

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

REPORT NUMBER 136 OF THE PLANNING AND BUDGET COMMITTEE

April 12, 2010

To the Academic Board,
University of Toronto

Your Committee reports that it held a meeting on Monday, April 12, 2010 at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, at which the following were present:

Professor Avrum Gotlieb (Chair)
Professor Cheryl Misak, Vice-President
and Provost
Ms Catherine J. Riggall, Vice-President,
Business Affairs
Professor Scott Mabury, Vice-Provost,
Academic Operations
Professor Denise Belsham
Professor Parth Markand Bhatt
Mr. P.C. Choo
Professor Joseph Desloges
Professor Jane Gaskell
Professor Ronald Kluger
Ms Shirley Hoy
Professor Angelo Melino
Professor David Mock
Professor Andrea Sass-Kortsak
Mr. Gregory Louis West

Non-voting Assessors:

Ms. Sally Garner, Executive Director,
Planning and Budget
Ms. Kim McLean, Chief Administrative
Office, University of Toronto at
Scarborough
Mr. Nadeem Shabbar, Chief Real Estate
Officer
Ms Elizabeth Sisam, Assistant Vice-
President, Campus and Facilities
Planning

Secretariat:

Mr. Anwar Kazimi, Secretary

Regrets:

Mr. Ryan Matthew Campbell
Professor William Cluett
Miss Tulika Gupta
Ms Carole Moore
Prof. Wendy Rotenberg
Mr. W. John Switzer
Dr. Sarita Verma

In Attendance:

Professor William Gough, Member of the Governing Council, Vice-Dean, Graduate Education and Program Development, University of Toronto at Scarborough
Professor Christine Bolus-Reichert, Program Director, English, University of Toronto at Scarborough
Mr. Brian Coates, Chief Administrative Officer, Innis College
Ms Shree Drummond, Assistant Provost
Professor Louis Kaplan, Director of the Institute of Communications and Culture, University of Toronto at Mississauga
Professor Rick Halpern, Dean and Vice-Principal (Academic), University of Toronto at Scarborough
Ms Helen Lasthiotakis, Director, Academic Programs and Policy, Office of the Provost
Ms Joan Leishman, Deputy Chief Librarian
Ms Lesley Lewis, Assistant Dean, University of Toronto at Scarborough
Mr. Henry Mulhall, Assistant Secretary of the Governing Council
Professor John Schreck, Vice-Dean, Undergraduate, University of Toronto at Scarborough
Professor Sonia Sedivy, Program Director, Philosophy, University of Toronto at Scarborough

ITEMS 4, 5 AND 6 ARE RECOMMENDED TO THE ACADEMIC BOARD FOR APPROVAL. ALL OTHER ITEMS ARE REPORTED FOR INFORMATION.

1. Report of the Previous Meeting (March 3, 2010)

Report Number 135 (March 3, 2010) was approved.

2. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting**Item 8: Budget Report**

A member had sought clarification on a non-discretionary expense. The member was provided the information by the Secretary.

3. Senior Assessor's Report

Professor Misak reported on the provincial budget. The universities had figured prominently in the budget and Professor Misak drew the members' attention to two items. The first of these was the, at least temporary, restoration of the full value of the Basic Income Unit (BIU), for enrolment growth. BIUs for enrolment beyond a target level had previously been discounted. The University had been expecting this discount and had, in fact, based its budget on that assumption. The elimination of the discount meant an additional \$16 million which would be distributed to the affected divisions.

Another highlight of the budget was the announcement of an additional 1,000 Ontario Graduate Scholarships (OGS). The University had persisted in advocating for more graduate student funding. Although there had been an expansion of graduate spaces, it had not resulted in additional funding to students until this announcement in the budget. Historically, the University's share of OGS recipients was approximately 25 per cent, and it was expected that this would remain the same.

