

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

**REPORT NUMBER 149 OF THE BUSINESS BOARD**

**May 3, 2006**

To the Governing Council,  
University of Toronto.

Your Board reports that it met on Monday, May 3, 2006 at 5:00 p.m. in the Croft Chapter House, University College, with the following members present:

Mr. Richard Nunn (In the Chair)  
Professor Angela Hildyard,  
Vice-President, Human Resources  
and Equity  
Mr. Donald A. Burwash  
Ms Susan Eng  
Mr. Ran Goel  
Dr. Gerald Halbert  
Mr. Roger P. Parkinson  
Mr. Timothy Reid  
Ms Marvi H. Ricker  
Professor Arthur S. Ripstein  
Ms B. Elizabeth Vosburgh  
  
Professor Vivek Goel, Vice-President  
and Provost

Professor John R. G. Challis,  
Vice-President- Research and  
Associate Provost  
Ms Rivi Frankle, Acting Vice-President,  
And Chief Advancement Officer  
Mr. John Bisanti, Chief Capital Projects  
Officer  
Ms Sheila Brown, Chief  
Financial Officer  
Ms Christina Sass-Kortsak, Assistant  
Vice-President, Human Resources  
Ms Elizabeth Sisam, Assistant Vice-  
President, Space and Facilities Planning  
Mr. Ron Swail, Assistant Vice-President,  
Facilities and Services

Secretariat:

Mr. Neil Dobbs  
Mr. Andrew O. P. Drummond

Regrets:

Mr. Husain Aboghodieh  
Ms Dominique Barker  
Mr. Brian Davis  
Dr. Alice Dong  
Ms Mary Anne Elliott  
Professor Glen A. Jones  
Ms Paulette L. Kennedy

Mr. Gerald A. Lokash  
Mr. Geoffrey Matus  
Ms Kim McLean  
Mr. George E. Myhal  
Ms Jacqueline C. Orange  
The Honourable David R. Peterson  
Mr. Robert S. Weiss

In Attendance:

Mr. Chris Caners, Sustainability Coordinator, Sustainability Office  
Ms Barbara Dick, Executive Director, Alumni Affairs and Administration, Division  
of University Advancement

**REPORT NUMBER 149 OF THE BUSINESS BOARD – May 3, 2006**

In Attendance (Cont'd)

Mr. Bruce Dodds, Director of Utilities and Building Operations, Facilities and Services Department

Ms Mary Jane Dundas, Special Assistant to the Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity

Mr. Hal Koblin, Special Adviser to the Vice-President and Chief Advancement Officer

Ms Kate Lawton, Employment Equity and Ontarians with Disabilities Act Officer

Ms Myra Lefkowitz, Manager, Health and Well-Being Programs and Services

Dr. Jeanne Li, Special Assistant to the Vice-President, Business Affairs

Mr. Peter Nichol, Director, Office of Environmental Health and Safety

Professor Beth Savan, Centre for Environment; Co-Chair, Environmental Protection Advisory Committee; Director, Sustainability Office

Mr. Rob Steiner, Assistant Vice-President, Strategic Communications

ALL ITEMS ARE REPORTED TO THE GOVERNING COUNCIL FOR INFORMATION.

**1. Report of the Previous Meeting**

Report Number 148 (March 27, 2006) was approved.

**2. Policy on the Use of the External Auditor for Non-Audit Services**

The Chair observed that the proposal was the outcome of recent developments with respect to the role of external auditors, and most corporations were developing policies to ensure the independence of external auditors by, among other things, controlling the amount of non-audit work they would be permitted to receive.

Ms Brown said that, to protect the independence of external auditors, the Sarbanes-Oxley Act in the United States and similar legislation in Canada required the Boards of publicly traded corporations to require Board approval for the appointment of the external auditors to carry out non-audit services. While that legislation did not apply to not-for-profit institutions, the Audit Committee proposed that governance approval be required for most uses of the external auditors for non-audit services. To make the need for approval workable in the University's governance system, the authority for approval would be delegated to the Chair of the Audit Committee. The Chair could approve the use of the external auditors for a particular service, or consult with the Audit Committee before granting approval, or require that the matter be submitted to the Audit Committee and the Business Board for approval. The proposed policy also provided for delegation of authority to the Chief Financial Officer to approve the engagement of the external auditors for specified, common services (such as tax matters and participation in the risk-assessment exercise) at a cost of no more than \$250,000 per assignment.

