

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL
REPORT NUMBER 98 OF
THE PLANNING AND BUDGET COMMITTEE

September 21, 2004

To the Academic Board,
University of Toronto.

Your Committee reports that it met on Tuesday, September 21, 2004, at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, with the following members present

Professor Avrum Gotlieb (in the Chair)
Professor Miriam Diamond, Vice-Chair
Professor Vivek Goel, Vice-President and
Provost
Ms Catherine Riggall, Interim Vice-
President, Business Affairs
Professor Safwat Zaky, Vice-Provost,
Planning and Budget
Professor Donald Brean
Professor Philip H. Byer
Mr. Bruce G. Cameron
Mr. P.C. Choo
Professor Jane Gaskell
Ms Shaila Kibria
Mr. William R. J. Lumsden
Professor Ian McDonald
Professor David Mock
Mr. Timothy Reid

Professor Robert Reisz
Professor Anthony N. Sinclair
Professor Pekka Sinervo
Mr. Stephen C. Smith
Professor Lisa Steele

Secretariat:

Mr. Neil Dobbs
Ms Cristina Oke, Secretary

Regrets:

Professor J. J. Berry Smith

In attendance:

Professor Angela Hildyard, Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity
Professor Brenda Andrews, Director, Terrence Donnelly Center for Cellular and Bio-
Molecular Research
Mr. Raymond de Sousa, Assistant Dean and Director, Planning Infrastructure and
Information Technology, Faculty of Arts and Science
Ms Sheree Drummond, Assistant Provost
Dr. Connie Guberman, Status of Women Officer
Professor Wayne Hindmarsh, Dean, Leslie Dan Faculty of Pharmacy
Professor Peter Lewis, Vice-Dean, Research, Faculty of Medicine
Professor Javad Mostaghimi, Vice-Dean, Research and Graduate Studies, Faculty of
Applied Science and Engineering
Ms Elisabeth Sisam, Director, Campus and Facilities Planning

ITEMS 4, 5 AND 6 ARE RECOMMENDED TO THE ACADEMIC BOARD FOR APPROVAL.

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

The Chair welcomed new and returning members of the Committee to the meeting, and invited them to introduce themselves. The Vice-President and Provost, senior assessor to the Committee, introduced the assessors who were in attendance. The Chair reviewed the role of the Committee and described the Committee's procedures.

1. Report of the Previous Meeting

Report Number 97 of May 18, 2004 was approved.

2. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting

There was no business arising from Report Number 97.

3. Senior Assessor's Report

Professor Goel reported on four items.

(a) Academic Planning

Professor Goel reminded members that the deadline for the submission of divisional academic plans had been June 30, 2004. These plans were being reviewed by the Provost's office. In light of the current budget situation at the University, divisions had been encouraged to look at actions that could be taken without further expenditure of funds. Several suggestions had been made concerning activities that enhanced student experience, the highest priority of this round of academic planning.

An Academic Initiatives Fund (AIF) had been established in the Long-Range Budget Framework to provide funding for new initiatives proposed in the academic plans. This fund provided \$5 million in base funding in each of the next six years. The deadline for divisions to apply for funding from the AIF was October 12, 2004. Recommendations for allocations from the AIF for 2004-05 were scheduled to come to the Planning and Budget Committee at its December meeting.

The Provost noted that recommendations arising from the divisional academic plans might come through several different governance bodies. It was the intention of his office to prepare a document for the Governing Council that would highlight all the activities undertaken to implement the divisional academic plans. Such a document would be an addition to past practice.

(b) Budget Review Group

Professor Goel informed members that a Budget Review Group, led by Professor Zaky, had been established. This group was examining ways in which the allocation to academic divisions of resources from various sources could be made to appear more transparent. A number of new programs, both provincial and federal, had been created in the past few years. Allocations from revenues generated from sources such as enrolment growth, tuition increases, and the Access to Opportunities Program (ATOP) were being made, but there have been some perceptions of lack of clarity about the underlying

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

(b) Budget Review Group (cont'd)

principles which determined the amount of the allocation. Recommendations arising from the work of this group would be reported to the Committee later this year for further consultation.

(c) Government Relations

Professor Goel noted that the University's budget would be closely tied to the implementation of the recommendations of the Rae Review of Post-Secondary Education in the 2005 provincial budget. One of the stated goals of the provincial government, as expressed in the election platform of the governing party, was to increase the funding per student in post-secondary education to the national average. The outcome of achieving that goal would be a thirty percent increase in funding.