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

Professor Misak stated that the provincial government had also announced that the existing tuition framework was to be extended for another two years. This was consistent with the assumption made in the University's budget. It was assumed that the legislated freeze in public-sector salaries would have an impact on negotiations with the University of Toronto Faculty Association (UTFA). Those negotiations would be completed by the end of the month. Even as the provincial government had indicated that collective bargaining should continue, any increase in compensation could result in the withholding of future transfer payments. The University would continue to follow the guidelines stipulated by the provincial government in this matter. There was also concern that the wage freeze would have unintended consequences, for example creating inequities between unionized and non-unionized staff working in comparable roles. The University continued to balance its fiscal responsibilities with its attempts to retain gifted faculty who were being sought by other institutions. Legal advice had been obtained by the University to assist it with these matters. In response to a member's question, Professor Misak said that the University continued to work on interpreting the legislation.

The provincial budget, Professor Misak stated, had also announced the establishment of a provincial online university. A committee had been struck with Professor Cheryl Regehr, Vice-Provost, Academic Programs, as Chair, to enable the University to participate in this venture in an appropriate manner.

The provincial government had announced its goal to attract an additional 20,000 international students. No specific target had been set for individual institutions within the province to absorb these students. While the University would intensify its efforts to recruit international students, Professor Misak noted that it could not be straightforwardly seen as a revenue generating initiative. It could be argued that international recruitment was fraught with uncertainties related to international events and with the value of Canadian dollar having an impact on the University's recruitment efforts. The University would continue to enhance its student services to ensure that international students, once on campus, would experience a smooth transition to allow them to adjust to their new environs and to be actively involved in the community.

In the discussion that followed, Professor Misak stated that the University would seek clarification from the provincial government on whether the additional OGS awards would be extended to international students. It was her understanding the focus on international students was primarily at the undergraduate level. The University would also continue its advocacy to seek partial BIU funding for international students.

Professor Misak concluded by expressing her pleasure that the provincial government had recognized the importance of universities for Ontario and its people.

4. University of Toronto at Scarborough: Establishment of a Department of English and a Department of Philosophy

Ms Garner said that the Department of Humanities at the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC) was its largest and most complex. This had been highlighted in an external review. Extensive consultations had taken place at UTSC with regard to the establishment of two new departments of English and Philosophy. Consultations had also taken place within the tri-campus governance structure. Consultation with the Human Resources Department had dealt with the impact of the proposed changes on the administrative component. It was expected that three additional administrative positions would be required as a result of the creation of the new departments.

Ms Garner said that all existing English and Philosophy courses would continue to be offered. The reorganization would have no immediate implication for space allocation. However, it was expected that with the construction of the new Instructional Centre by April 2011, more space would become available for the three departments. Finally, the Office of Planning and Budget had reviewed the proposal and had concluded that there would be no financial implications for the University budget as funds would be reallocated within the existing UTSC operating resources.

Professor Halpern stated that the University of Toronto at Scarborough had evolved from a college structure accommodating 4,000 students about 12 to 15 years ago, and with an omnibus Humanities division. The growth in the student population had created the need for departmentalization. An external review had validated the long-held desire of the faculty for the creation of the two new departments. The recommendations of the review had been given serious consideration and had formed the basis of the consultations that had begun in January 2010 with members of the community. It was conceivable that further departmentalization would occur at UTSC. Professor Halpern expressed his confidence that the remaining Department of Humanities would be strengthened as a result of this departmentalization, with a renewed interest and commitment to interdisciplinary planning across administrative lines. Departmentalization would allow English and Philosophy to develop graduate programs that would map with those currently offered through the School of Graduate Studies. It was expected that problems concerning the composition of promotion and tenure committees would also largely be solved with the establishment of the two new departments.

In response to a member's question, Professor Halpern said that the faculty complement for the two new proposed departments compared favourably with those in other institutions in North America. Autonomous faculty-complement planning would allow the departments to identify the fields for future hires based on their specific needs. In closing, Professor Halpern expressed his confidence that the departments would be in place to begin work by the proposed date of July 1, 2010.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the proposal dated April 5, 2010 to establish a Department of English and a Department of Philosophy in the University of Toronto at Scarborough, a copy of which attached hereto as [Appendix "A"](#), be approved, effective July 1, 2010.

