

**UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO**  
**THE GOVERNING COUNCIL**  
**REPORT NUMBER 71 OF**  
**THE PLANNING AND BUDGET COMMITTEE**

**April 17, 2001**

To the Academic Board,  
University of Toronto.

Your Committee reports that it met on Tuesday, April 17, 2001, 5:00 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, with the following members present:

Professor David Mock (In the Chair)  
Professor Avrum Gotlieb (Vice-Chair)  
Professor Adel S. Sedra, Vice-President and  
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 McNutt  
Mr. Fayez A. Quereshy

Professor Nancy Reid  
Professor Fred Wilson

Non-Voting Assessors:

Professor Heather Munroe-Blum, Vice-  
President, Research and International  
Relations  
Professor Carolyn Tuohy, Deputy Provost

Secretariat:

Mrs. Beverley Stefureak, Secretary  
Mr. Neil Dobbs

**Regrets:**

Mr. Muhammad Basil Ahmad  
Mr. Brian C. Burchell  
Professor Philip Byer  
Professor Ruth Gallop

Mr. Ljupco Gjorgjinski  
Professor Kenneth Sevcik  
Ms. Wendy Talfourd-Jones  
Professor Linda Wilson-Pauwels

**In Attendance:**

Mr. Louis R. Charpentier, Secretary of the Governing Council  
Dr. Beata FitzPatrick, Assistant Provost  
Professor Ulli J. Krull, Vice-Principal (Research and Graduate Studies) and Associate Dean  
(Sciences), University of Toronto at Mississauga  
Ms. Manon Le Paven, President, Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students  
Ms. Carole Moore, Chief Librarian, U of T Library  
Dr. David Naylor, Dean, Faculty of Medicine  
Miss Janice Oliver, Assistant Vice-President, Operations and Services  
Professor Barry Sessle, Dean, Faculty of Dentistry  
Ms. Elizabeth Sisam, Director of Campus and Facilities Planning  
Ms. Lynn Snowden, Assistant Vice-Provost, Arts and Science  
Professor Ron Venter, Vice-Provost, Space and Facilities Planning  
Dr. Cecil Yip, Vice-Dean, Research, Faculty of Medicine  
Mr. Norman Abrahams, Planning Office, Sunnybrook and Women's College Health Sciences  
Centre

THE MEETING WAS HELD IN OPEN SESSION.

ITEMS 4 TO 10 AND 12 ARE RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL.

**1. Reports of Previous Meetings**

The Chair noted one correction to each Report. Ms. Manon LePaven, President of the Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students, was added to those in attendance at each meeting. With that correction, Reports Number 69 (March 13, 2001) and Number 70 (March 20, 2001) were approved.

**2. Business Arising from the Reports of the Previous Meeting**

**2.1 Notice of Item: Allocation of Funding for Physical Accessibility Retrofit of University of Toronto Facilities**

The Chair reviewed his memorandum to members explaining that this topic had been discussed on two previous occasions during the past twelve months. The motion would be for reconsideration and would, therefore, require a two-thirds majority. More importantly, there was currently a task force studying the issue of physical accessibility on campus and its report was expected soon. Professor Sedra had given his assurance that the report and the administrative response to it would be brought to Planning and Budget Committee for discussion as soon as possible.

A member asked when this might be expected. Professor Sedra responded that the administration would need to have the report of the task force within the next ten days in order to bring it to the next meeting. Failing that, he gave his assurance that it would be brought to the Committee this fall.

**2.2 Any Other Items**

There were no other items of business arising out of the reports of the previous meetings.

**3. Senior Assessor's Report**

Professor Sedra informed the Committee that the Canada Foundation for Innovation (CFI) had agreed, in light of the escalation of construction costs in the Toronto area, to provide \$5.4 million of additional funding for the Centre for Cellular and Biomolecular Research. That amount would be matched by an equal amount from the Ontario Innovation Trust (OIT). Although \$40 million was still required, this additional \$10.8 million moved the project a step closer to realization.