The Secretary proposed that two minor amendments be made for technical reasons. First, the Business Board terms of reference made it clear that governance approval of the appointment of the external auditor for non-audit services would be normally be granted at the Board level. While the Governing Council itself appointed the external auditors, the additional assignments

**REPORT NUMBER 149 OF THE BUSINESS BOARD – May 3, 2006****2. Policy on the Use of the External Auditor for Non-Audit Services (Cont'd)**

for the auditors would not normally require approval at that level, apart from some very exceptional matter. The Business Board had authority for "approval of policies with respect to financial programs and transactions, and approval of individual programs and transactions as required by those policies." In addition, requiring approval at the level of the Governing Council would, in practical terms, make the approval unwieldy and time-consuming. It was therefore suggested that item 4 of the Policy end with the words "recommend approval to the Business Board and, in exceptional circumstances, the Governing Council." Second, it was proposed that the effective date for the policy be June 1, 2006 rather than May 1, avoiding retroactive approval.

On the recommendation of the Audit Committee

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

The proposed Policy on Use of the External Auditor for Non-Audit Services, as amended, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "A".

**3. Report Number 80 of the Audit Committee – March 22, 2006**

The Board received the items for information contained in Report Number 80 of the Audit Committee (March 22, 2006).

**Order of the Agenda**

To ensure that the Board maintained its quorum for consideration of the remaining items for approval, it was AGREED to amend the order of the agenda to consider next the Report of the Dispute Resolution Panel with the Faculty Association and the proposed membership of the Striking Committee.

**4. University of Toronto Faculty Association: Report of the Dispute-Resolution Panel for 2005-06**

THE BOARD MOVED *IN CAMERA*.

In the course of the *in camera* meeting, the Chair explained that the Memorandum of Agreement with the Faculty Association made the report of a dispute resolution panel (or arbitration panel) binding, unless the President chose to recommend its repudiation. Should the President do so on one occasion, the next report would be binding, without the right to repudiate. The President had not recommended repudiation, and therefore the award was binding. The Business Board was, nonetheless, required to give formal approval to one aspect of the report – the pension augmentation. The Chair recalled that Section 27(d) of By-Law Number 2 prohibited moving, seconding, or voting on motions related to compensation by any employee of the University, or any immediate family member of an employee, except for the President and the Vice-Presidents (who were excluded from that prohibition).

**REPORT NUMBER 149 OF THE BUSINESS BOARD – May 3, 2006**

**4. University of Toronto Faculty Association: Report of the Dispute-Resolution Panel for 2005-06 (Cont'd)**

On the recommendation of the Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT authority be delegated to the Administration to execute amendments to the Pension Plan so that pensions in payment to retirees under the University of Toronto Pension Plan and the University of Toronto (OISE) Pension Plan who retired from the University as members of the academic staff or as librarians will be augmented as of July 1, 2006, by a percentage that combines with the cost-of-living adjustments since July 1, 2004, or date of retirement if later, to bring the cumulative increase provided through indexations and augmentations up to 100% of the increase in the Consumer Price Index to July 1, 2006. The augmentation percentages applied to the pension payable as of June 30, 2006 will be as shown below (subject to adjustments for retirees under the prior provisions of the OISE Plan)

Date of Retirement or Death in Service	Percentage Increase
Prior to July 1, 2005	1.07%
January 1, 2005 to December 31, 2005	0.55%

**5. Striking Committee, 2006: Appointment**

In the course of the *in camera* meeting, the Chair said that the Striking Committee was responsible for reviewing nominations of non-Governing Council members to the Business Board and to its Audit Committee. That Committee included the Chair of the Board and one Governing Council member of the Board from each estate that was represented on Council.

On motion duly made and seconded, it was RESOLVED

THAT the following be appointed to the Business Board Striking Committee to recommend appointments for 2006-07:

Ms Jacqueline C. Orange (Chair)  
 Mr. Richard Nunn (Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council appointee; Vice-Chair)  
 Mr. Husain Aboghodieh (student)  
 Mr. Brian Davis (administrative staff)  
 Professor Arthur S. Ripstein (teaching staff)  
 Ms B. Elizabeth Vosburgh (alumna)

**REPORT NUMBER 149 OF THE BUSINESS BOARD – May 3, 2006**

## THE BOARD RETURNED TO OPEN SESSION

**6. Health and Safety: Annual Report, 2005**

The Chair stressed that it was very important that the Board give particularly careful attention to the annual Health and Safety Report. University officers and Board members could be held personally liable for any failure to exercise due diligence in ensuring that the University was carrying out its responsibilities under the *Occupational Health and Safety Act*.