Professor Goel commented that a review of the reports of provincial government committees examining post-secondary education, undertaken by Professor Tuohy, Vice-President, Government and Institutional Relations, had shown that such committees had been established every three or four years over the past two decades. The presentations by the Council of Ontario Universities (COU) and by individual universities had been consistent, as had been the recommendations of the committees. However, the recommendations had not always resulted in funding for implementation from the provincial government.

The Rae Review Committee was expected to issue a discussion paper on September 30, 2004, which would include a number of questions that were to be addressed in submissions to the Review Committee. Responses to the Committee were due in November.

The administration intended to prepare and circulate a draft position paper in response to the Rae Review, and invite comments from the University community. This draft would be circulated to the Governing Council and its Boards and Committees. In light of the short timelines, the final version of the University's position paper might have to be submitted directly to the Governing Council. Professor Tuohy was working closely with the Chair and the Secretary of the Governing Council to determine the most appropriate procedure and recommendation for consideration by the Council.

A member asked whether procedures concerning consideration of the University's response to the Rae Review would be changed at the Governing Council, if the position paper proceeded directly to Council. Professor Goel replied that the position which would be articulated by the administration in the position paper was expected to be consistent with the policy framework of the University that had been approved by the Governing Council. The Council might therefore be asked only to look at the general thrust of the paper and to endorse it in general terms. The member suggested that the inclusion of footnoted references to policies in the University's position paper would assist members of the Governing Council in their consideration of the paper.

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

(d) Capital Plan

Professor Goel noted that capital projects had formed a significant part of the agenda of the Committee in the past few years. He indicated that a revised list of capital projects would be brought to the October meeting of the Committee.

Professor Goel informed members that it was the intention of the administration to bring forward the proposal for the Varsity site redevelopment to the October meeting of the Committee, if the project plan was ready at that time. In preparation for consideration by governance, an information session on the Varsity site redevelopment was being held on October 14. The architects and consultants for the project would be available to answer questions for clarification. It was hoped that, by providing detailed information prior to governance consideration of the project, members could focus their attention on the aspects of the project that were in the terms of reference of the Board and/or Committee to which they belonged.

(e) Questions

A member asked whether the recent downgrade of the credit rating of the University would have any effect on the interest rate charged on University debt. Ms Riggall replied that the University did not expect that the downgrade would have a negative effect on the University.

4. *Ontarians with Disabilities Act: University of Toronto Accessibility Plan, 2004-05*

The Chair welcomed Professor Angela Hildyard and Dr. Connie Guberman to the meeting for this item.

Dr. Guberman reviewed the "University of Toronto *Ontarians with Disabilities Act (Act)* Accessibility Plan, 2004-05 (*Plan*)" using a PowerPoint presentation (attached hereto as Appendix "A"). She noted that the *Act* required all universities to develop annual accessibility plans and to file the *Plan* by September 30 each year. This *Plan* was an update of last year's *Plan*, and included a status report of the initiatives that had been identified in the 2003-04 Accessibility Plan, and new initiatives to be addressed in 2004-05. The University was required to make the *Plan* public.

Dr. Guberman stated that the intent of the *Plan* was to identify, remove and prevent barriers that preclude persons with disabilities from participating fully in the teaching, learning, research and "business" of the University. The *Plan* reflected the University's commitment to equity and access, and built on existing practices and expertise. Although the *Plan* was a provincial legislative requirement, no additional resources were being provided by the province. The development of the *Plan* included broad consultation with key stakeholders. There was an Accessibility Planning Committee with 40 active members.

Dr. Guberman reviewed the key accomplishments of 2003-04. The University had hosted two events related to accessibility – the "Breaking Down Barriers" Conference and "Claiming Disability: A Symposium on Disability Scholarship". A number of enhanced educational and awareness initiatives had been undertaken. One of these was an awareness campaign launched by the Office of Student Affairs that included posters featuring the accomplishments of students who happened to have a disability. Another was the involvement of the University with the Canadian Network for Inclusive Cultural Exchange (CNICE). *A Statement of Commitment Regarding Persons with Disabilities*

had

4. *Ontarians with Disabilities Act: University of Toronto Accessibility Plan, 2004-05* (cont'd)

been developed and would be considered by the University Affairs Board for recommendation to the November meeting of the Governing Council.

Dr. Guberman then described the goals for the 2004-2005 *Plan*. These included the expansion of design standards beyond physical accommodation, and the assessment of signage. In addition, an equity survey would be developed and best practices regarding chemical and environmental sensitivity would be identified.