Professor Sedra recalled that he had not yet proposed Academic Priorities Fund (APF) allocations for the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM). UTM had made its 1.5% per year budget reduction for re-allocation, but the APF allocation was awaiting the outcome of discussions on three-campus planning involving the Principals of the Mississauga and Scarborough campuses and the Dean of Arts and Science. In the interim, UTM was proceeding with its new Centre for Culture, Communications and Information Technology building to accommodate 720 students jointly with Sheridan College of Applied Arts and Technology. Professor Sedra anticipated that the Province would provide operating funds for the new Centre. It had provided capital funding for it from the SuperBuild Growth Fund, and it would be highly unlikely that it would not also

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

provide operating funds, although the amount was unknown. UTM had, therefore, been given permission to proceed with some of the academic appointments for the Centre at this time.

Before moving into the business of the meeting, the Chair took the opportunity to recognize Dr. Beata Fitzpatrick for her tremendous contribution to the Committee through her support to the Provost. The Committee joined the Chair in offering best wishes to Dr. Fitzpatrick as she moved into her new position as Assistant Vice-President and Director of the President's Office.

### 4. Academic Priorities Fund: Allocation - University of Toronto Library

Professor Sedra referred to Table 1 of his April 10 memorandum (attached as Appendix "A") which summarized the allocations from the Academic Priorities Fund in Support of *Raising our Sights* plans. Table 1 updated what the Committee had seen previously, showing that the total fund had increased from \$33 million to \$34.8 million as a result of the most recent increase in tuition fees in deregulated programs. Allocations currently recommended for approval appeared in italics. He noted that still pending were proposals from Information Studies, Law and Management.

Professor Sedra expressed pleasure in bringing forward the request for a generous allocation to the University of Toronto Library. The Library had been ranked 4<sup>th</sup> in North America last year by the Association of Research Libraries. He viewed the proposed allocation as a positive response to a good plan which contained a mix of traditional modes of service with ones to capitalize on newer modes of information technology. Part of the allocation was for a proposed resource centre for information technology to better support the use of information technology and new media by faculty members in course development and delivery. Responding to a member's question, Professor Sedra confirmed that the resource centre would be a tri-campus service, but would not preclude the emergence of similar centres at one or both of the other two campuses.

A member asked for clarification of the one-time-only funds in the Academic Priorities Fund. Professor Sedra said the source of these was carry-forwards in base funding. He explained that the amount available was difficult to quantify because it depended on year-end balances. One-time-only allocations prior to year-end were based on estimates of the operational rhythm of divisions, timing of appointments, etc.

Referring to the pilot project, a member asked if 24-hour service in the Library would include access to stacks or only to study and computer space. Ms. Moore said the proposal was for the minimum service involved in keeping the bottom two floors open and was primarily in response to student requests for additional access to study space and computer stations. Access to the stacks would not be available. The pilot project would be starting in October, spanning the Library's busiest period of the year.

4. **Academic Priorities Fund: Allocation - University of Toronto Library** (cont'd)

On the recommendation of the Vice-President and Provost,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT an APF allocation of \$1,580,000, in base funding and \$2,776,000 in one-time-only funding be approved in support of the *Raising Our Sights* plan of the University of Toronto Library.

The Chair reported that the motion had been carried unanimously.

5. **Academic Priorities Fund: Allocation - Office of Vice-President and Provost and Office of Vice Provost Planning and Budget**

Professor Sedra was pleased to recall that the Offices of the Provost and Vice Provost had come forward infrequently with funding requests. Restructuring had occurred several times and the number of positions had increased by .5 over the last eight years. The Offices had taken the 1.5% per year budget reduction recently, as well as previous reductions. The proposal brought forward in his memorandum of April 10, 2001 (attached as Appendix "B") was to restore one full-time equivalent position and to add one full-time equivalent position, with the result that the staff would increase by one administrative assistant.

The Planning and Budget Office had requested funding to provide more resources to meet the demands in the areas of budget and space planning. This was submitted prior to Professor Venter's appointment and thus covered the entire planning and budget operation, including space. Professor Sedra reminded the Committee that the number of capital projects continued to increase. In addition, as the number of separate funding envelopes continued to increase the auditing and reporting responsibilities in the planning and budget area multiplied. The request before the Committee was to add to base three staff members that had been funded for several years on one-time-only money. Finally, the Office requested one-time-only funding for two additional positions to assist during the peak period associated with current capital activity. One was for an analyst and the other for a space planner. Professor Sedra was not recommending the latter, waiting until Professor Venter could assess what the needs were.

