

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

REPORT NUMBER 72 OF

THE PLANNING AND BUDGET COMMITTEE

May 25, 2001

To the Academic Board,
University of Toronto.

Your Committee reports that it met on Friday, May 25, 2001, 9:00 a.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, with the following members present:

Professor David Mock (In the Chair)	Professor Fred Wilson
Professor Avrum Gotlieb (Vice-Chair)	Professor Linda Wilson-Pauwels
Dr. Robert J. Birgeneau, President	
Professor Adel S. Sedra, Vice-President and Provost	Non-Voting Assessors:
Professor Michael Finlayson, Vice-President Administration and Human Resources	Ms. Sheila Brown, Acting Chief Financial Officer
Professor Derek McCammond, Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget	Professor Carolyn Tuohy, Deputy Provost
Professor Philip Byer	Secretariat:
Professor W. Raymond Cummins	
Mr. Brian Davis	Mrs. Beverley Stefureak, Secretary
Professor Bruce Kidd	Ms. Cristina Oke
Professor Robert McNutt	

Regrets:

Mr. Muhammad Basil Ahmad	Professor Susan Horton
Professor Carl Amrhein	Mr. Fayez A. Quereshy
Mr. Brian C. Burchell	Professor Nancy Reid
Professor Ruth Gallop	Professor Kenneth Sevcik
Mr. Ljupco Gjorgjinski	Ms. Wendy Talfourd-Jones
Professor Angela Hildyard	

In Attendance:

Ms. Susan Addario, Director, Student Affairs
Mr. Louis Charpentier, Secretary of the Governing Council
Ms. Audrey Cheung, Director, Research Grants
Dr. Luc De Nil, Acting Chair, Department of Speech-Language Pathology
Dr. Beata FitzPatrick, Director of the Office of the President and Assistant Vice-President
Ms. Mary McGee, Assistant Provost
Ms. Carole Moore, Chief Librarian
Dr. David Naylor, Dean, Faculty of Medicine
Miss Janice Oliver, Assistant Vice-President, Operations and Services
Professor Edward Relph, Associate Principal for Campus Development, University of
Toronto at Scarborough
Professor Pekka Sinervo, Vice-Dean, Research Infrastructure and Graduate Education,
Faculty of Arts and Science
Ms. Elizabeth Sisam, Director of Campus and Facilities Planning
Professor Ron Venter, Vice-Provost, Space and Facilities Planning

Professor Molly Verrier, Chair, Department of Physical Therapy
Dr. Catharine Whiteside, Associate Dean for Inter-Faculty and Graduate Affairs

ITEMS 4 TO 15 ARE RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL.

The Chair noted that Professor Sedra had requested the addition of an item to the agenda. A revised document, addressing this item, had been placed on the table.

ON MOTION DULY MOVED AND SECONDED,

“Academic Priorities Fund: Allocation - School of Graduate Studies – Knowledge Media Design Institute” was added to the agenda.

The Chair reported that the motion had been carried unanimously.

1. **Report of Previous Meeting**

Report Number 71 of April 17, 2001 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 Sedra was pleased to report that, in the more recent rankings of the American Association of Research Libraries, the Library of the University of Toronto had moved up one, surpassing Stanford and placing third after Harvard and Yale. It had been rated number one among all public universities and both rankings were a credit to the excellent leadership of Chief Librarian Carole Moore.

Professor Sedra presented, in Power Point (attached as Appendix “M”), an overview of the Provincial budget and its implications for the University of Toronto.

In concluding, Professor Sedra noted that a working group had been brought together to ensure that the response to the funding announcements went forward in a planned manner, with beneficial consequences for all three campuses. Terms of reference and membership of the working group were part of the Power Point presentation. In response to a member’s question about consequences if growth were limited, Professor Sedra said that this Government announcement was in response to an agreed-upon plan put forward by all Ontario universities. It was an opportunity to move forward with improvements to the East and West campuses within an enrolment plan determined by the University.

A member congratulated Professor Sedra on his wisdom in establishing a working group with terms of reference that would look strategically at how to deal with the significantly increased enrollment. He also supported the allocation to Vice-President Levy’s office, recognizing that Dr. Levy was fulfilling what was a particularly critical role for the University at this time. He added that it might be useful for the working group to establish a sub-committee charged with such governance issues as who would bear the increased costs of student services for three campuses. Professor Sedra agreed.

A member asked if the University would receive full funding for both undergraduate and graduate students. Professor Sedra said that, starting this year, all enrolment increases

would be funded. The funding increase in graduate enrolment was important for the University of Toronto because of its emphasis on graduate studies and research.

