

**UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO**

**THE GOVERNING COUNCIL**

**REPORT NUMBER 93 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD**

**August 10, 2000**

To the Governing Council,  
University of Toronto.

Your Board reports that it held a special meeting on Thursday, August 10, 2000, at 5:00 p.m. in the Dean's Conference Room, Medical Sciences Building, at which the following were present:

Mr. Brian C. Burchell (In the Chair)  
Professor Ian Orchard, Vice-Provost,  
Students  
Ms Susan Addario, Director,  
Student Affairs  
Ms Yvette Y. Ali  
Ms Jennifer Carson  
Ms Susan Eng  
Dr. Shari Graham Fell  
Professor Bruce Kidd  
Mr. Vivek Krishnamurthy  
Mr. Darren R. Levstek  
Ms Karen Lewis  
Mr. Paul McCann

Mrs. Susan M. Scace

Non-Voting Members:

Mr. Louis R. Charpentier, Secretary of the  
Governing Council  
Miss Janice Oliver, Assistant Vice-President,  
Operations and Services  
Ms Marilyn Van Norman, Director,  
Student Services

Secretariat:

Ms Margaret McKone

Professor Ian R. McDonald

Regrets:

Mr. Muhammad Basil Ahmad  
Dr. Robert Bennett  
Professor Marion Bogo  
The Honourable William G. Davis  
Mr. Ljupco Gjorginski

Ms Margaret Hancock  
Dr. Heather Lane  
Mr. Fayez A. Queresby  
Ms Nancy L. Watson  
Ms Szu-Mae Yoon

In Attendance:

Professor John Browne, Director, Residence Development  
Mr. Jim Delaney, Manager, Liaison and Campus Life Services, Office of Student Affairs  
Dr. Jack Dimond, Secretary Emeritus of the Governing Council, and Coordinator,  
Varsity/Devonshire/Bloor Precinct Project  
Ms Lorena Gaudio, Senior Financial Consultant, Financial Services Department  
Professor Angela Hildyard, Principal, Woodsworth College  
Ms Manon LePaven, President, Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students  
Mr. Tom Nowers, Associate Vice-Principal, Student Affairs, University of Toronto at  
Scarborough

ITEMS 4 AND 5 CONTAIN RESOLUTIONS CONCURRING WITH PLANNING  
AND BUDGET COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS.

ALL OTHER ITEMS ARE REPORTED FOR INFORMATION.

**Chair's Remarks**

The Chair welcomed members to the first meeting of the Board for 2000-2001 and invited members to introduce themselves and to indicate their constituencies. He noted that there had been need for a summer meeting to consider two users' committee reports that required approval under summer executive authority. A brief orientation was planned for the outset of the Board's next meeting.

The Chair drew members' attention to a list of members' addresses that had been placed on the table. He invited members to check the accuracy of the contact information provided and to report any errors or amendments to the Secretary.

**Pursuant to Section 33(ii) of By-Law Number 2, item 1 was considered in closed session.**

**1. Council on Student Services: Appointment of Chair**

The Chair noted that the *Memorandum of Agreement between the University of Toronto and the Students' Administrative Council, the Graduate Students' Union, and the Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students for a long-term Protocol on the increase or introduction of compulsory non-tuition related fees* provided that, on the advice of the President, the University Affairs Board appoint a non-voting chair for the Council on Student Services (COSS).

Professor Orchard said that at its final meeting of the 1999-2000 academic session, COSS had composed a ranked listing of nominees for COSS Chair for 2000-2001. These had been passed on to the President, who had made a recommendation to the University Affairs Board. Appended to Professor Orchard's introductory memorandum was a *curriculum vitae* for the proposed candidate.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT Mr. Liam Mitchell be appointed Chair of COSS for 2000-2001.

**The Board returned to open session.**

**2. Report of the Previous Meeting held May 23, 2000**

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

Report Number 92 of the University Affairs Board  
(May 23, 2000).

**3. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting**

**Item 3 – Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting -- Student Club Space at 21 Sussex Avenue - Accessibility**

The Chair recalled that the Board had previously been apprised of the administration's efforts to renovate 21 Sussex Avenue, a newly designated site for student clubs, to ensure that it was fully accessible. Invited to provide an update on this initiative, Miss Oliver reported that she anticipated that the tendering process would be completed by mid-October and the construction process completed by mid-December. She reiterated that there was an elevator within the property and therefore the efforts to increase accessibility pertained to existing washrooms and the building entrance.