Professor Sedra addressed the third area, that being a proposed allocation to Other Academic Costs which included costs for advertising of academic positions, academic reviews, decanal searches and research support for Principals and Deans. Over the past many years, these had been funded out of central contingency. That fund was depleted at a time when the need to advertise had increased and costs for searches and academic reviews had gone up. Provision of modest research allowances to principals and deans continued to be important. The recommended allocation to base would allow these to be put on a sound financial footing.

A member spoke to the proposed motion, recalling that the Report of the Task Force on Investing in Students had recognized the underfunding of administration in Ontario universities. Further, he stated that the University of Toronto has had excellent planning from this office and that it was his pleasure to support these allocations.

5. **Academic Priorities Fund: Allocation - Office of Vice-President and Provost and Office of Vice Provost Planning and Budget** (cont'd)

On the recommendation of the Vice-President and Provost,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the following allocations be approved from the Academic Priorities Fund

- \$154,375 in base in support of the *Raising Our Sights* plan of the Office of the Vice-President and Provost;
- \$203,622 in base and \$210,000 one-time-only in support of the *Raising our Sights* plan of the Office of the Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget; and,
- \$430,000 in base to adjust the budgets for the following “Other Academic Costs” funds: Advertising of Academic Positions in University Affairs; Academic Reviews; Decanal Searches; and, Research Support for Principals and Deans.

The Chair reported that the motion had been carried unanimously.

6. **Academic Priorities Fund: Allocation - Faculty Recruitment**

Faculty recruitment was one of the three key priorities identified in *Raising our Sights*. The University was entering a ten-year period of intensive faculty hiring. Professor Sedra spoke to three faculty recruitment initiatives that had been tried on an experimental basis and supported by one-time-only funding. The initiatives had proven effective in supporting successful recruitment and he proposed that they now be allocated base funding.

The first was a commitment to startup funding for new faculty. In July 1999, \$2 million from the Academic Priorities Fund had been allocated by this Committee to be distributed as startup funding. However, a total of \$3.2 million of central University funding had been distributed over the past two years, a summary of which was provided in Attachment 1 to Professor Sedra’s memorandum of April 9, 2001 (attached as Appendix “C”). These funds were in addition to \$8.4 million from the CFI New Opportunities Funds, matched by funds from OIT. As well, each faculty member automatically received a startup grant of \$10,000 from the Connaught Fund.

Professor Sedra noted that the allocations were requested with the intent that the Committee would be informed annually of how the funds were distributed.

During discussion, it was noted that the University of Toronto at Scarborough did not appear because it was in its final year of responsibility-centre budgeting and was still managing its own allocations. UTSc allocations would be made in the usual way in subsequent years.

A member noted that the report did not take into account funds that were unmatched and that distribution was predominantly to science-based disciplines. Professor Sedra agreed, noting that central funds never provided the full support. Divisions must contribute considerable funds from their own resources. Speaking to that point, a member confirmed that startup funding under \$100,000 usually was addressed by the divisions. Such requests would not reach the Provost’s Office and they included most non-Science disciplines.

As a final comment on this initiative, Professor Sedra indicated that discussions would be undertaken with respect to the suburban campuses once the Government funding was known.

**6. Academic Priorities Fund: Allocation for Faculty Recruitment (cont'd)**

Professor Sedra spoke to the initiative of spousal hiring in support of faculty recruitment. He thought it had proven to be a good program. If possible, spouses were provided with contractually-limited term appointments funded equally by the department who hired the lead spouse, the department receiving the "trailing" spouse and centrally. Currently, 30 spouses were in such appointments. Ongoing, it was estimated that approximately 10% of new hires would involve spousal appointments, resulting in a steady state cost of \$3.0 million shared three ways.

The same approach was used to permit opportunity appointments, where outstanding individuals were identified when the University was not in a search or where the University was presented with the opportunity to complete a search by hiring two outstanding candidates. Such opportunities were especially desirable where they helped to advance the equity agenda. The University intended to expand the number of opportunity appointments and the Provost would be informing the Committee of this at a later date.