Dr. Guberman concluded her presentation by noting some longer term issues which would be addressed. These included an exploration of issues related to mental health and mental illness and a review of dispute-resolution mechanisms. Disability studies and scholarship would also be a long-term focus. As well, an employee satisfaction survey would be conducted during 2004-05, which would yield information on the University's accommodation of disabilities among employees.

Several members commended Professor Hildyard and Dr. Guberman on the *Plan*. A member asked how progress with respect to identified goals was being evaluated. Dr. Guberman replied that thirty-six of the forty-five initiatives that had been identified in the 2003-04 *Plan* had been completed, while nine were ongoing. Twenty-three of the 2003-04 initiatives were being continued.

A member noted that no cost figures had been included in the documentation, and asked how much the identified initiatives would cost. Dr. Guberman replied that no additional resources were required to fund the initiatives in the *Plan*. Professor Hildyard added that many of the activities fell within the portfolio of the Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity. Several initiatives were becoming part of day-to-day operations at the University. Professor Goel noted that the cost of physical accommodation was included in an annual report to governance.

Several members asked if approximate costing could be done to illustrate the cost to the University in meeting this legislative obligation. Professor Goel repeated that the cost of physical accommodation was captured in the annual report to governance. He noted that most of the remaining costs involved person hours, which were difficult to track.

A member noted that, while excellent progress was being made in making the University accessible, there were still significant shortcomings. He asked how members of the University could know how accessible the University really was. Professor Hildyard replied that it was difficult to answer the question in a quantitative way; however there were indications that attitudes towards disabilities had improved over the past few years.

A member noted that one measurement of progress with respect to accessibility could be found in the annual reports from the Equity Officers that were given to the University Affairs Board.

A member commended the communication with student groups that had been part of the consultative process.

A member asked whether the requirements of the *Act* increased the potential liability of the University. Dr. Guberman replied that the Planning Committee worked closely with the Senior Employment Relations Legal Counsel, and only identified activities that were realistically possible. Professor Hildyard added that the University received claims under

the Ontario Human Rights Code from individuals who did not believe that the University

4. *Ontarians with Disabilities Act: University of Toronto Accessibility Plan, 2004-05* (cont'd)

had accommodated their needs. Professor Goel noted that the *Act* expanded on the requirements of the Ontario Human Rights Code, in that it included attitudinal barriers as a ground for discrimination.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the *Ontarians with Disabilities Act: University of Toronto Accessibility Plan, 2004-05*, attached hereto as Appendix “B”, be approved in principle.

5. *School of Graduate Studies: Proposed new Master’s Program in Environmental Science (M.Env.Sc.)*

The Chair reminded members that the Planning and Budget Committee had responsibility for advising the Academic Board on the resource implications of proposals to establish academic programs. He noted that the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs would be considering this program at its meeting on September 22.

Professor Zaky explained that this program had been developed in response to a demand for people with skills in this area. The University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC) had identified the resources necessary to support this program, and no central funding had been requested, aside from the usual tuition sharing for increased enrolment. This information was included in Professor Zaky’s memorandum dated September 8 which is attached hereto as Appendix “C”.

A member asked whether any funding would be available from the federal government. Professor Zaky replied that no direct federal funding was available for any academic program. The University was, however, always seeking enhanced federal funding for research, including targeted funding for environmental research.

A member asked what the steady state enrolment in the program was expected to be. Professor Zaky replied that forty students was the steady state enrolment target.

A member asked what the role of members was if they felt that a proposal was not financially sound. Professor Zaky replied that members should consider any allocation within the overall budget of the University. Each division had some discretion with respect to how it allocated its resources. Professor Goel stated that the proposed program had the support of the administration, including the Vice-President and Provost and the Vice-President and Principal of UTSC. The program was seen by UTSC as being a major step forward in developing distinctiveness. Another member commented that this professional master’s degree program was part of three-campus graduate planning, and was based on the successful precedent of the Master’s degree in Biotechnology at the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM).

A member asked if tuition fees for this program would be deregulated. A member replied that the tuition would be the standard tuition for professional Master’s programs.

5. School of Graduate Studies: Proposed new Master’s Program in Environmental Science (M.Env.Sc.) (cont’d)

A member asked what the role of the Committee was with respect to this program.¹ It was his understanding that the Committee should be indicating its concurrence with a recommendation from the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs. A member noted that the Planning and Budget Committee commented on the resource implications of a proposed program. In this case, UTSC would receive from the Enrolment Growth Fund 75% of the tuition revenue generated by this program.

A member asked whether resources would be taken away from undergraduate programs to support this graduate program. A member replied that all teaching staff were expected to teach at both the graduate and undergraduate level. The opportunity cost for this program would be other teaching at the graduate level.