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

Professor Sedra confirmed that the Government announcement had included a directive that deficit budgets would not be permitted among universities in the system next year. This was an initiative wherein the provincial auditor would be active in ensuring that the public was receiving value for money. Universities generally saw this as an intrusion into their autonomy and, system-wide, it would be monitored carefully. He said the Committee would be kept informed.

4. Administrative Priorities Fund and Administrative Transition Fund: Allocations – Various

Professor McCammond reminded members that the budget had allocated \$1 million to the Administrative Priorities Fund to cover costs associated with changes in the senior administrative structure. Professor McCammond reviewed his memorandum of April 20, 2001 (attached as Appendix "A"), which had outlined the proposed allocation to each area of senior administration. Some of these items had been covered by one-time-only funding in the past. The request was to fold the amounts into base. He noted that several of the senior administrative portfolios were affected by a recent appointment and a search that was currently underway. These portfolios and the portfolio of the Chief Financial Officer would undergo revision when the new vice-presidents were in place.

A member questioned if this action was protecting the senior administrative offices from budget cuts compared, for example, to the Faculty of Arts and Science. Professor Sedra responded that the proposed reallocation of 1.5% represented a planning decision simply to maintain these offices at their current level of funding. The Faculty of Arts and Science, on the other hand, had received the 1.5% reallocation from the Academic Priorities Fund plus an additional 4.5%. The latter had been in response to a strong and persuasive plan submitted by the Faculty that was deemed worthy of the additional allocation. Professor Sedra indicated that, generally speaking, the principle of reallocation meant that some areas received the same year-over-year funding, others received increased funding and still others received less.

The President added that offices like that of Research and International Relations were under tremendous pressure to assist the University in responding to administrative requirements associated with securing and maintaining the significant volume of external funding currently available. He foresaw a future need, in order to ensure this continuing source of funding to the Faculties, for increased administrative allocations.

Responding to a question about why the allocation for the Vice-President, Administration and Human Resources was broken down, Professor McCammond said that this allocation was larger than most and had been in response to a detailed plan presented by Professor Finlayson.

The member asked about the reduction in the maintenance budget. Professor Finlayson said that the maintenance area had taken an overall net reduction of about \$200,000.

Several members spoke in support of the proposed allocations. The important administrative role of the senior team in Simcoe Hall should not be under-estimated. Most of the tasks could not be downloaded to the academic units. The very effective role of the offices of the Vice-President, Government and Institutional Relations and the Vice-

President, Research and International Relations in lobbying for and supporting the academic endeavour was vital to the economic well being of the University. Further, evidence as recent as the *Portals and Pathways* showed that Ontario universities were

4. Administrative Priorities Fund and Administrative Transition Fund: Allocations – Various (cont'd)

very well managed and the University of Toronto was among the best. However, it should be remembered that as the University underwent expansion it would be important to attend to divisional as well as central administrative needs.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS:

THAT the following allocations from the Administrative Priorities Fund (AdPF) and the Administrative Transition Funds (AdTF) be approved:

President: \$407,815 in base from the AdPF;
 Vice-President, Government and Institutional Relations: \$169,978 in base from the AdPF;
 Vice-President, Administration and Human Resources: \$538,874 in base from the AdPF;
 Vice-President, Research and International Relations: \$209,553 in base from the AdPF and \$250,000 one-time-only from the AdTF;
 Vice-President, Development and University Relations: \$91,491 in base from the AdPF;
 Vice-President, Business Affairs: \$277,000 in base from the AdPF and \$143,000 one-time-only from the AdTF;
 Chief Financial Officer: \$71,188 in base from the AdPF;
 Office of the Governing Council: \$41,634 in base from the AdPF and \$59,600 one-time-only from the AdTF;
 Internal Audit: \$9,083 in base from the AdPF.

The Chair reported that the motion had been carried with one abstention.

5. University Infrastructure Investment Fund: Allocation - Faculty of Arts and Science - re Magellan Telescopes

The Chair welcomed Professor Pekka Sinervo who would respond to questions on behalf of Dean Carl Amrhein on this item.

Professor McCammond referred to his memorandum of May 15, 2001 (attached as Appendix "B") and noted that the Department of Astronomy and Astrophysics was a strong academic unit, as was the Canadian Institute for Theoretical Astrophysics. As a result of the Department's work in Chile, the University had been offered a unique opportunity to expand the Department's capabilities by collaborating with the Carnegie Institute of Washington in the Chilean Magellan Telescopes Project. The contribution required was US\$2.5 million and the benefit to the University would be a substantial increase in viewing time to 33 nights for each of the next five years.

