THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

REPORT NUMBER 108 OF

THE PLANNING AND BUDGET COMMITTEE

February 28, 2006

To the Academic Board,
University of Toronto.

Your Committee reports that it met on Tuesday, February 28, 2006, at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, with the following members present

Professor Avrum Gotlieb (in the Chair)
Professor Vivek Goel, Vice-President and Provost
Ms Catherine J. Riggall, Vice-President, Business Affairs
Professor Safwat Zaky, Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget
Professor Philip H. Byer
Mr. Ryan Matthew Campbell
Mr. P.C. Choo
Professor John Coleman
Miss Coralie D'Souza
Professor Miriam Diamond
Mr. Martin Hyrcza
Professor Glen A. Jones
Professor David Mock
Ms Carole Moore
Mr. Timothy Reid
Professor Pekka Sinervo
Mr. Stephen C. Smith

Regrets:

Professor J. J. Berry Smith
Professor Ron Smyth

Non-voting Assessors:

Ms Elizabeth Sisam, Assistant Vice-President, Space and Facilities Planning

Secretariat:
Mr. Henry Mulhall
Ms Cristina Oke, Secretary

In attendance:

Mr. Chris Caners, Sustainability Coordinator, Sustainability Office
Mr. Ray deSouza, Chief Administrative Officer, University of Toronto at Mississauga
Mr. Bruce Dodds, Director, Utilities and Building Operations, Facilities and Services
Ms. Sheree Drummond, Assistant Provost
Ms Rosanne Lopers-Sweetman, Director, Special Projects, Office of the Vice-President and Provost
Mr. Ben Louie, Development Manager, Capital Projects, University of Toronto at Mississauga
Ms Kim McLean, Chief Administrative Officer, University of Toronto at Scarborough
Professor Beth Savan, Director, Sustainability Office
Mr. Ron Swail, Assistant Vice-President, Facilities and Services
Mr. Demetrios Voudouris, Manager, Accounting Services, Financial Services Department

ITEMS 6, 7 AND 9 ARE RECOMMENDED TO THE ACADEMIC BOARD FOR APPROVAL.

ALL OTHER ITEMS ARE REPORTED TO THE ACADEMIC BOARD FOR INFORMATION.

1. Report of the Previous Meeting

The Chair noted that the attendance list in the Report had been revised. Report Number 107 of February 7, 2006 was approved as amended.

2. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting

There was no business arising from Report Number 107.

3. Senior Assessor's Report

(a) 2006-07 Budget

Professor Goel advised members that the 2006-07 Budget was scheduled to be presented to the Committee at its meeting on March 28, 2006. In preparation for that meeting, an information session on the Budget and tuition fees was being held on March 22, 2006 for members of the Committee and of the Business Board.

(b) Graduate Enrolment Expansion

Professor Goel informed members that the University was continuing to develop graduate enrolment plans while waiting for an announcement from the provincial government about the allocation of funds for graduate expansion.

(c) Academic Initiatives Fund

Professor Goel indicated that the Round 3 allocations from the Academic Initiatives Fund (AIF) would be brought to the Committee at its meeting on March 7, 2006.

4. Capital Projects: Capital Plan for Buildings and Projects in Excess of $2-Million – Update Report

The Chair noted that this item was for information. The Committee received an updated list of Capital Projects at meetings at which approval was sought for a capital project.

Ms Sisam summarized the changes to the Capital Plan between October 31 and December 31, 2005. A number of projects had been closed. [1] Funding for three approved projects had been clarified. [2] The borrowing requirements that had been identified in the October 31, 2005 capital plan had totaled $693.24 million, with $67.36 million available for other initiatives. As of December 31, 2005, the total borrowing requirement was $693.38, with $67.22 million available for other initiatives.

A member asked whether any project had moved from one list to another in the Capital Plan between October 31 and December 31, 2005. Ms Sisam replied that there had been no change in the priority status of any capital project during that period.

---

[1] The following projects had been closed: University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC) Residence Phase 4; UTSC Parking and Roadway; UTSC Drop-off Circle, University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM) CABB; Sidney Smith Patio; Sidney Smith Infill; Bahen Centre for Information Technology (BCIT); BCIT Parking Garage; School of Continuing Studies Community Learning Renovation; King's College Open Space Plan; 500 University Renovation; Lash Miller Undergraduate Chemistry Lab; Lash Miller Davenport; Purchase of Colony Hotel: 89 Chestnut Street.