In response to a member's questions, Miss Oliver noted that she had undertaken to complete an audit of campus buildings to determine the extent to which they were fully accessible. The Office of Space Management currently maintained an accessibility database of buildings containing classrooms. While there was no policy for ensuring that all University buildings were fully accessible within a stated timeframe, the University was very much committed to ensuring that all newly constructed buildings were fully accessible.

**4. Varsity/Devonshire/Bloor Precinct: Oral Presentation**

The Chair recalled that there had been insufficient time remaining at the previous meeting for members of the Board to engage in discussion of Dr. Dimond's status report on the Varsity/Devonshire/Bloor Precinct project. He had therefore invited Dr. Dimond to return so that the Board could have a meaningful opportunity to provide guidance and to play a constructive role in shaping this major project.

The Chair noted that the evolution of the Varsity/Devonshire/Bloor precinct project had implications for each of the Governing Council's three boards. Prior to consideration of the capital project by the Governing Council, the Academic Board, on the advice of its Planning and Budget Committee, would be asked to approve in principle the capital project including such elements as site, space plan, overall costs and sources of funds. The role of the University Affairs Board would be to offer advice on aspects of the project within its terms of reference, including anticipated residence fees, parking, and the quality of student life within the project. Subject to the approval of the Academic and University Affairs Boards, the Business Board would be asked to establish appropriations and to authorize the execution of the capital project within the approved costs, thus ensuring that the University was getting the best value for its expenditure. The Business Board would also be asked to review the financial plan for the project to ensure that it was sound.

The Chair welcomed Dr. Jack Dimond, Secretary Emeritus of the Governing Council, and coordinator of the project.

Dr. Dimond clarified that his report to the Board at this time was informational. The Board was invited to provide advice on the various directions contemplated. He envisaged that a formal report, for which approval would be sought for various aspects, would be brought to the Board in the late fall.

Dr. Dimond noted that there were two overarching objectives to the project. First, it was proposed that the project would make a significant contribution to the University's plan to increase student residence facilities on the St. George campus. Currently, the University provided residences for 16 percent of the full-time student body; the provincial average was

**4. Varsity/Devonshire/Bloor Precinct: Oral Presentation (cont'd)**

25 percent. The University's goal was to increase its capacity to 25 percent. The second objective was to substantially improve and add on to the University's athletics and recreation facilities.

Dr. Dimond recalled that the University had previously abandoned a plan for the major commercial development of the Varsity Stadium site. This decision had been taken in part because of a lack of sufficient space on campus for increased residences.

Dr. Dimond then highlighted the following aspects of the project.

- Five or six new residences would be built, accommodating between 1600-1700 students (approximately 700 undergraduate students, 700 graduate and second-entry students, and the balance undetermined at present).
- The residence currently located at Bloor and St. George Streets would be demolished and replaced by a new Woodsworth College residence that would incorporate approximately 380 of these residence spaces.
- A residence was contemplated for the west side of Devonshire Place (Site 12), which currently housed a parking lot and two day care facilities. The development of this site would require that the University find alternative space for the facilities currently located there.
- Also, an area of new green space, comparable in size to the quadrangle within Massey College, would be created west of Devonshire Place between the above two new buildings.
- The existing Varsity Stadium would be demolished and replaced with a 5,000-seat stadium.
- The relocation of the track to the south and east would create residential building sites along the perimeter of the site (i.e. Devonshire Place).
- A six-story building, with generous openings for views throughout the site, would border the perimeter to the south and west sides of the new stadium. At the north-west corner there would be a 'point' tower of thirteen additional stories above the six stories that would house approximately 380 residence spaces and at the north-east corner a similar tower would house approximately 320 students.
- The top three floors of each of these towers would contain 15 two-bedroom apartments for housing new faculty. These units together with 40 apartment units in the Huron / Sussex area behind Robarts Library would be available to new faculty members on a three-year basis and would serve as a valuable recruitment tool.
- Discussions had been initiated with the Deans of professional faculties (e.g. Joseph L. Rotman School of Management, Faculty of Social Work, and the Faculty of Music) concerning these faculties.
- A small building on the southwest corner of the Varsity Stadium site would be able to accommodate 100 residence spaces. Running north from this building along the east side of Devonshire Place would be a narrow building with 100 additional residence spaces. This building would include, at grade, several views through and a means of easy access to the playing field area.