Professor Hildyard said that the administration would be increasing its focus on risk management: assessing areas of greatest vulnerability and acting to reduce the level of risk. An increasingly proactive approach would stress increased training in health and safety matters and improved handling of workplace issues.

Ms Sass-Kortsak presented the highlights of the report. There had been a steady increase in health and safety activity in the University, resulting in an increased awareness of the importance of health and safety matters. One area of emphasis had been health and safety in laboratory activities, which were extensive in the University. There had been a significant increase in governmental oversight, leading to a continuing challenge to meet higher expectations. A very important step taken by the University had been to make training readily available, and in 2005 there had been a 50% increase over the previous year in the number of staff trained. The University was seeking to provide more training resources on-line. One measure of the University's success in this area was accident frequency, and 2005 had seen a decline in the number of lost-time accidents. The rate of lost-time accidents had been stable in most employee groups and it had declined markedly in the skilled trades group. That had been the outcome of a new emphasis on the responsibility of line-management for safety matters and an increase in the training provided for them. The Health and Well-Being Programs and Services unit had continued its health-promotion activities for employees, including programs dealing with depression in the workplace and stress management. One area of concern was the University's joint health and safety committees. Those committees, which included both worker and management representatives, were mandated by the Occupational Health and Safety Act. They conducted workplace inspections, received accident reports, and discussed and made recommendations on health and safety matters. Each committee was required to have at least two certified members – members who had completed substantial training programs – and to meet at least four times annually. In 2005, fewer than half of the University's committees had met those requirements, with employee transfers, departures and retirements presenting a real challenge. One option to be considered was a reduction in the number of committees, with the objective of having fewer but more active committees remaining in place.

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

**(a) Workplace Safety and Insurance Board surcharge.** A member observed that notwithstanding the improvements that had been reported, the University had been required to pay a surcharge on its Workplace Safety and Insurance Board premium because of the number and severity of its accident claims compared to other similar organizations. Invited to respond,

## REPORT NUMBER 149 OF THE BUSINESS BOARD – May 3, 2006

### 6. Health and Safety: Annual Report, 2005 (Cont'd)

Ms Lefkowitz said that the surcharge had been the outcome of four specific matters and had been atypical. The University of Toronto was in general regarded as a leader among the peer group of education institutions in the area of safety. For example, a group from McMaster University had recently visited this University for a consultation. Professor Goel added that the event rate among education institutions was so low that a small number of occurrences could lead to large percentage swings in rates. Because of that fact, data from the Workplace Safety and Insurance Board was not satisfactory for comparing educational institutions.

**(b) Comparisons and benchmarks.** A member suggested that research-intensive universities presumably had unique risks arising from such activities as laboratory work with hazardous materials and with animals. It was therefore important to gather comparisons with peer institutions and to establish benchmarks. Professor Hildyard replied that the University had adopted an active approach to identifying and managing risk precisely because of the special hazards mentioned by the member.

**(c) Return to work after injury.** In response to a member's question, Professor Hildyard said that the Health and Well-Being Programs and Services unit had a program to assist departments and employees in arranging for employee's timely and successful return to work following accident or significant illness. The University had established inclusive, fair and proactive guidelines for accommodating employees who had become disabled owing to accident or illness.

### 7. Health and Safety: Quarterly Report on Compliance with Legal Requirements

The Board received for information Professor Hildyard's quarterly report on compliance with legal requirements in the area of health and safety. The report included the follow-up report requested at the February meeting, when Professor Hildyard had reported on the audit of the University by the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission.

### 8. Employment Equity: Annual Report, 2005

Professor Hildyard presented the annual report on employment equity for 2005. While the Board's terms of reference made it responsible for employment equity for administrative staff, Professor Hildyard would also present some information concerning faculty. The highlights of the report included the following.

- **Aboriginal persons and persons with disabilities** were generally underrepresented among both academic and administrative staff.
- **Academic positions: women.** The proportion of female faculty continued to increase. While in a given year there might be reductions or increases, the overall direction of change was an increase in the proportion of women. Women were well represented in academic leadership roles; with the arrival of the new Dean of Applied Science and

## REPORT NUMBER 149 OF THE BUSINESS BOARD – May 3, 2006

8. **Employment Equity: Annual Report, 2005** (Cont'd)

Engineering, nearly 50% of the Principals and Deans would be women. There was, however, one area of concern: in some fields, the proportion of women hired was lower than the proportion graduating.