Two applications for funding would be associated with this project. One, submitted to the Ontario Innovation Trust (OIT), had already been successful in the amount of \$1.3 million. The other, for the remainder of the requirement, was being prepared for submission to the Canada Foundation for Innovation (CFI) International Access Fund.

This was an excellent project for the newly announced CFI fund and was expected to be successful.

5. University Infrastructure Investment Fund: Allocation - Faculty of Arts and Science - re Magellan Telescopes (cont'd)

A member recalled that there was some history to the University of Toronto's involvement with astrophysics work in South America. Professor Sinervo agreed, saying that a University faculty member had been involved in a somewhat serendipitous discovery some years ago. This had been on older instruments. What was proposed today was funding for next generation telescopes that would ensure users were in the global forefront of the field. It would allow exploration of the early evolution of the universe and give a significant advantage to researchers working in the field.

The University of Toronto had been a partner in a small telescope in Chile which was now an archival instrument. The two new telescopes, considered to be the best in the world, would be six metres in size and this contribution would allow an infrared camera to be built into one of them.

A member asked why this was coming forward before all avenues of support had been fully explored. Professor Sedra replied that in order to enter into the partnership a payment of US\$1 million was required immediately. The President added that a well-known Canadian was on the Carnegie Institute Board and there was hope that private support for the project would be forthcoming. A member added assurance that, in his view, this was a project that met very well the guidelines for the CFI International Access Fund competition, that it was a wonderful opportunity to allow a program of high quality to move ahead, and that it had the added advantage of signaling to funding agencies that the University of Toronto was well-placed to respond quickly to calls for international proposals.

Responding to a member's request for clarification of the status of the University Infrastructure Investment Fund (UIIF), Professor Sedra said that the summary provided covered a number of years. The UIIF was not in cash-flow difficulty and it would not be placed in a deficit position to the detriment of other programs.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS:

THAT an allocation of up to \$2.7 million be approved from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund to the Faculty of Arts and Science for access to the Magellan Telescopes at the Observatories of the Carnegie Institute of Washington with the understanding that the funding will be returned to the UIIF if the Canada Foundation for Innovation application for this project is successful.

The Chair reported that the motion had been carried unanimously.

6. University Infrastructure Investment Fund: Allocation - University of Toronto at Scarborough

The Chair introduced Professor Edward Relph from the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSc) representing Principal Paul Thompson. Professor Relph was prepared to respond to questions on this item and on the Master Plan, which would be considered later in the meeting.

Professor McCammond referred to his memorandum of April 25, 2001 (attached as Appendix "C"). The proposed allocation arose out of the discontinuation, with the end of

6. **University Infrastructure Investment Fund: Allocation - University of Toronto at Scarborough** (cont'd)

Responsibility Centre Management, of the direct flow to UTSc of its share from current service pension cost savings. UTSc plans for 1998-2004 included expenditures of these funds, but they were now flowing into the University Infrastructure Investment Fund. This proposal was to appropriately transfer to UTSc what was necessary to meet their commitments beyond 2000-01.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS:

THAT an allocation of \$1,153,550 be approved from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund to the University of Toronto at Scarborough for commitments made under the Responsibility Centre Management where funding was budgeted from current service pension cost savings beyond 2000-01.

The Chair reported that the motion had been carried with one abstention.

7. **Faculties of Medicine and Pharmacy: Institute for Drug Research – Establishment**

The Chair welcomed Dean Naylor, Faculty of Medicine. Dean Naylor indicated that Dean Hindmarsh of the Faculty of Pharmacy was in Halifax and that he would be responding on behalf of both Faculties to questions, if any arose.

Professor McCammond introduced the proposal, described in his memorandum of May 9, 2001 (attached as Appendix "D") to establish the Institute for Drug Research (IDR) as an Extra-Departmental Unit reporting to the Deans of the Faculties of Medicine and Pharmacy. He said that capabilities of the Institute would be much like those of a Department, engaged in teaching, research and making faculty appointments. Professor McCammond saw this as a groundbreaking initiative to bring the resources of two Faculties together, thereby strengthening each Faculty.

Resources for the Institute were to come from funds already allocated to the two Faculties. There were no additional financial implications to the University.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS:

THAT the Institute for Drug Research (IDR) be established and that it report to the Deans of the Faculties of Medicine and Pharmacy.