**4. Varsity/Devonshire/Bloor Precinct: Oral Presentation (cont'd)**

- The new stadium would be equipped with an all-weather field and an eight-lane modern track.
- Varsity Arena would be extensively renovated and a second ice surface would be built immediately to the south of the Arena. This would allow for the closure of the existing facility behind Robert Street, which had come to the end of its useful life.

In conclusion, Dr. Dimond noted that the estimated project cost should be determined by the end of the summer, at which time plans would be formulated for overall funding of the project. The University was in discussions with all levels of government to maximize operating and capital funding for the Varsity Stadium and Arena and to ensure they were accessible to a wide range of users and activities.

Dr. Dimond responded to a number of questions for clarification. Among the substantive matters that arose were the following.

**Potential for Revenue-generating Enterprises on the Varsity Stadium Site.** In response to a member's question, Dr. Dimond noted that it was not a good idea to build residences at grade along Bloor Street, which had a lot of street traffic. Additional revenues were being sought to make the project financially viable and, therefore, plans were being examined for the commercial retail use of this frontage. In addition, the administration was examining the potential for two revenue-generating options, a multiplex cinema and a parking garage, both to be located under the Varsity Stadium field. While the University was not required to provide additional parking on this site – a minimal number of spaces were to be displaced - it was anticipated that there would be increased demand for parking with the inclusion of a multiplex cinema.

**Need for Additional Family Housing on Campus.** Dr. Dimond noted the absence of provision for family housing in the proposed development. While the University was in fact seeking opportunities to add 300-400 family units it would not be financially viable to incorporate these apartment style housing within the project owing to economics and space restrictions.

**Discussions with External Parties.** In response to a query, Dr. Dimond responded that with the exception of height, he anticipated that the developments substantially conformed to the Campus Master Plan. The administration was in discussions with the City regarding the building requirements for this site as well as City requirements for building setbacks along Bloor Street. The University was also in discussions with Trinity College concerning boundary issues between its campus and the Varsity Stadium/Arena site.

**Multiplex Cinema and Parking Garage.** A member asked if the University had engaged the Toronto Transit Commission in its discussions of these options. Dr. Dimond responded in the negative; however, the planners that had been asked to advise on an overall approach to the area had been requested to examine the issues associated with parking and transportation. The University had also discussed the potential for a parking garage with the Royal Conservatory of Music and the Royal Ontario Museum.

**4. Varsity/Devonshire/Bloor Precinct: Oral Presentation (cont'd)**

A member asked if the funding of the project was contingent upon the provision of a multiplex cinema. Dr. Dimond replied that this was a potential option and would only be pursued if it could generate sufficient revenue. Alternative options included an underground classroom complex. He noted that the underground parking garage would be scaled back if the multiplex cinema was not pursued.

A member suggested that the University pursue as large a parking garage as possible, given the potential for revenue. She also suggested that the University seek a long-term lease for a multiplex cinema given that the long-term market for such facilities was not known.

During the course of the discussion, Dean Kidd noted that he was very happy with the development of the project. He looked forward to the improved athletics facilities that could be utilized many hours a day.

**5. Capital Projects: Users' Committee Report – Woodsworth College**

The Chair noted that this and the following item involved capital projects, which fell within the jurisdiction of the Academic Board and its Planning and Budget Committee. The role of the University Affairs Board was to advise the Governing Council on the implications of capital projects in its areas of responsibility. The Chair noted that in considering the two Users' Committee Reports, members should reflect on the residence sizes, given anticipated enrollment growth, on the kinds of residences being proposed (i.e. family, single or faculty) and the desirability of the selected sites in their proximity to colleges, parking and campus services. The University Affairs Board had a special role to play on this issue in that it had sole responsibility for the Residence Ancillary.

The Chair noted that because there was some urgency to these projects, the administration had indicated that it would be seeking their approval under Summer Executive Authority.

The Chair welcomed Professor Angela Hildyard, Principal, Woodsworth College; Professor John Browne, Director, Residence Development; and Ms Lorena Gaudio, Senior Financial Consultant, Financial Services Department, who were in attendance to respond to members' questions.