A member noted that both spousal employment and the ability to make opportunity appointments had been critical to UTM.

Concluding, Professor Sedra addressed the request for an allocation to support services for Faculty Recruitment. Specifically, funding was requested for the Provost's Advisor on Pro-Active Recruitment, the Faculty Relocation and Support Program and the provision of immigration support services. Provision of those services through one-time-only funding had made a significant difference and he wished to put them on sound footing by the allocation of base funding.

On the advice of the Vice-President and Provost,

**YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS**

THAT the following allocations in support of Faculty Recruitment be made from the Academic Priorities Fund:

- \$1,238,809 one-time-only to cover the cost of funding for start-up packages already committed for 2000-01
- \$2,000,000 in base to create a fund to be distributed annually by the Provost to support start-up packages for new faculty
- \$1,000,000 in base to create a fund to be distributed annually by the Provost to provide support for academic appointments of "trailing" spouses
- \$500,000 in base to provide ongoing funding for support services to assist in faculty recruitment.

The Chair reported that the motion had been carried unanimously.

**7. Academic Priorities Fund: Allocation - Council of Health Sciences and Social Work Deans, Interdivisional Initiatives**

Professor Sedra explained that the Council, which included the Deans of Medicine, Dentistry, Nursing, Pharmacy, Physical Education and Health, and Social Work, had met frequently to identify synergies and joint initiatives for the benefit of the group. Their proposal (attached as Appendix "D") had requested funding for interprofessional education, a health sciences writing centre and a consultant to develop modular orientation programs for new faculty. He was

7. **Academic Priorities Fund Allocation: Council of Health Sciences and Social Work Deans – Interdivisional Initiatives** (cont'd)

recommending that the first two be funded with a one-time-only allocation, but that funding for the third be found elsewhere.

Professor Sessle, the current Chair of the Council, added that the allocation for interprofessional education would support continued momentum of an important initiative that had begun five or six years ago in the Faculty of Medicine.

A member asked why this was proposed as two years of one-time-only funding, rather than as an allocation to base. Professor Sedra said that there would be an assessment of how the initiative unfolded. The Committee should expect in due course that a plan would be developed for base funding.

On the recommendation of the Vice-President and Provost,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT an Academic Priorities Fund allocation of \$342,150 in one-time-only funding be approved in support of inter-divisional initiatives proposed by the Council of Health Sciences and Social Work Deans.

The Chair reported that the motion had been carried unanimously.

8. **Capital Project: University of Toronto at Mississauga, Centre for Applied Bioscience and Biotechnology - Users' Committee Report**

The Chair introduced Professor Ulli Krull of the Department of Chemistry, UTM, who chaired the Users' Committee and who was a guest of the meeting to help inform the Committee on this project.

Professor Venter referred to the Report of the Users' Committee for the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM) Centre for Applied Bioscience and Biotechnology (CABB) under cover of his memorandum of April 10, 2001 (attached as Appendix "E"), which made recommendations for a new research facility of approximately 330 net assignable square metres (nasms) of laboratory space in the South Building.

Professor Venter noted that the funds were in place, with support from the Canada Foundation for Innovation (CFI), the Ontario Innovation Trust (OIT), UTM, the University of Toronto and Glaxo Wellcome. He acknowledged Professor Ray Cummins for initially bringing this to his attention.

A member noted for the information of the Committee that there was a component of Forensic Science included in the proposed usage of the laboratory facilities.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

- (i) THAT the Users' Committee Report for the Centre for Applied Bioscience and Biotechnology be approved in principle to allow for the construction of 330 nasms in the South Building at UTM. This will provide a new core

8. **Capital Project: University of Toronto at Mississauga, Centre for Applied Bioscience and Biotechnology -Users' Committee Report** (cont'd)

research facility in biosciences and biotechnology at UTM, specifically comprising a high field NMR, a micro-array research and development facility and an automated DNA sequencer.

- (ii) THAT the project scope as identified in the Users' Committee Report be approved at a cost of \$2,082,000 with funding from the Canada Foundation for Innovation and the Ontario Innovation Fund.

The Chair reported that the motion had been carried unanimously.