The Chair reported that the motion had been carried unanimously.

8. **University Infrastructure Investment Fund: Allocation - Faculty of Medicine – Department of Medicine**

Professor Venter said that with renovations to, and changes within, the University Health Network it had become necessary for the administrative offices of the Department of Medicine to relocate from the Bell Wing of the Toronto General Hospital to a new

8. University Infrastructure Investment Fund: Allocation -Faculty of Medicine – Department of Medicine (cont'd)

hospital building. Details of the proposed move were described in his memorandum of May 14, 2001 (attached as Appendix “E”). The University would be responsible for renovating the new space, and the University Health Network would rent the space at the rate that had applied for the past several years. Professor Venter believed the agreement to be attractive and beneficial to both parties, and he noted that it would allow the Department of Medicine to remain in an advantageous location.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS:

THAT an allocation of \$400,000 be approved from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund to fund the design and implementation costs required to establish the administrative offices of the Department of Medicine within the University Health Network. This cost includes construction plus professional fees, signage and window coverings and all relevant taxes.

The Chair reported that the motion had been carried unanimously.

**9. Capital Project: Childcare Facilities, St. George Campus, Phase 1, Early Learning Centre – Users’ Committee Report
University Infrastructure Investment Fund: Allocation**

Professor Venter recalled that the terms of reference and membership of a Users’ Committee for Childcare Facilities had been reported for information at the last Planning and Budget Committee meeting. Earlier planning had been underway since 1997. Hard work on the part of Ms. Addario, Miss Oliver, Ms. Nolan, Ms. Sisam, Professor Finlayson and the Users’ Committee had made it possible for the completed report to be considered today.

Childcare facilities currently comprised four units offering different types of care. The report proposed that Nancy’s and Margaret Fletcher be accommodated at the Glen Morris site. They would operate independently under the same roof as, and would be administratively linked with, Kidspace. Phase 1 addressed the need for infant and toddler spaces. Approval to proceed with this phase, relocating Nancy’s and Margaret Fletcher, would allow the Woodsworth residence and the Devonshire Place projects to proceed.

Phase 2, which would be undertaken next, would consider the remaining childcare facilities and address the upgrading to the childcare facilities in the family housing buildings at 30 and 35 Charles Street West.

Responding to a question, Professor Venter gave assurance that childcare spaces would not be increased beyond those that were subsidized and that there was a commitment to have no fewer spaces once both phases were concluded. Currently, 82% of the spaces were occupied by University community users. The intent was to increase that number to 100%.

A member sought clarification of the University's financial responsibility with respect to childcare facilities. Miss Oliver indicated that the University was responsible for maintaining the building and that furnishings, playground, toys and operating costs were covered by the childcare facility. She noted that large appliances such as dishwashers,

9. **Capital Project: Childcare Facilities, St. George Campus, Phase 1, Early Learning Centre – Users' Committee Report**
University Infrastructure Investment Fund: Allocation (cont'd)

which became part of the building, were the responsibility of the University. The member expressed concern that the University should not be responsible for a recurring expense of this nature. The principle should be established that fixed equipment was not the responsibility of the University and future users' committee reports should reflect that principle. Rather than the member proposing an amendment to the report, Mr. Charpentier said that it would be sufficient that administration communicate this to users' committees. The member concurred with this approach and the assurance of Professor Venter that future users' reports would be unambiguous in this regard.

A member enquired if approval of this project would necessitate an increase in student services fees paid by all students and if this would require the approval of the University Affairs Board. It was noted that the UAB had already approved fees for this year. In any event, Ms. Addario said fees would not be increased as a result of this project. She explained the shared funding and the transfer from compulsory non-academic ancillary fees. In conclusion, she noted that childcare services were within the mandate of UAB and this report would go to that Board for consideration of level of service.

Professor Venter hoped that the new facilities would help in attracting new faculty. A member added that they would also help in recruiting students and commended the individuals responsible for concluding the report for Phase 1.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS:

THAT the Users' Committee Report (attached as Appendix "F") for the planning and construction of the Childcare Facility on Glen Morris Street on the St. George campus at the University of Toronto be approved in principle;

THAT the project scope as identified in the Users' Committee Report be approved in principle at a cost of \$4.3 million; and

THAT an allocation of \$4.3 million from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund be approved to address the complete cost of the Childcare facility on Glen Morris Street.

The Chair reported that the motion had been carried unanimously.