Professor Orchard introduced the proposal recalling that *Expanding Residence Capacity at the University of Toronto*, which had been developed from the *Raising Our Sights* companion document *Student Housing: A Plan for the Next Phase*, had called for the addition of 1935 places for undergraduate students at the colleges on the St. George campus. Based on the guideline in *Student Housing: A Plan for the Next Phase* that the University should have the capacity to house 25 percent of its full-time student population, Woodsworth College's residential capacity should be approximately 600 places at a steady state.

Professor Orchard drew attention to the funding component of the proposal, noting that base funding of up to \$1,024,000 per year was being recommended from the Academic Priorities Fund for a period of 8 years. This significant level of funding was required in this instance owing to the fact that the residence would be the first for Woodsworth College and, therefore, there was no reserve from an existing residence in the College. The recommended funding would help reduce the costs of construction and the down payment, thereby avoiding the scenario of unacceptably high room rates.

**5. Capital Projects: Users' Committee Report – Woodsworth College (cont' d)**

A member noted her enthusiasm for the approval and sought clarification as to the percentage of first-year students who would be guaranteed a residence. Professor Browne responded that upon the successful completion of the project, Woodsworth College would be able to guarantee a residence space to 60 percent of its first-year students. Existing policy required a residence guarantee to 50 percent of first-year students; however, some divisions had increased this percentage to 60 owing to increased demand. Professor Browne believed the more desirable percentage was 50 because it provided additional spaces for students who wished to stay in residence beyond first year.

A member asked if other residences had been built with similar subsidies from the Academic Priorities Fund. Miss Oliver responded that the level of subsidy was contingent upon funding in the residence ancillary. The ultimate goal was to ensure that all residences were able to break even after eight years of occupancy. She recalled that when the responsibility for residences had been devolved to the Colleges, undistributed revenue from residence fees had been retained in the central residence ancillary. These funds had been allocated for the down payment for the recently completed Graduate House. However, the residence ancillary had been depleted and Woodsworth College did not have an existing residence that generated revenue.

In response to a member's question, Professor Browne assured the Board that approval of the proposal would not constitute a precedent for future subsidies. The recommended allocation pertained only to the proposal currently before members.

A member indicated her approval of the new residence and urged the need for controlled access to the residence. She also asked about the potential for realizing the proposed room rate of \$550 per month at opening.

Professor Browne responded that it was a general principle in this and other users' committees that residences be as secure as possible. With regard to the proposed room rate, he clarified that this amount had been determined as an assumption for purposes of determining a revenue and expense plan for the new residence. The final outcome would be contingent upon various factors, including interest rates and construction costs. He believed the assumption to be conservative. He reminded members that University Affairs Board members had an opportunity to comment on residence fees when the Board reviewed the annual operating plans for residences.

Principal Hildyard elaborated upon the security provisions for the new residence, noting that the architects had been charged with ensuring maximum safety. A computerized/card-entry locking system would be used as well as monitor/security personnel. Electronic monitoring of adjacent open spaces was also contemplated to ensure proper security for the residence. The potential for retail on the first and second floors of the residence would provide additional security. Mindful of non-residence traffic within the residence, the spaces dedicated to the Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students, Lesbian, Gay, Transgendered and Queer Resources and Programs, and the Woodsworth Alumni Association had been restricted to areas where there were no residence spaces.

A member recalled the considerable cost overruns associated with Graduate House and asked if the funding assumptions for this project took into account the problems encountered with the recently constructed residence. Miss Oliver responded that a contingency of 10 percent was built in to the construction contracts for all new construction projects.

**5. Capital Projects: Users' Committee Report – Woodsworth College** (cont'd)

The Chair cited the delay in completion of the Graduate House by almost 12 months and asked if there were timeline contingencies incorporated into the current project. Miss Oliver confirmed that the proposed schedule, which contemplated occupancy by 2003, had incorporated the schedules associated with Graduate House and the recently completed residence at the University of Toronto at Mississauga.

A member noted the Users' Committee had suggested that the possibility of classrooms, preferably underground, be explored during the project's implementation phase. The member wondered at what point a decision on this suggestion would have to be made. Miss Oliver responded that a determination would have to be made within the architect selection period, which totaled two months. Principal Hildyard added that the Provost was aware of the classroom issues raised by the Users' Committee.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD CONCURRED WITH THE  
RECOMMENDATION OF THE PLANNING AND BUDGET  
COMMITTEE

- (i) THAT the Users' Committee Report for the Woodsworth College Student Residence (dated 18 July, 2000) proposing a 14,000 gross square meter building on site 26 on the St. George Campus, be approved in principle;
- (ii) THAT the project cost of \$27 million be approved;
- (iii) THAT the sources of funding, a 25-year mortgage to be repaid from residence fees and an allocation from the Academic Priorities Fund, be approved; and
- (iv) THAT base funding of up to \$1,024,000 per year be allocated from the Academic Priorities Fund to Woodsworth College for a period of 8 years, the allocation to be reviewed at the that time.