- **Academic positions: visible minorities.** Overall the number of members of visible minorities in the faculty continued to increase. There was a particularly strong representation of visible minorities at the rank of Assistant Professor (Conditional). Those appointments were for faculty members who had not yet completed their PhD degrees, and the strong representation demonstrated the University's efforts to recruit good people who were members of visible minorities. There had been some decline in the number of faculty members from visible minorities in the Physical Sciences, and the University would examine that situation carefully to determine whether there was need for action.
- **Administrative-staff appointments: women.** Women were well represented in the administrative staff although there was some clustering in the administrative assistant / clerical areas. The promotions of women matched their representation in the workforce.
- **Administrative-staff appointments: visible minorities.** Members of visible minorities were well represented in the administrative staff overall, with an increase among senior managers and professionals. They remained under-represented in some groups such as sales and service positions.
- **Key initiatives for 2006.** The University had conducted a new employment-equity census, including new questions with respect to sexual minorities. Professor Hildyard was disappointed with the 57% return rate, and she and her colleagues would work to achieve a return of over 90%. In October, the administration would distribute an employee-experience survey to all faculty and staff in an effort to determine what it was like to work at the University. That survey would include questions with respect to equity and diversity. The University would enhance its support and training for new faculty, new academic administrators, and those involved in faculty recruitment. The University was developing a toolkit to improve diversity in the recruitment of administrative staff. As the University moved to on-line recruitment, it would develop a database that would include identification of members of visible minorities. Using external funding, the University would establish a new position in the Human Resources Department for aboriginal initiatives. Working with the aboriginal communities, the new officer would focus on the recruitment and retention of aboriginal employees. Finally, the University would continue with its work on the accommodation of employees with disabilities.

A member expressed pleasure with respect to the University's growth in the quantity of members of the designated groups who were recruited and promoted. He asked whether the University had any information about the quality and performance of the members of the groups.

**REPORT NUMBER 149 OF THE BUSINESS BOARD – May 3, 2006****8. Employment Equity: Annual Report, 2005 (Cont'd)**

Professor Goel replied that a number of measures were available. They included promotion to full professor, which indicated a high level of academic achievement. The proportion of women promoted to full professor was equal to their representation in the appropriate age-cohorts of faculty. He noted that in the Faculty of Medicine the level of externally supported endowed chairs and award-holders among women faculty represented their proportion in the faculty as a whole. In addition, the University monitored the departure of faculty members. In some cases, faculty members who departed were required to do so because of poor performance, but in other cases they were recruited by other institutions because of their outstanding performance. There was no difference in the rate of departures among men and women faculty. Overall, the University's level of faculty retention was good, demonstrating that the work environment for University of Toronto faculty was a good one.

**9. Interim Vice-President and Chief Advancement Officer: Update Report**

Ms Frankle recalled that following the presentation of the Advancement annual report in the fall, members had requested further information on the alumni-affairs area. At that time as well, there was uncertainty about the University's plans with respect to strategic communications. One key source of that uncertainty had been removed with the recent appointment of Mr. Rob Steiner as the new Assistant Vice-President, Strategic Communications. Therefore, the current update report to the Board would focus on the areas of alumni relations and strategic communications and would not deal with fundraising. Among the highlights of Ms Frankle's report on alumni relations matters were the following.

- **The University's alumni.** The University had over 411,000 living alumni. The University had current addresses and telephone numbers for about 70% of them and current e-mail addresses for more than 25%. 61% of alumni lived in the greater Toronto area, 23.2% in the rest of Ontario, 6.9% in the rest of Canada, 5.1% in the United States, 1.8% in Asia (primarily Hong Kong) and others throughout the world. About one third of alumni had supported the University at some time.
- **Organization of alumni relations.** Alumni-relations activities were carried out both on a University-wide basis and by each academic division. Alumni-relations activities were much more decentralized than fundraising. The alumni structure predated the fundraising structure, and the divisional alumni development officers reported directly to the Principal or Dean and were fully funded by their divisions' budgets. There was no dotted-line reporting arrangement to the University-wide office. In Ms Frankle's previous report to the Board, she had reported solely on University-wide activities, which did not at all represent the full breadth of the University's efforts with respect to its alumni.
- **1997 alumni plan.** In 1997, alumni-relations staff across the University had adopted an alumni-relations plan based on two principles. First, alumni were recognized as one of

## REPORT NUMBER 149 OF THE BUSINESS BOARD – May 3, 2006

**9. Interim Vice-President and Chief Advancement Officer: Update Report (Cont'd)**

the University's greatest assets. Their achievements and impact reflected the calibre and value of a University of Toronto education. Second, alumni were recognized as among the University's most important stakeholders.