[2] Funding for UTM Residence Phase 8 had previously been recorded as funds available, but should have been recorded as debt. Funding for the UTSC Science Building had previously been recorded as debt, but was now being funded from the FRP-OTO fund. Funding for the Economics Building of the Faculty of Arts and Science had been incorrectly noted previously.

5. Capital Projects: Infrastructure Renewal - Review

Ms Riggall introduced Mr. Ron Swail, Assistant Vice-President, Facilities and Services, Mr. Ray deSouza, Chief Administrative Officer, University of Toronto at Mississauga, and Ms Kim McLean, Chief Administrative Officer, University of Toronto at Scarborough.

(a) Presentation

Mr. Swail provided an overview of the infrastructure renewal planning of the University, and highlighted the following points.

- Utilities Infrastructure were those systems that heated, cooled and provided power to the buildings at the University of Toronto. The systems included:
  - steam systems (heating);
  - chillers (cooling);
  - electrical systems (power);
  - roads and walkways;
  - tunnels;
  - sewers;
  - storm water management systems;
  - voice and data networks.

- Representatives from the St. George, University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM), and University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC) campuses had begun to meet in 2005 to discuss a number of challenges:
  - lack of infrastructure capacity to support new buildings and continuing growth;
  - aging plant and equipment, increasing failures;
  - large increases in commodity prices of gas and electricity which increased operating costs and resulted in the need to improve energy efficiency;
  - tougher environmental standards imposed by legislation;
  - offers from outside companies to purchase, manage, or partner with the University in the area of utilities infrastructure.

- Four options were available for the long term management of utilities infrastructure:
  - sale of systems to third party operators;
  - outsourcing of management;
  - continued in-house operations;
  - creation of unincorporated utilities business ancillary.

- In order for the University to determine the most appropriate option for the management of its utilities, the following were necessary:
  - an assessment of the current state of plant and equipment;
  - a list of priorities for upgrades, replacements, repairs
  - plans for projects to accommodate immediate growth needs;
  - a long term financial plan.
- Consultants had been retained by UTM and UTSC to deal with the immediate needs on those campuses.
- The University had engaged the consultants Sebesta Blomberg for strategic advice, including:
  - assessment of current operations;
  - definition of deferred maintenance and renewal needs going forward;
  - provision of benchmark data;
  - creation of financial models;
  - development of strategies for operational effectiveness and financial viability.

5. Capital Projects: Infrastructure Renewal - Review (cont'd)

(a) Presentation (cont'd)

- **St. George Campus**
  Heating
  - The central steam plant served 85% of campus and a variety of stand-alone heating systems.
  - The plant was efficient, in reasonably good condition, and had no immediate capacity issues.

  Cooling
  - Three chiller plants fed approximately half the campus, and a number of buildings had stand alone chillers.
  - Many of the chillers required significant renewal because they were well past their useful life and were energy inefficient .

  Power
  - Most of the power was provided by the university-owned high voltage distribution system, which was nearing capacity.
  - As a result of recent capacity issues, new buildings had been connected directly to Toronto Hydro, and some buildings on the periphery of the campus had been disconnected from the university system and connected directly to Toronto Hydro.
  - The St. George campus also had a large cogeneration system that produced approximately 15% of the campus' electricity.

  Action Required to Address Infrastructure Challenges
  - Replace 18 chillers that were beyond their useful life, contained chlorofluorocarbons (CFC's), and were energy inefficient.
  - Replace 70,000 energy inefficient lamps with modern energy efficient lamps and ballasts.
    - The combined project would require approximately $17M of the University's borrowing capacity but would provide savings of over $1million per year on electricity expenses.

  - Provide a systematic infusion of capital of approximately $150 million over the next 30 years to keep the St. George utilities infrastructure in good repair.

- **University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM)**
  Heating
  - UTM had a central steam plant, but stand alone units provided heat in most buildings.
  - Residences were heated by electricity.

  Cooling
  - UTM had a central chiller plant and stand alone units.
  - The main chiller within the chiller plant was past its useful life and required replacement.

5. Capital Projects: Infrastructure Renewal - Review (cont'd)

(a) Presentation (cont'd)

- **University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM)** (cont'd)

Power

- Power to the buildings at UTM was a serious issue.
  - The current electrical distribution system could not support the needs of the 3 new buildings under construction.
  - The existing grid was below capacity and unreliable.
  - Electrical wiring and hardware were obsolete.
  - There was no redundancy in the electrical distribution system - only one line was currently operational and there was no back up in case of failure.
  - There was an aging distribution and high voltage system.
  - There was no cogeneration, but a micro turbine provided a small percentage of campus needs.