10. **Capital Project: 500 University Avenue - Users' Committee Report**
University Infrastructure Investment Fund: Allocation

Professor Venter introduced Professor Molly Verrier, Chair, Department of Physical Therapy; Dr. Catharine Whiteside, Associate Dean, Inter-Faculty and Graduate Affairs; and Dr. Luc De Nil, Acting Chair of Speech-Language Pathology.

Referring to his memorandum of May 14, 2001 and the Users' Committee Report for 500 University Avenue (attached as Appendix "G"), Professor Venter recalled that following the University's recent acquisition of this property, a Users' Committee had been established. The objective of the Committee was to determine how the rehabilitation

**10. Capital Project: 500 University Avenue - Users' Committee Report
University Infrastructure Investment Fund: Allocation (cont'd)**

sciences could be brought together in the new building of which seventy percent was unoccupied, with the remaining thirty percent leased to the current occupants through 2010.

The project would be undertaken in three phases, with phase 1 to advance from the preliminary Users' Committee Report to the architectural design phase to re-position and integrate four academic units within the building. Phase 1 would also include the construction and implementation of space assigned to the Continuing Education program of the Faculty of Medicine, which should allow for synergies with the rehabilitation science units.

Professor Venter hoped to come back with further recommendations to the next meeting of the Planning and Budget Committee so that phase 2 could proceed rapidly to a conclusion for July 2002. Phase 3 would continue through 2002 to 2010, when all leases would have terminated.

Professor Venter thanked the Chairs of the various units involved and others who had worked diligently to bring this project forward so quickly.

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS:

THAT the Users' Committee Report for the planning, renovation and related construction required to convert 500 University Avenue into suitable accommodation to house the academic programs in rehabilitation medicine be approved in principle;

THAT the project scope as outlined in Phase 1: Architectural Design Phase and Continuing Education, be approved at a cost of \$700,000; and,

THAT an allocation of \$700,000 from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund to fund Phase 1 of the 500 University Avenue project be approved.

The Chair reported that the motion had been carried unanimously.

**11. Capital Project: Gerstein Science Information Centre – Phase 2
University Infrastructure Investment Fund: Allocation**

The Chair welcomed Ms. Carole Moore, Chief Librarian, and congratulated her on the recognition given to the Library by the American Association of Research Libraries.

Professor Venter referred to his memorandum of May 14, 2001 (attached as Appendix "H") noting that details of the additional cost for this project had been outlined in the attached report from Miss Oliver to the Business Board. He explained that the private donor for this project would be approached to request funding for a portion of the

cost overrun. There was the possibility that the cost to the University Infrastructure Investment Fund would be reduced somewhat.

**11. Capital Project: Gerstein Science Information Centre – Phase 2
University Infrastructure Investment Fund: Allocation (cont'd)**

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS::

THAT an allocation of up to \$1.83 million from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund be approved to fund the increased costs of Phase 2 of the Gerstein Science Information Centre.

The Chair reported that the motion had been carried unanimously.

**12. Capital Project: Communications, Culture and Information Technology
(CCIT) Building at University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM) – Users'
Committee Report University Infrastructure Investment Fund: Allocation**

Professor Venter referred to his memorandum of May 14, 2001 and the attached Users' Committee Report (attached as Appendix "I"). The plan for a new building of 5763 net assignable square metres was consistent with the UTM Master Plan and would begin to address the anticipated increased enrolment at that campus. The completion date was expected to be 2004, but it could be as early as 2003. The total cost of the project was expected to be \$34.6 million, \$15.6 of which had been received as one of three SuperBuild awards. The new building would help convert UTM into an information technology campus that should be attractive to students.

UTM was considering options for parking, including an underground garage. Before an architect could begin to work on the project, decisions on parking would need to be made. Professor Venter indicated that a report, addressing parking options, would be presented to the Planning and Budget Committee in June.

A member asked if UTM would be offering degrees in Information Technology. Principal McNutt responded that, for now, combined majors would be offered, eventually evolving into specialist degrees. The potential for graduate programs was being studied.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS:

THAT the Users' Committee Report for the planning and construction of the Communications, Culture and Information Technology Building (CCIT) at the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM) be approved in principle;

THAT the project scope as identified in the Users' Committee Report be approved at a cost of \$34.672 million with initial funding from SuperBuild plus interest (\$16.486 million), City of Mississauga (\$3.5million), Access to Opportunities Program (\$0.450 million), Ontario Innovation Trust (\$1.2 million), and the University Infrastructure Investment Fund (\$2.5 million); and

THAT an allocation of \$2.5 million from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund towards the construction of the Communications, Culture and Information Technology Building be approved.