A member asked whether there had been consultation with students during the development of this program. The Chair replied that the question was within the mandate of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs. It was noted that the proposal had gone through divisional governance processes at UTSC and the School of Graduate Studies, which included substantial student representation.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE CONCURS WITH THE RECOMMENDATION
OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS

THAT the proposal for a Master’s degree in Environmental Science (M.Env.Sc.) at the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC) be approved. This program will be supported by resources from UTSC and by a share of enrolment growth revenue.

6. Capital Project: Terrence Donnelly Centre for Cellular and Bio-Molecular Research [CCBR] - Project Planning Committee Report Update

The Chair reminded members that, under the *Policy on Capital Planning and Projects*, significant changes to the scope and source of funding for approved capital projects must be submitted to this Committee.

The Chair welcomed Professor Peter Lewis, Vice-Dean, Research, from the Faculty of Medicine, Dean Wayne Hindmarsh from the Leslie Dan Faculty of Pharmacy, Professor Javad Mostaghimi, Vice-Dean, Research and Graduate Studies, from the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering, and Professor Brenda Andrews, Director of the Terrence Donnelly Centre for Cellular and Bio-Molecular Research, to the meeting.

Professor Goel informed members that the usual reason for capital projects to come back to the Committee was an increase in cost. In this case, the proposal represented good news. Additional funds had been received which allowed the completion of the project: the finishing of five floors of the building which were originally only to be

¹ Section 4.4.2 of the Terms of Reference states: *The Committee advises the Academic Board on the planning and resource implications of plans and proposals to establish, disestablish or significantly restructure academic programs. Those implications might include significant planning and budgetary changes within the division or significant effects on other divisions, the University as a whole and the public.*

6. Capital Project: Terrence Donnelly Centre for Cellular and Bio-Molecular Research [CCBR] - Project Planning Committee Report Update (cont'd)

shelled in. The original cost estimate had been \$105 million, based on two phases of construction. The revised cost was \$96.6 million, with the construction to be completed in one phase. A detailed summary of the costs was included in the Memorandum from Professor Venter, dated September 10, 2004, attached hereto as Appendix “D”.

A member asked whether the three faculties involved in the CCBR were comfortable with the mortgage arrangements. Professors Hindmarsh, Lewis, and Mostaghimi replied that they were comfortable that their faculties would be able to manage the debt to be incurred for this project. They noted that the debt attributed to each division would depend on the number of researchers that would be accommodated for each division, and this had not yet been finally established. It might well be that the Faculty of Medicine would increase the number of its researchers in the building and hence its proportion of the debt and debt service. Professor Hindmarsh noted that the Leslie Dan Faculty of Pharmacy would have need to accommodate researchers in the new facility. The new Leslie L. Dan Pharmacy Building would not provide sufficient accommodation. It was noted that the mortgage amounts for each Faculty would be based on the number of scientists that were housed in CCBR, and the numbers had not been finalized.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

1. THAT the Users’ Committee Report [currently referred to as the Project Planning Report] for the Terrence Donnelly Centre for Cellular and Bio-Molecular Research previously approved in February 2001 be fully implemented to complete the atrium and the five shelled-in floors and make them fully operational.
2. THAT the Terrence Donnelly Centre for Cellular and Bio-Molecular Research be completed at a cost of \$96,600,000 with funding sources as follows:
 - a. \$30,800,000 from the Canada Foundation for Innovation [CFI],
 - b. \$30,000,000 from the Ontario Innovation Trust [OIT],
 - c. \$2,000,000 from the I’Anson Fund,
 - d. \$2,800,000 from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund,
 - e. \$1,275,000 from the interest on funds received,
 - f. \$11,500,000 contribution from Terrence Donnelly,
 - g. \$4,522,000 matching from the McLaughlin Fund [OIT/ U of T],
 - h. \$2,500,000 cash contribution from the Faculty of Medicine
 - i. A mortgage in the amount of \$11,203,000 to be amortized over 20-25 years and to be repaid by collective contributions from the Faculty of Medicine, the Leslie Dan Faculty of Pharmacy and the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering through Ph.D. enrolments and or the operating budgets of these Faculties.

7. Capital Project: Department of Mathematics – Project Committee, Terms of Reference and Membership

The Chair informed members that the establishment of a project committee for a capital project was reported to the Planning and Budget Committee for information.

There were no questions.

8. Capital Project: Varsity Site Development – Project Committee, Terms of Reference and Membership

The Chair noted that members had received the Terms of Reference and Membership of the Project Committee for the Varsity Site Development.

