently spread out widely, creating a situation where students were often reluctant to move between buildings. The new Student Centre had been located on the "Five Minute Walk" between the main building and the North Building to intensify the use of the space between the buildings and to make it feel safer and more hospitable. Professor McNutt concurred with that view. In particular, occupants of the North Building felt a real sense of isolation. It was to have been a temporary building for use only until the construction of the rest of the campus was complete, but it had become a permanent feature when funding for university expansion had been cut off in the 1970s.

**(d) Design.** A member hoped that outdoor sculpture would be used to complement the campus. Professor McNutt replied that sculpture would be a welcome addition if funds or contributions of pieces became available. In response to another question, Professor McNutt said that each new building would be designed separately. While all would be required to conform to the proposed Master Plan there was no intention to impose a unified architectural style.

On the recommendation of the Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget,

**YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS**

THAT the University of Toronto at Mississauga Master Plan 2000, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "F", be approved in principle, replacing the Master Plan approved in 1994.

---

**10. Capital Project: Users' Committee for the Department of Economics – Terms of Reference**

The Chair reminded members that the University's *Policy on the Steps in the Approval of Capital Projects* required that the terms of reference of users' committees be reported for information to the Committee.

Professor McCammond said that there was a widespread recognition that the Department of Economics, the largest in the Faculty of Arts and Science, was not well housed. The absence of adequate accommodation had been raised in every recent review of the Department. The Users' Committee had been established to consult and to make a recommendation on a means of providing better facilities for the Department. In response to a question, Professor McCammond said that the Users' Committee would initially determine the Department's space requirements and then decide if they could be met by an expansion of the current building at 150 St. George Street or whether an alternative would be required.

**11. Date of Next Meeting**

The Chair reminded members that the next regular meeting of the Committee was scheduled for Tuesday, January 23, 2001 at 5:00 p.m.

The meeting adjourned at 7:15 p.m.

---

Secretary

December 18, 2000

---

Chair