Action Required to Address Infrastructure Challenges

- A major upgrade in the electrical supply was required to meet capacity and provide system redundancy.
- Upgrades to the steam system were needed.
- A large chiller in the chiller plant required replacement.
- An infrastructure master plan, at an estimated cost of $16 million over the next 8 years had been developed.
  - The plan included an immediate upgrade to the electrical supply and distribution and the replacement of the chiller.

Other Infrastructure Needs

- Major sewer pipes were beyond capacity, and the sanitary sewer was unable to support new buildings currently under construction.

- Storm water management did not meet standards and had to be upgraded before any future projects were approved.

- Improvements were needed to roadways, sidewalks, landscaping and data/voice infrastructure.

- **University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC)**

In 2003, a multi year plan to upgrade the campus utilities infrastructure had been developed and approved.

Heating

- The central steam plant heated all buildings at UTSC.

Cooling

- Cooling was provided by central chillers for all but two buildings.
- New cooling towers were installed in 2005.
- A new 1700 ton chiller would be installed in the summer of 2006.

Power

- High voltage power feeds to the campus were upgraded in 2004.
- Power was accessible to all areas via 3 nodes.

5. Capital Projects: Infrastructure Renewal - Review (cont'd)

(a) Presentation (cont'd)

- **University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC)**

Action Required to Address Infrastructure Challenges

- To date, over $10.7 million had been invested in the infrastructure upgrades at UTSC.
- The backup generator would replaced and expanded, and a PCB transformer would be replaced in Phase 5 of the infrastructure renewal.
- The estimated cost for Phase 5 was $4.5 million.

Other Infrastructure Needs

- Structural - concrete fatigue in one of the buildings,
- Elevators,
- Data and voice networks,
- Fire safety systems,
- Storm and sanitary systems,
- Yearly preventive maintenance.

Conclusion

- Utilities Infrastructure was critical to the University's mission.
- Infrastructure must be carefully planned to facilitate growth and prevent major breakdowns.
- A significant investment was required to address backlog of deferred maintenance.
- Finally a long term strategic plan was required for funding upgrades and facilitating growth the future.

Next Steps

- Receive final report from consultant on long term needs, strategies and financial impacts.
- Prepare recommendations for further action , including creation of utilities ancillary (tri-campus).
- Assess possible partnerships.
- Update campus master plans.

(b) Discussion

A member asked what planning would be undertaken by the University when considering the various options for the management of its infrastructure. Ms Riggall replied that there had already been discussions with several third parties interested in the utilities infrastructure on all three campuses. In the initial assessment by the consultants, the assets were worth much more than the offers that had been made. There appeared to be no advantage to the University in selling its infrastructure. One possibility for managing the infrastructure would be the creation, by the Business Board, of a business ancillary.

The member noted the variety of approaches that could be taken with respect to energy conservation and efficiency, and asked whether the possibilities of partnerships with governments or the use of innovative and cost-effective technologies were being pursued. Mr. Swail replied that the project that was being considered by the Committee later in the meeting was innovative, represented best practice, included government support and would be energy efficient.

5. Capital Projects: Infrastructure Renewal - Review (cont'd)

(b) Discussion (cont'd)

At the invitation of the Chair, Mr. deSouza referred to the Centre for Innovative Energy Technology that was located at UTM. Several innovative technologies including fuel cells, micro-turbines, and solar panels were being used on the campus.

A member offered his congratulations for the presentation and for the strategic planning that was being done by the University. He emphasized the importance of the links with the initiatives of the Sustainability Office with respect to energy conservation and efficiency. The member referred to the consideration, by the University's Design Review Committee, of the UTSC Science Building, when it had been noted that certain 'green roof' provisions for energy use and diversion of roof water into neighbouring ravines had not been included in the design of the building. He expressed the view that energy conservation and efficiency elements should be integral to plans for new buildings. A member who had been involved with the development of the project stated that there had been discussions of 'green roof' technology, but it had not been possible to accommodate the technology within the required elements of the building's design.

A member asked if savings would result from future infrastructure projects. Mr. Swail replied that the replacement of lights would result in the greatest savings. The new chillers would be 30 to 35% more efficient, and would also create savings in energy costs.

A member asked whether geothermal warming could be harnessed for energy savings. Invited to respond, Mr. Dodds stated that it was awkward to use geothermal heat on the St. George campus because of the amount of infrastructure support that was located underground. Such technology could be built into new construction, but older buildings would require extensive retrofitting.