9. **Capital Project: Faculty of Medicine - Laboratory Centre for Disease Control Facility Compliance for Level 3 Containment Facility - Users' Committee Report**

Speaking to his memorandum of April 6, 2001 and the attached Users' Committee Report (attached as Appendix "F"), Professor Venter noted that the University of Toronto currently had a containment facility located on the fourth floor of the Medical Sciences Building that was designed for both *in vitro* and *in vivo* investigations and procedures. In March 2000, this facility had been found to be in need of upgrading to accommodate the type of research being done there. Since late 1999, the facility had not been in full compliance for Level 3 containment, preventing a range of research at that laboratory and restrictions on collaborative research with other laboratories.

A member asked if it was anticipated that in the long term the University would continue to need its three such research laboratories, or if upgrading this facility would replace usage of the other two. Dr. Yip responded, saying that the proposed upgraded facility was for tissue culture and cell research. No animals were involved. There was no duplication of facilities among the three laboratories and in the long term, the need for all three was likely to continue. In a few years, it was probable that similar upgrades would be needed in the other two facilities.

A member asked if CFI funding had been sought for this project. Professor Venter indicated that this was intended in the future, but that an allocation was needed now to allow this important upgrading to proceed immediately.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the Users' Committee Report for a Level 3 Containment Facility as defined by the Laboratory Centre for Disease Control be approved in principle, including the space program and allocation in priority ranking as outlined in the Report (attached as Appendix "F"), at a total cost of \$1.6 million to be funded by the Faculty of Medicine, The Hospital for Sick Children and St. Michael's Hospital.

The Chair reported that the motion had been carried unanimously.



### **10. Canada Research Chairs' Fund: Allocation - Faculty of Medicine**

Professor Sedra recalled that the Committee had previously dealt with a recommendation for the allocation of Canada Research Chairs funding for divisions other than the Faculty of Medicine. The current recommendation concerned the allocation to that Faculty. The University's financial model for the chairs provided for a total of 126 chairs to be awarded to the Faculty of Medicine over five years. Of those, 63 would be tier I chairs valued at \$200,000 per year and 63 would be tier II Chairs valued at \$100,000 per year. Forty of the chairs allocated to Medicine would be based on campus (20 tier I and 20 tier II) and 86 would be based at the affiliated teaching hospitals and their research institutes (43 tier I, 43 tier II). The Canada Research Chairs Fund model presumed government funding for the 126 chairs, amounting to \$18.9 million.

Professor Sedra's proposal (attached as Appendix "G") concerned the chairs awarded to the Faculty of Medicine in the September 2000 competition. In that competition, the Faculty had been awarded 23 chairs: a \$1.2 million grant for 7 campus-based chairs (5 tier I and 2 tier II) and a \$2.3 million grant for 16 hospital-based chairs (7 tier I and 9 tier II). In accordance with the University's approved financial model, the University would recover central indirect costs amounting to 16% of the salary and benefits of the campus-based chairs. For chairs based in the affiliated teaching hospitals and research institutes, the comparable rate would be 6%.

The Chair invited Dean Naylor to elaborate on the proposal. Dean Naylor reported that the University had sought nominees through a canvas on campus and among the Vice-Presidents responsible for research at the affiliated teaching hospitals. The outcome had been 50 nominations, which through a detailed assessment were reduced to 23. All had been approved in the federal review. A part of the process had been an effort at some capacity building, for example to strengthen the research program at the Toronto Rehabilitation Hospital. For the campus-based chairs (5 tier I and 2 tier II), the focus of attention had been the use of the program to retain outstanding individuals who were already on the faculty. Over the life of the program, the Faculty would like half of the chairs at each level to be given to new faculty, reflecting a commitment to move from a focus on retention to a focus on recruiting outstanding new faculty.

Dean Naylor stressed that while the Government funding for the Canada Research Chairs was very welcome, it was important to be aware that it provided only a part of that required to support the work of the chairs. For the campus-based chairs, the \$1.2-million of Government funding would be supplemented by nearly \$700,000 of funding from central University sources and from the Faculty of Medicine and by a further amount of nearly \$1.6-million from primarily external research grants. Dean Naylor stressed that it was very costly to establish the operations of the high-level researchers who would hold the Canada Research Chairs. He elaborated on the distribution of the funding, from all three sources, for the **campus-based chairs**.