The plan defined the University's commitments to alumni. Those commitments were: to provide opportunities for alumni to maintain a meaningful involvement and engagement with their *alma mater*; to have their contributions to University life and to society recognized through University publications and awards; to provide opportunities for alumni to keep in touch with each other; to provide access to value-added affinity services; to provide a prompt and courteous response to alumni who contacted the University for any purpose; and to provide alumni activities that were sensitive to the diverse nature of the University community.

- **Types of alumni programming.** General alumni programming fell into several categories: educational opportunities, communications and publications, establishment of linkages with alumni and among alumni, awards, services, and volunteer opportunities, including participation in student recruitment.
- **Focus of University-wide programming.** Programming provided by the central Office of the Vice-President and Chief Advancement Officer would focus on activities that were of interest to the alumni of all divisions or activities that would require a critical mass – that is, that would take place in areas where single divisions lacked sufficient alumni for activities but where there were enough alumni of all divisions. University-wide activities would complement, and not compete with, the work of the individual divisions.
- **University-wide programming: Educational opportunities** included the Canadian Perspectives Lecture series – a very successful series managed by the Senior Alumni. Other learning opportunities were being planned in cooperation with the School of Continuing Studies.
- **University-wide programming: Communications and publications.** The University provided the *University of Toronto Magazine* four times a year to all alumni with known addresses. That was a very expensive service, but one to which the University remained committed. The University also distributed an electronic summary of campus headlines, research news, and other news, sent by e-mail to almost 100,000 alumni and other friends of the University for whom the University had current e-mail addresses. Finally, the University sent out personal communications to offer congratulations or condolences when the University became aware of the occasion to do so.
- **University-wide programming: Establishing linkages with and among alumni.** Traditional programming included the major spring reunions held each year, with approximately 2,500 – 3,000 graduates coming back to the University, especially

**REPORT NUMBER 149 OF THE BUSINESS BOARD – May 3, 2006**

**9. Interim Vice-President and Chief Advancement Officer: Update Report (Cont'd)**

members of certain special-anniversary graduating classes such as those that graduated twenty-five and fifty years ago. Alumni met their former classmates and participated in numerous special events. Alumni celebrating the 55th, 60th, 65th, 70th, 75th and 80th year of their graduation were presented with Chancellor's Medals. An example of newer efforts to establish linkages with and among alumni were the innovative "Shaker" events for younger alumni, which had won national and North American awards. Shaker events were, for example, planned for June 1, 2006 in Toronto, Vancouver, London and Hong Kong. A number of programs were family based, including group visits to the Young Peoples' Theatre and to sporting events. About 30 regional events were held each year, such the University's Asia Alumni Congress attended by 60 alumni in Kuala Lumpur. Where there were too few University of Toronto alumni for regional events, the University often participated in events along with other Canadian universities.

- **University-wide programming: Awards programs.** The Division of University Advancement coordinated a number of University-wide awards programs. Arbor Awards were presented to alumni and other friends of the University for outstanding volunteer service to the University. The Division coordinated the awards of excellence, which included awards to outstanding faculty, administrative staff and students. It also coordinated the Gordon Cressey Student Leadership Awards.
- **University-wide programming: services for alumni.** The University's affinity services not only brought valuable services to alumni, it also generated revenue which was used to support the activities of the alumni associations of the various Colleges and Faculties. More than 65,000 people made use of the affinity services such as the University of Toronto credit card. Numerous other services available to alumni included library borrowing privileges (for a small annual fee) and reduced rates for membership of the Athletic Centre.
- **University-wide programming: volunteer opportunities.** Alumni were welcomed to participate in the University of Toronto Alumni Association and its various committees. Mr. Michael Deck, President of the University of Toronto Alumni Association, had met with the Council of Presidents of the Faculty and College alumni associations to propose a constituency relations committee, which would promote interaction and joint activities of the various divisional alumni associations. Alumni volunteers assisted with student recruitment (a notable example was recruitment visits arranged by the Hong Kong alumni office), participated in send-off receptions for new students held in Canada and around the world, and participated in student and alumni mentoring programs.
- **Role of the academic divisions.** Most Faculties and Colleges had alumni offices, which reported to the Deans and Principals. They did not have a formal relationship with the Office of the Vice-President and Chief Advancement Officer. Divisional and central alumni-relations officers did, however, meet four times a year in retreats to discuss