6. Capital Project: Energy Efficiency Project on Lighting Retrofit and Chiller Replacement, St. George Campus: Project Planning Report

The Chair advised members that the amounts for the interest-free loan and the debt financing in the motion that had been included in the documentation were incorrect, and the motion would be amended as follows:

Interest-free loan:	$ 2.74 million
Debt financing	$14.20 million

At the invitation of the Chair, Mr. Swail introduced the proposal. He explained that there was an urgent need for renewal of the primary infrastructure used to air condition buildings on the St. George campus if the normal functioning of the University of Toronto was to continue without interruption.

The proposal combined the infrastructure renewal, which involved 18 chillers serving 23 buildings, with an imminent major lighting retrofit of 70,000 lamps in three buildings (Robarts Library, Medical Sciences Building and the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto (OISE/UT)).

The water chillers currently serving the St. George campus used ozone layer damaging chlorofluorocarbon (CFC) refrigerant. Some had exceeded their rated service life by 20 years years and had experienced an increasing frequency of breakdowns in the past three years.

The buildings which were involved in the lighting retrofit used inefficient T-12 fluorescent lights, many of which had ballasts containing polycarbonate byphenyls (PCB's). Retrofitting the lights with T-8 technology would improve reliability and safety and would result in substantial energy savings.

6. Capital Project: Energy Efficiency Project on Lighting Retrofit and Chiller Replacement, St. George Campus: Project Planning Report (cont'd)

The proposed project would reduce energy use by approximately 12 GWh per year, reduce costs by over $1.3 million per year, and, at the same time, reduce the demand on the University's near-capacity electrical distribution system by 4.2 MW. This project would also reduce greenhouse gas emissions from the University by 3,100 tonnes of CO_2 per year – the equivalent of permanently removing 600 cars from the road.

The University had qualified for grants totaling $2.93 million. While the cooling infrastructure project had a long payback period, the lighting retrofit had a short payback period, which helped offset the cost of the cooling infrastructure renewal over time. The project required the University to initially allocate $16.94 million of its borrowing capacity. The loan would be repaid through energy savings of approximately $1.3 million per year. A portion of the debt could be supplied by a zero-interest load of $2.74 million expected from the City of Toronto Better Buildings Partnership.

The proposal resulted in a major deferred maintenance project with a value of almost twenty million dollars being accomplished with virtually no overall long-term cost to the University's cash reserves, while providing a continuing positive cash flow to the operating budget.

A member asked about the timeline on the projects. Mr. Swail replied that the project would take three years.

A member asked whether the lighting retrofit would result in the closure of laboratories or rooms in the Medical Sciences Building. Mr. Dodds replied that, at the time of the previous retrofit, work had been done during the night so as not to inconvenience students. It was his expectation that special arrangements would be made with Principal Investigators to schedule the work in research laboratories.

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

That the Project Planning Report for the St. George Campus Cooling Infrastructure Upgrade and Major Lighting Retrofit Project, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix 'A', be approved in principle at an estimated total project cost of $19.87 million, with sources of funding as follows:

NRCan grant	$ 0.25-million
Toronto Hydro grant	0.68-million
Facilities Renewal funds	2.00-million
Interest-free loan from the City of Toronto Better Buildings Partnership to be repaid by the operating budget from energy savings	2.74-million
Debt financing to be repaid by the operating budget from energy savings	14.20-million

7. Capital Project: University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC) Infrastructure Upgrades Phase V: Project Planning Report

Ms Sisam explained that the Campus Master Plan for UTSC, approved in May, 2001, had included the construction of several new buildings to accommodate projected increases in student enrolment. The existing electrical and mechanical infrastructure had been assessed and several potentially critical conditions and deficiencies had been identified. UTSC had developed a multi-phase plan to replace and upgrade the infrastructure at UTSC.

Numerous infrastructure needs related to both the electrical and mechanical systems at UTSC had required urgent attention in the past 36 months. Extensive construction had occurred on the UTSC campus, with each of the five new major buildings requiring adequate electrical and mechanical services to ensure effective operation. Phase 5 was required by the New Science Building, which was scheduled for completion in 2008, and included three separate projects: the replacement of boiler controls for two existing boilers; the replacement of an existing 200 kW diesel generator; and the replacement of six existing PCB transformers.