- **Government funding through the Canada Research Chairs program - \$1.2-million.** Of this, 66% would be devoted to the salaries and benefits of the chair-holders, 19% would support the chair-holders' trainees (at the undergraduate, master's, doctoral and post-doctoral levels), and 4% would be devoted to other research expenses. The remaining 11% would be recovered by the University to cover overhead costs.

**10. Canada Research Chairs' Fund: Allocation to the Faculty of Medicine for Chairs Approved in September 2000 Competition (cont'd)**

- **Funding from the University and the Faculty of Medicine - \$697,000.** Of this, 8% would be devoted to the salaries and benefits of the chair-holders, 7% would support the chair-holders' trainees, 36% would provide for other research expenses, especially the cost of technical staff, 37% would be devoted to the purchase and maintenance of research equipment, 10% would provide research allowances, and 1% would go towards the recovery of institutional costs.
- **Funding from other sources - \$1,577,000.** Of this amount, 2% would support the salaries and benefits of the chair-holders, 8% would support their trainees, 20% would support other expenses, and 1% would be devoted to the purchase and maintenance of equipment. The remaining 69%, from external research grants, would be devoted to supporting the research projects for which the grants were awarded. Dean Naylor commented that over \$1-million of research grants had been projected for only seven people, but those individuals were truly outstanding researchers.

Dean Naylor then elaborated on the distribution of the funding, from all three sources, for the **hospital-based chairs**. He observed that the distribution was similar to that of the campus-based chairs.

- **Government funding through the Canada Research Chairs program - \$2.3-million.** Of this, 60% would be devoted to the salaries and benefits of the chair-holders, 12% would support the chair-holders' trainees, and 17% would be for other research expenses. The remaining 11% would cover University and hospital overhead.
- **Funding from the hospitals - \$5,853,000.** Of this, 13% would be devoted to the salaries and benefits of the chair-holders, 6% would support the chair-holders' trainees, 59% would provide for other research expenses, especially the cost of technical staff, 4% would be devoted to the purchase and maintenance of research equipment, and 18% would go towards the recovery of institutional costs.
- **Funding from other sources - \$3,852,000.** Of this amount, 4% would support the salaries and benefits of the chair-holders, 26% would support their trainees, 47% would go towards other expenses, and 23% would be devoted to the purchase and maintenance of equipment.

Only 20% of the funding for the hospital-based Canada Research Chairs would be derived from the Canada Research Chairs program itself, with a large amount of money required from other sources.

Dean Naylor displayed the distribution of the \$1.2-million from the Canada Research Chair Program itself to support the seven campus-based chairs awarded in the September 2000 competition. In addition to the 11% for University overhead, 19% would be channeled through the Faculty of Medicine's pool and 70% would be channeled through the chair-holders' departments. Over the five years of the program, the University would receive a total of \$6-million to support 40 campus based chairs, including \$4 million to support the 20 tier I chairs at a rate of \$200,000 per year and \$2-million to support the 20 tier II chairs at a rate of \$1-million per year. Again, 11.4% would cover University overhead. Twenty percent would flow through the Faculty of Medicine Pool and 68.6% through the chair-holders' departments.

**10. Canada Research Chairs' Fund: Allocation to the Faculty of Medicine for Chairs Approved in September 2000 Competition (cont'd)**

Dean Naylor described the planned use of the \$1.2-million Faculty of Medicine Pool over the five years of the program at a steady state. Four hundred and twenty thousand dollars would be required to provide the Faculty's share of the cost of salary and benefits increases for the chair-holders. Those increases, including both across-the-board salary increases and progress-through-the-ranks increases, were anticipated to cost a cumulative 50% of the initial salary base over the five years of the program. The cost of those increases would be evenly shared between the Faculty and the chair-holders' departments. In addition, the departments would be responsible for assuming the salary and benefit costs of the Canada Research Chair-holders after the end of the program and until their retirements. In addition, \$400,000 would be budgeted for academic recruitment, especially bridge financing for some of the appointments. All new faculty and staff positions would be regarded as bridges to retirements or chair recruitment. Two hundred thousand dollars would be devoted to administrative staff support. Finally \$180,000 would be used for program support and contingencies. Program support would be provided in the form of one-time-only funding. The objective of the contingency support category was to seek to contain unanticipated costs within each of the clusters.