5. Capital Project: Project Planning Report for the renovation of the Innis College Town Hall

Ms Sisam said that in 2004 a committee had looked at a variety of renovations at Innis College. The first phase had resulted in the installation of an elevator and certain other renovations. However, further renovations were critical for the Town Hall to meet the needs of the Cinema Studies program. Five aspects had been identified for the renovations totaling 514 net assignable square metres (nasm). These included:

- A clearly identified entrance on St. George Street to give the Town Hall a prominent street presence;
- Delineating the lobby area with highly visible signage;
- Conversion of three to four existing fixed seats in the Town Hall to two barrier-free spaces to accommodate patrons requiring wheelchairs;
- Enhancements to the projection booth to house additional audio-video equipment; and,
- Renovations of the existing basement washrooms located beneath the Town Hall.

It was estimated that the renovation work would take about 16 weeks over the summer period. Although there would be a loss of income from the Town Hall during the renovation period, it was expected that this would be adequately made up once the renovations were completed.

The fund-raising campaign for this project had been made a high priority by the Faculty of Arts and Science. There were no financial implications as work would not commence until the required donations of \$3.2 million had been received.

Invited to comment, Ms Papazian added that the Town Hall had been important for the community as it hosted numerous film festivals and the mayoral debate among many community events. She emphasized its importance for the Urban Studies and Cinema Studies programs at Innis College.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

1. THAT the Project Planning Report (February 2010) for the renovation of the Innis College Town Hall (312 nasm) and adjacent areas (202 nasm) on the St. George campus at the University of Toronto, a copy of which is attached hereto as [Appendix "B"](#), be approved in principle;
2. THAT the project scope as identified in the Project Planning Report be approved in principle at a cost of \$3.2 million subject to the receipt of funding.

6. Capital Project: Project Planning Report for the Robarts Library Pavilion

Ms Sisam stated that a report had been received in March 2008 that had recommended interior renovations at the Robarts Library. Some renovations had been completed on selected apexes of the building with the aim of revitalizing the structure and improving the study space available to students. The last phase of the report's recommendations had been the creation of additional study spaces. This particular phase was now set to proceed to the construction stage with the receipt of an extraordinary generous private donation of \$15 million. The proposed Pavilion would create 1,000 study spaces. A separate entrance would enable the students to gain access to the Pavilion 24 hours a day. A café would provide a basic food service to the users. Ms Sisam told members that the Pavilion had been a part of the original plans when the library had first been constructed. However, budgetary constraints meant that it could not be constructed at that time. With the municipal approvals in place, the University was now ready to move forward with the construction. In response to a query from a member, Ms Sisam added that the construction of an enclosure around the Thomas Fisher Library, on the south side, was part of the master plan, and the additional operating costs for the enclosure would be borne by Robarts Library. She encouraged members to visit the library to see the enhancements brought about by recent renovations. Professor Misak commended the efforts of Ms Carole Moore in securing the benefaction.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

1. THAT the Project Planning Report for the Robarts Library Pavilion Project, a copy of which is attached hereto as [Appendix "C"](#), be approved in principle;
2. THAT the project scope, comprising new construction of 3325 nasm (5540 gsm) at a total project cost of \$38.59 million be approved in principle;
3. THAT \$1.0 million of the funding in hand be accessed to initiate schematic architectural and structural design work; and
4. THAT construction of the Pavilion proceed once the remainder of the funding has been confirmed.

7. Capital Project: University of Toronto St. George Campus Data Centre Renewal – Project Planning Committee Terms of Reference

Members received, for information, the Terms of Reference and Membership for the Project Planning Committee for the University of Toronto St. George Campus Data Centre Renewal.

There were no questions.

8. Date of the Next Meeting – Wednesday, May 5, 2010

The Chair reminded members that the next meeting of the Committee was scheduled for Wednesday May 5 at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber.

9. Other Business

There were no items of other business.

The meeting adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

Secretary

Chair