UTSC had directed a total of $10,725,000 towards Phases 1, 2 3 and 4 of the infrastructure upgrades plan. The original projected total cost of $17.351 million had been reduced to $15.255 million. These changes were possible because Phase 5C, replacement of PCB transformers had made Phase 6 unnecessary. Approval of the project was required now to allow for heating and emergency power backup for the New Science Building that was scheduled to open in January 2008, as well as meeting the federal legislation regarding PCB removal. The work would be implemented in the 2006-07 fiscal year.

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the Project Planning Report for the Electrical and Mechanical Infrastructure Upgrades at the University of Toronto at Scarborough, Phase 5, comprising the replacement of the existing electronic controls for the two existing boilers, the replacement of the existing 200 kW diesel generator, and the replacement of the 6 existing PCB transformers, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix ‘B’, be approved in principle at an estimated total project cost of $4.530 million, with the sources of funding as follows:

Funding for the new UTSC Science Building provided by the UTSC operating budget	$ 3.785-million
Enrolment Growth Fund	.320-million
Deferred Maintenance Funds	.425-million

8. Capital Project: Infrastructure Upgrades Program for the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM)

The Chair noted that the Project Planning Report had been inadvertently omitted from the agenda package, and that copies of the report had been placed on the table.

Ms Riggall explained that this report was parallel to the report on UTSC that had been before the Committee last year. It outlined the work that had to be done over the next few years to upgradethe infrastructure at UTM

UTM was undergoing significant expansion. Undergraduate enrolment in 2007-2008 was expected to reach a peak of 11,500 students, and graduate student enrolment was also expected to increase. Several large buildings would be commissioned in 2007-2008. This increased amount of activity would put a huge strain on an already overloaded and aging infrastructure. No major upgrade of the infrastructure had been carried out since the Erindale Campus was constructed in the 1960's. New capital projects would rely on the general campus infrastructure for such services as power, storm water management, sewer capacity and general campus access including parking.

To meet the impending increased academic demand, a phased upgrade to UTM infrastructure had been proposed. Critical projects included:

- Replacement and upgrading of the electrical supply to the Campus. The existing supply was not sufficient for the loads of the new Wellness Recreation and Athletic Centre, (WRAC) Academic Learning Centre (ALC) and Phase 8 Residences.
- Replacement of the chiller unit with an upgraded unit to meet the demands of the new buildings (WRAC, ALC and CCIT).
- Completion of the sanitary sewer diversion at the Ring Road to ensure sewage did not back up into the Academic Learning Centre when it was put in operation.
- Completion of the sanitary diversion around the South Building to permit upstream development and to prevent backups into the South Building.
- Implementation of the Storm Water Management pond to facilitate development permit approvals. The Credit Valley Conservation Authority would withhold further development approvals until the facility was undertaken.

A member asked whether there were municipal storm sewers in the vicinity. Mr. deSouza replied that UTM was not allowed to discharge directly into the municipal system, which did not extend into the campus.

A member asked whether the entire project should be approved in principle, to be followed by approval of each phase as it was about to be initiated. The Chair took the suggestion under advisement.

9. Capital Project: University of Toronto at Scarborough: East Arrival Court: Project Planning Report

Ms Sisam advised members that, due to intensive development at UTSC in recent years, the conditions of pedestrian pathways, the east parking lots, open space and roadways had deteriorated, creating unsafe conditions.
The existing layout of the area no longer aligned with surrounding facilities, both those which were older and those recently constructed, and did not make use of the existing space and parking area in an efficient, attractive manner. In keeping with the planning principles of the 2001 Master Plan, the current proposal for the East Arrival Court incorporated the recommendations and direction set out within it, making improvements to enhance the student environment. The key to the design of the East Arrival Court was its pick-up/drop-off feature, adding a second commuter facility to the campus, both very much needed by the student population.

The East Arrival Court would provide a new entrance from Military Trail, organized around a principal landscape feature, a "bioswail", which would enhance the environmental performance of the campus and improve storm water management in the Highland Creek Valley watershed. The parking area would be re-organized to provide 21 barrier free spaces for patrons with disabilities and increase visitor parking capacity. 282 standard spaces for permit holders would be maintained.

A member asked how the bridge funding would be managed. Ms McLean explained that, when the project had been completed, a loan from the budget carryforward would be made to the parking ancillary. The ancillary would repay the UTSC budget over a twelve-year period.