Finally, Dean Naylor described the use of the departmental allotment for the campus-based chairs. Ten percent would be used to pay the departments' share of the cost of salary and benefits increases; 10% would be devoted to the salaries and benefits of trainee; 10% percent would be devoted to the salaries and benefits of support staff; 30% percent would be used for equipment purchase and maintenance; and, 10% would be used for space renovation. The final 30% would be used for other research support, including research allowances. The support of the chairs would be interlocking, and the outcome should be a sustainable, steady-state program.

Among the matters that arose in questions and discussion were the following.

**(a) Nature of academic appointments in the Faculty of Medicine.** In response to a question, Dean Naylor said that the overwhelming majority of the 5,000 academic appointments in the Faculty of Medicine were status-only appointments in the University, with the individuals being self-employed clinicians or hospital-appointed clinicians or researchers. Those individuals provided highly valued teaching both in clinical and classroom settings. Only 200 members of the teaching staff of the Faculty held traditional tenured or tenure-stream appointments.

**(b) Costs and benefits of the program.** A member expressed some concern that Dean Naylor's presentation showed that for the initial seven campus-based chairs, for example, the University would receive \$1.2-million of Government funding but would have to allocate an additional \$700,000 of its own funding to support the chairs as well as nearly \$1.6-million of funding received from other sources. It appeared that the program was causing net pain rather than benefit. Dean Naylor replied that the Faculty regarded the program as a very good thing indeed, but it was one that required other funding for such added costs as technical staff, other research support, various services and overhead. The full costs of medical research, especially by the outstanding individuals who would hold the Chairs, was very substantial. It was, moreover, very important to demonstrate to the Government of Canada that, while the program was a very welcome one, the support it provided was by no means sufficient to meet the indirect costs of the chairs' research. Professor Munroe-Blum and Dean Naylor added that the federal support was not even sufficient to meet the direct costs because the support for the chairs would not grow over the years to take into account the compound cost of salary increases.

**10. Canada Research Chairs' Fund: Allocation to the Faculty of Medicine for Chairs Approved in September 2000 Competition (cont'd)**

A member commented that the problem of funding salary and benefit increases was not exclusive to the Canada Research Chairs. It was presumably shared by the endowed chairs as well. Professor Sedra replied that the payout from the endowment was intended to be less than the long-term growth in its value so that the value of the endowment and the payout would keep pace with inflation. While the poor returns on the securities markets in the past year would mean that the objective might well not be attainable in the current year, it should be attained over the long run. He noted that the value of the payout for the current year had been 9% greater than that of the previous year.

A member expressed concern that parts of the University that would benefit less from the program would effectively have to contribute to paying the indirect cost of the Canada Research Chairs in Medicine. Dean Naylor replied that the Faculty was making every effort to achieve sustainable support for the chair-holders so that no costs would be shifted onto other parts of the University.

**(c) Support for hospital-based trainees.** A member observed that 26% of the cost of the trainees of hospital-based chairs would be provided by funding sources other than the Canada Research Chair program itself or the hospitals. Dean Naylor recognized that there was some cause for concern that a significant number of Ontario Graduate Scholarships were being awarded to graduate students who were supervised off campus at the hospitals and their research institutes. He noted that the amount of scholarship money was less than it would be if there were a level playing field. Nonetheless, if more graduate trainees could be supported by other sources, there would be less need for concern about the transfer of Ontario graduate funding off campus. Dean Naylor undertook to examine the matter if the level of other support for hospital-based trainees did not increase.

In the course of discussion, a member enquired about the schedule for hiring the incumbents of the chairs that had previously been allocated in the divisions other than the Faculty of Medicine. Professor Tuohy replied that she was working towards agreements on scheduling with the Principal or Dean of each division.

On the recommendation of the Vice-President and Provost,

**YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS**

THAT \$1.07 million (\$1.2 million minus \$127,000 indirect cost of 16% of salaries and benefits) be allocated from the Canada Research Chairs Fund to the Faculty of Medicine to cover the salaries and benefits and cluster support for the 7 campus-based chair-holders approved in the September 2000 CRC competition.