**6. Capital Projects: Users' Committee Report – University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC) Student Residence (Phase 4)**

In addition to the previously recognized guests for the two users' committee reports, the Chair welcomed Mr. Tom Nowers, Associate Vice-Principal, Student Affairs, UTSC.

Professor Orchard introduced the proposal, noting that *Expanding Residence Capacity at the University of Toronto* had also recommended that the Mississauga and Scarborough campuses increase their capacity to offer residence to 25 percent of first-year students. Currently, UTSC was only able to offer a residence space to 10 percent of its first-year students. The users' committee report currently before members sought to address the current demand.

In response to questions, Mr. Nowers noted that the site had not yet been finalized; however, the preference of the Users' Committee had been for a site south of the Student Village Centre, alongside the inner parking lot. This was consistent with the UTSC's long-term plan for residence expansion. A consultant had been hired to recommend on the residence site as well as the UTSC Master Plan. He was confident that UTSC would be



**6. Capital Projects: Users' Committee Report – University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC) Student Residence (Phase 4) (cont'd)**

able to fill the new residence given current demand and the existing residence availability, which offered only townhouse style residences.

A member commented that a recent survey of applicants to Ontario universities had indicated that students were attracted not only to the academic quality of an institution but also to the quality of campus life and the guarantee of a residence. The proposed new residence should therefore serve as a valuable recruitment tool for UTSC.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD CONCURRED WITH THE  
RECOMMENDATION OF THE PLANNING AND BUDGET  
COMMITTEE

- (i) THAT the Users' Committee Report for the Scarborough College Student Residence (dated 11 July, 2000) proposing a 7,558 gross square meter building on the Scarborough Campus be approved in principle;
- (ii) THAT the project cost of \$13.7 million be approved;
- (iii) THAT the sources of funding, a 25-year mortgage to be repaid from residence fees and an allocation from the Academic Priorities Fund, be approved; and
- (iv) THAT base funding of up to \$204,000 per year be allocated from the Academic Priorities Fund to Scarborough College for a period of 8 years, the allocation to be reviewed at the that time.

**7. Report of the Administrative Assessors**

Professor Orchard noted that he would forego his report given the lateness of the hour. He would report in detail at the Board's next meeting.

Ms Addario recalled that a number of issues had been raised the previous year concerning the *DisAbility* Services for Students on the St. George Campus. As previously reported, She and Professor Orchard had commissioned a review of the office, which had since culminated in the issuing of a report the previous week. The staff of the office had since been given copies of the report and provided with an opportunity to comment. The final version of the report would be available from her office and on the Student Affairs' web page the following week. She added that *DisAbility* Services for Students was to be relocated to Robarts Library. Plans were currently underway for the renovation of the new spaces and the move would hopefully take place before the end of December.

Invited by the Chair to address the Board, Ms Manon LePaven, President, Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students, asked when a new Director would be appointed, noting that it was important for there to be student input into the hiring process. Ms Addario responded that a selection committee had been struck, which included two students with experience in disability-related issues.

**6. Report of the Administrative Assessors (cont'd)**

Miss Oliver reported that the Committee to Review the St. George Campus Police Service had issued its report, which was available on the web page for the Vice-President, Administration and Human Resources. An administrative response was currently being prepared. Miss Oliver invited members to contact Professor Finlayson with any comments they might have on the report.

In response to a question, Miss Oliver reported on the status of Graduate House, whose completion had been delayed from last September. The ground through to the third floors had been available for occupancy since August 1. The completion of floors six and seven had been further delayed until the end of October owing to the installation of glass on the building exterior, which was proving to be more difficult than planned. All remaining floors would be ready for occupancy by August 23.

**7. Date of the Next Meeting**

The Chair reminded members that the Board's next meeting was scheduled for Tuesday, September 26, 2000 at 5 p.m.

**8. Other Business**

There were no items of other business.

The meeting adjourned at 6:40 p.m.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Secretary

October 30, 2000

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chair