A member asked whether it was possible to suggest additions to the Terms of Reference of the Project Committee. Professor Goel explained that the administration established Project Committees and reported them for information. This was the appropriate time to suggest changes. The member asked whether the Project Committee would consider the savings created by having new facilities that reduced the wear and tear of existing buildings. The member also noted the misconceptions that many had concerning the schedule of events for the proposed Varsity development. Professor Goel assured the member that the Project Committee would examine secondary effects of projects as a matter of course, and that the Project Committee would also consider program schedules and utilization reports. Highly detailed schedules had been prepared and summaries were being developed.

A member commented that concerns had been raised earlier in the year because of the way information was being provided. The member urged that all documentation make it clear that no final decisions had been made to proceed with the project and that the administration was examining it with an open mind. Professor Goel replied that the process with respect to this proposed project had been exceptionally open and consultative.

The member asked whether noise and traffic studies would be available at the information session scheduled for October 14. He also asked whether documentation would be available prior to the October 19 meeting of the Committee, and whether other options would be included in the documentation. Ms Riggall assured the member that the noise and traffic studies would be available at the information session, and that documentation showing the variety of options that had been considered, would be distributed prior to the October 19 Committee meeting.

A member asked whether the contract with the Toronto Argonauts could be made available to the Committee. Ms Riggall explained that contracts were negotiated by the administration. While the principles underlying the contract would be submitted to the Business Board for review and approval, detailed contracts were not normally reviewed by governance.

The member asked whether additional student members could be added to the Project Committee, particularly members of representative student committees such as the Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students (APUS), the Graduate Students' Union (GSU), and the Scarborough Campus Students' Union (SCSU). Professor Goel replied that it was not practice for Project Committees to include elected representatives from all student groups. Rather, the student members of Project Committees included users of the facilities being planned, for example the Council on Athletics and Recreation.

8. Capital Project: Varsity Site Development – Project Committee, Terms of Reference and Membership (cont'd)

The member asked who should be approached to discuss the issue of the inclusion of members of representative student committees on Project Committees. Professor Goel replied that the member could approach Professor David Farrar, Deputy Provost and Vice-Provost, Students to discuss the issue.

9. Accommodation and Facilities Directorate: Annual Report on Approvals on Projects between \$0.5 M and \$2.M (2003-04)

The Chair explained that the *Policy on Capital Planning and Projects* required that the Accommodations and Facilities Directorate (AFD) report annually to the Planning and Budget Committee on projects costing between \$500,000 and \$2 million, that fall within the approval authority delegated under the *Policy* to the AFD.

There were no questions.

10. Report on Decisions under Summer Executive Authority

The Chair reminded members that each year, at its first meeting, the Committee was informed of any decisions that had been made within its terms of reference under Summer Executive Authority.

The following approvals fell under the Committee's terms of reference:

- (i) **Program Option Addition – School of Graduate Studies: Proposal for the Department of Physical Therapy to establish an e-learning Advanced Standing Option, within the existing Master of Science in Physical Therapy (M.Sc.P.T.) Program**

THAT the proposal from the Department of Physical Therapy to establish an E-Learning Advanced Standing Option within the existing Master of Science in Physical Therapy (M.Sc.P.T.) program, effective September 2004, be approved.

- (ii) **School of Graduate Studies: Proposal of the Institute of Medical Science for the Discontinuation of the Combined Master in Science in Biomedical Communications (M.Sc.B.M.C.) and Post-Graduate Certificate in Biomedical Communication and Computer Animation at the University of Toronto and Sheridan College**

THAT the proposal of the Institute of Medical Science for the Discontinuation of the Combined Master in Science in Biomedical Communications (M.Sc.B.M.C.) and Post-Graduate Certificate in Biomedical Communication and Computer Animation at the University of Toronto and Sheridan College, effective September 2004, be approved.

11. Calendar of Business 2004-05

The Chair remarked that the proposed Calendar of Business for the upcoming year had been included in the agenda package for the meeting. The Calendar was a living document which was updated following each Agenda Planning meeting and again after

11. Calendar of Business 2004-05 (cont'd)

each Committee meeting. It was part of a consolidated Governing Council Calendar of Business which was available on the Governing Council website

Members were encouraged to review the Calendar carefully so that they could participate at an early stage in the formulation of recommendations coming forward on matters in which they had a particular interest.

There were no questions

12. Date of the next Meeting

Members were reminded that the next meeting of the Committee was scheduled for Tuesday, October 19, 2004 beginning at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber.

13. Other Business

There was no other business.

The meeting adjourned at 6:10 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

September 27, 2004