THAT \$2.2 million (\$2.3 million minus \$83,000 indirect cost of 6% of salaries and benefits) be allocated to the Faculty of Medicine in support of the 16 chair-holders based in Hospital/Research Institutes.

The Chair reported that the motion had been carried unanimously.

**11. Sunnybrook and Women's College Health Sciences Centre Expansion**

The Chair noted that this item was for information only but that it was placed before the last two agenda items for approval to take advantage of Dr. Naylor's presence.

Professor Venter recalled that the University of Toronto had approved the Sunnybrook Health Sciences Centre Master Site Plan in March 1992 with the requirement that Sunnybrook provide information to the University regarding substantive changes to the master plan. Sunnybrook was planning now to implement two portions of the Plan, both of which conformed to the Plan. Other than improving lands adjacent to the campus, these plans had no implications for the University. He noted that guests from Sunnybrook were in attendance to respond to questions.

**12. Academic Program Changes: School of Graduate Studies****12.1 Collaborative M.Eng./M.A.Sc. Program in Welding Engineering – Closure**

Professor McCammond said that the collaborative M.Eng./M.A.Sc. Program in Welding Engineering had been established to respond to interest in the mid '80s. It was a collaborative program between the University of Toronto and the University of Waterloo. The University of Toronto departments involved were Civil and Mechanical Engineering and Metallurgy and Material Science. Interest in the program had waned. The Memorandum of Understanding had not been renewed since 1990; there had been no new graduates for five years and no registrations for a considerable period before that. All signatories had agreed to the closure of the program and there were no resource implications. (See Appendix "H".)

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the Collaborative M.Eng/M.A.Sc. Program in Welding Engineering be discontinued, effective immediately.

The Chair reported that the motion had been carried unanimously.

**12.2 M.A. Program in South Asian Studies – Cessation of New Admissions**

Professor McCammond informed the Committee that the School of Graduate Studies and the Centre for South Asian Studies had existing master's and doctoral collaborative programs in South Asian Studies in addition to the M.A. program. It was proposed to discontinue and suspend admissions to the M.A., South Asian Studies and to counsel any new students interested in the discipline to register in the appropriate collaborative program. This would not reduce the academic focus on South Asian Studies nor would it disadvantage any students. (See Appendix "I" attached.)

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT admission to the M.A. Program in South Asian Studies be suspended, effective September 2001.

The Chair reported that the motion had been carried unanimously.

### **13. Items for Information**

#### **13.1 Capital Project: Energenius Centre for Advanced Nano-Technology/Renovations of the Haultain Building - Users' Committee Terms of Reference and Membership**

Professor Venter outlined the terms of reference and membership for the new Users' Committee related to renovations of the Haultain Building. The Committee report would be expected by June 30, 2001.

#### **13.2 Capital Project: Childcare Facilities, St. George Campus, Phase I, Early Learning Centre – Users' Committee Terms of Reference and Membership**

Professor Venter recalled that a Users' Committee had been struck to look at childcare in 1997. That Committee identified possible sites that had since been used for other purposes. He proposed to establish a new Users' Committee to build on the first report, to accumulate the information that had become available since then and to have the new Committee report back to the Planning and Budget Committee on May 15.

A member noted that there was no one from Campus Co-op Daycare on the new Committee. Professor Venter responded that, although the earlier Users' Committee had looked at four childcare facilities, the new Users' Committee would look at Nancy's, Margaret Fletcher and Kidspace, with a separate strategy under consideration for Campus Co-op. A representative of Kidspace would be invited to join the Users' Committee. The Users' Committee would bring forward specific recommendations in May for Phase I and more general recommendations for overall planning of childcare facilities on campus. Information on the funding of childcare facilities would be included in the Users' Committee report.

### **14. Date of Next Meeting**

The Chair reminded members that the next regular meeting of the Committee was scheduled for Tuesday, May 15, 2001.

### **15. Other Business**

There was no other business.

The meeting adjourned at 7:00 p.m.

---

Secretary

---

Chair

April 26, 2001