The Chair reported that the motion had been carried unanimously.

13. Policy on Capital Planning and Capital Projects

Professor Venter presented his memorandum of May 14, 2001 and the attached Policy on Capital Planning and Capital Projects (attached as Appendix "J"). He referred to the Policy as a living document that would be updated at regular intervals as better ways were found for capital planning. Extensive discussion of the document had taken place with many bodies, in an attempt to get as much input as possible. A major change was to convert users' committees to project committees that would move with the project from its conception to its final realization. The Policy also proposed a Design Review Committee to bring an expert advisory dimension to capital undertakings. Membership of the Design Review Committee would aim to strike a good balance between the three campuses while maintaining a workable size.

A final review of the report had revealed the need for some housekeeping amendments and Professor Venter presented these to the Committee on overheads. Proposed amendments were to the glossary on page 2, including a final sentence noting University Affairs Board involvement with capital projects; to the preamble on page 3 which identified the policies currently in place that would be superceded by this Policy; to the overview on page 5 which would more clearly articulate the governance process that was currently in place; and on page 11 to change "without the authority of the Business Board" to "before approval of the project by the Business Board". Finally, on page 22, C.3.2 was amended to include two members of the Design Review Committee (or designates) on the Architect Selection Panel.

A member noted that 3 and 5 in C.3.1 on page 22 should read C.1.1 and C.1.5. Professor Venter and Miss Oliver agreed to make this change.

A member indicated that the Policy was a good document and that he agreed it would need to be a living document. However, he suggested that Professor Venter's intention to bring this back in a year was too ambitious and that it would be preferable to determine the effectiveness of the Policy over a two-year period before proposing amendments. Professor Venter agreed that the Policy would be monitored, and a review for amendments might not be necessary in a year. Changes would be brought through governance as they were necessary.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS:

THAT the Policy on Capital Planning and Capital Projects be approved.

The Chair reported that the motion had been carried unanimously.

Members thanked all who had worked very hard to draft this new policy.

14. University of Toronto at Scarborough, MasterPlan 2001

Professor Venter referred members to the master plan for the University of Toronto at Scarborough (attached as Appendix “K”). The master plan set a framework within which to move forward with the development of Scarborough campus.

14. University of Toronto at Scarborough, MasterPlan 2001 (cont’d)

A member asked about the involvement of members of the Scarborough campus. Professor Venter indicated that the Scarborough campus community had been very involved through a site planning committee, a planning and budget committee, community open houses and a variety of other ways to engage the university community at all stages. The result was a superb plan.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS:

THAT the University of Toronto at Scarborough MasterPlan 2001 be approved in principle.

The Chair reported that the motion had been carried unanimously.

15. Academic Priorities Fund: Allocation - School of Graduate Studies – Knowledge Media Design Institute

Professor Sedra introduced the proposal (attached as Appendix “L”) for an allocation from the Academic Priorities Fund in support of one element of the *Raising our Sights* Plan for the School of Graduate Studies, the Knowledge Media Design Institute; He noted the Institute had been funded on a one-time-only basis for the past three years, pending the development of a plan for graduate programs. The School had submitted a wonderful proposal for a collaborative program that was going through various levels of government approval, and it was appropriate that the funding now be converted to base.

On the recommendation of the Vice-President, Academic and Provost,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS:

THAT additional Academic Priorities Fund (APF) allocations for the Knowledge Media Design Institute be approved in support of the Institute’s Collaborative Masters’ and Doctoral Program, subject to the program receiving all necessary approvals. The funding will flow from the APF as \$96,000 one-time-only for 2001-02 and \$180,000 in base in 2002-03. The \$180,000 base allocation replaces the \$60,000 one-time-only allocations previously approved for 2002-03 and 2003-04.

The Chair reported that the motion had been carried with one abstention.

The Chair noted that the next scheduled meeting of the Planning and Budget Committee was on Wednesday, June 27, from 5:00 to 7:00 p.m. He reminded continuing members that July 24 was being held as a reserve date for a meeting.

16. Dates for Summer Meetings (cont'd)

Professor Sedra took the opportunity to thank members of the Committee who were not continuing and who might be absent from the next meeting for all the support they had given during the year. In particular, he thanked the Chair, Professor David Mock, for his tremendous commitment to the Planning and Budget Committee over the past five years.

The meeting adjourned at 12:05 p.m.

Secretary

Chair