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the Project Planning Report for the East Arrival Court at the University of Toronto at Scarborough at an estimated total project cost of $3,112,642 be approved in principle, with the sources of funding as follows:

Cash allocation from carry-forward	
Funds in the UTSC operating budget	$ 232,763
Capital investment by the UTSC ancillary operations budget	249,961
Debt financing to be provided by the UTSC operating budget and repaid by the UTSC ancillary operations budget	2,629,918

10. Enrolment Report

Professor Zaky noted that the enrolment report and enrolment projections had been combined into a single document this year to provide increased clarity. The format of the report had been redesigned to enable better tracking of enrolment trends and changes in the composition of the student body over time.

Highlights of the report included the following.

- In 2005-06, 71,399 students had been enrolled at the University of Toronto, 62,672 full-time and 8,727 part-time. In terms of full-time equivalents, the 2005-06 level of 60,973 FTE's represented a 4% increase in enrolment over 2004-05 levels.

10. Enrolment Report (cont'd**)**

- The University continued to see a substantial increase in international student enrolment, both in undergraduate (15.4%) and graduate (2%) programs. International enrolment was at its highest level since 1978-79, at 9.5%.

- In 2006-07, undergraduate enrolment was expected to increase by 384 FTEs to a level of 50,511 FTEs, while graduate enrolment was expected to increase by 907 FTEs to a level of 11,523 FTEs. The projected growth in 2006-07 would begin to restore the University's enrolment balance to a level comparable to its peers.

- In 2005-06, full-time intake into direct-entry programs had been 661 students higher than 2004-05 levels, and 596 students higher than planned levels. Intake into Year 1 of undergraduate professional programs in aggregate was 57 higher than previous year's levels and 62 higher than plan.

- Entering averages of incoming students had remained steady.

- In 2005-06, 73.3% of undergraduate students came from the GTA , 9.2% came from elsewhere in Ontario, 5.2% came from other Canadian provinces, and 12.2% were international students. For graduate students, the percentages were 61.5% GTA, 12.3% other Ontario; 10% other Canadian; and 16.3% international.

A member asked how many international students received financial assistance. Professor Goel replied that international graduate students were covered by the funding guarantee, while undergraduate international students were required to demonstrate their financial resources before they received a student visa. A limited amount of scholarship support was available for international undergraduate students.

A member asked how many unfunded Basic Income Units (BIUs) were included in the enrolment figures. Professor Goel replied that unfunded BIUs were being dealt with by the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities (MTCU) with the new funding allocations.

A member asked whether the increase in tuition for international students had affected enrolment. Professor Goel replied that Table 7 in the Report showed that the number of international students had increased steadily since 1997-98.

A member expressed surprise that only 5% of students came from Canada outside of Ontario. Professor Zaky replied that the University's national recruitment efforts needed strategic attention.

A member asked whether the University had any initiatives to increase scholarships. Professor Zaky recalled that the President had announced at his installation that the University would increase the number of merit scholarships that it offered. The member asked how merit would be defined, in light of the differences in standards of education across the country. Professor Zaky replied that the system for awarding merit-based scholarships was still being developed, and would include ways to acknowledge the differences among schools and among provinces. Professor Goel added that merit would be broadly defined and would include achievements in academics, extracurricular activities, athletics, and the arts.

A member noted that the financial assistance currently offered by the University was 25% merit-based and 75% needs-based. Students with averages of 97% or higher received scholarship offers from the Faculty of Arts and Science and from Colleges.

10. Enrolment Report (cont'd)

A member asked how the number of out-of-province students at other Ontario universities compared with the number at the University of Toronto. Professor Goel reminded members that, because of the size of the University, the absolute number of out-of-province students at the University of Toronto would be greater than the number at other institutions. It was noted that it would be difficult to define appropriate goals for the number of out-of-province students.

Professor Goel acknowledged the importance of the discussion on enrolment. He observed that the University had a mandate from the province to serve the population in the surrounding area. The number of first-generation students at the University was likely the largest of all universities. Canada did not have a strong tradition of student mobility across provinces. The enrolment distribution therefore reflected both the mandate and local culture.

11. Date of Next Meeting

The Chair reminded members that the next meeting of the Committee was scheduled for Tuesday, March 7, 2006 at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber.

12. Other Business

(a) Information Session on the Budget and Tuition Fees

The Chair informed members that they had been invited to attend an information session on the Budget and Tuition fees on Wednesday, March 22 from 12 noon to 2 pm in the Council Chamber. This session was intended to be an informal, private briefing and discussion for members of the Business Board and Planning and Budget Committee. Members of the Academic Board and Governing Council were also welcome to attend. The session was not open to non-member guests.

The meeting adjourned at 5:35 p.m.

_____ _____

Secretary Chair

March 6, 2006