**REPORT NUMBER 149 OF THE BUSINESS BOARD – May 3, 2006****9. Interim Vice-President and Chief Advancement Officer: Update Report (Cont'd)**

strategy. Many of the academic divisions were very active in providing educational opportunities. In the professional Faculties, that often took the form of professional upgrading courses and lecture series. The divisions produced regular publications for their alumni. They provided a great deal of other programming including a wide variety of social events. Many divisions operated alumni mentoring programs. As well as nominating their graduates for University-wide awards, most Faculties and Colleges had their own alumni-recognition awards. There were volunteer opportunities in every division, including participation in alumni associations and other work. The funding of alumni-relations activities varied widely among divisions, causing some disparities in the level of programming provided. The University had, therefore, engaged Mr. Dan White, formerly of Princeton University, to review alumni relations activities across the University. The overall objective of the review was to provide advice to the University on methods to increase opportunities for alumni engagement, to inspire alumni pride and affinity, and to enhance the services provided to alumni.

Mr. Steiner provided a brief update on strategic-communication matters. He listed the six priorities for strategic communications: to shift the internal perspective to focus on the student experience; to shift the external perception of the University as one that is focused on the student experience; to advocate long-term shifts in Government policy with respect to post-secondary education; to support international student recruitment in carefully segmented markets; to advance the University's broader international reputation; and to prime the public environment for the launch of the next campaign.

Mr. Steiner said that the Strategic Communications group published the *University of Toronto Bulletin*, supported the University's media-relations activities, and supported the University's advancement activities. The group's focus until this time reflected the administration's priority to raise the research profile of the faculty and the reputation of the University as a leading international public research institution. The strategy had enjoyed considerable success. For example, the medical science divisions had come to be recognized as an international powerhouse. At this time in the evolution of the University, however, it had become important to determine how to rebalance the University's message to give more stress to the importance of the student experience. Mr. Steiner planned to implement a number of strategies. First, the change in the name of his group to "Strategic Communications" was intended to make clear that the work of the group would be closely aligned with the aims of the University. The aim would be to communicate better with the University's internal audience, including students. Second, Mr. Steiner's group would work to build the University's capacity to communicate directly with the University's students, spread over three campuses and registered in seventeen different Faculties. Achieving that objective would require creative thinking and a good marketing strategy. Third, Mr. Steiner's group would work to change the focus of communications with faculty and staff to stress the student experience. Mr. Steiner would work closely with the Office of Teaching Advancement in implementing that strategy. Fourth, his group would strive to achieve closer working relations with the communications units in the academic divisions in order to advance the overall communications strategy. Finally, Mr. Steiner

**REPORT NUMBER 149 OF THE BUSINESS BOARD – May 3, 2006****9. Interim Vice-President and Chief Advancement Officer: Update Report (Cont'd)**

would seek to advance the University's "branding exercise." That went far beyond establishing recognized logos and word-marks. Rather, it sought to shape how members of the University viewed its identity and represented it to those outside the University. In Mr. Steiner's view, the University of Toronto brand was well established in Canada. The key objective would be to build up the perception of the University of Toronto model outside of Canada.

Mr. Steiner commented on the time-frame for achieving those strategies. It would take about a year to assemble the needed strategic-communications "machinery" and another year to have it functioning at peak efficiency. In the third year, he hoped that the University would recognize an "overnight success." He would welcome advice from members of the Board.

The Chair said that there was little time left for the discussion of the reports at this time, but he anticipated that the Board would have an opportunity to have more dialogue at future meetings as the Advancement group provided half-yearly updates.

**10. Capital Projects Report as at April 5, 2006**

Ms Sisam outlined the principal changes to the Capital Projects Report since the previous report as at February 28, 2006. In addition to minor changes in the funding requirements for four projects, an additional four projects had been approved, three of them for the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC). The new UTSC Science Building had been approved at a cost of \$30.09-million, with borrowing of \$20-million required. The UTSC East Arrival Court project had been approved at a cost of \$3.11-million, for which full funding was available. Phase V of the UTSC Electrical / Mechanical Infrastructure Upgrade project would cost \$4.53-million, with borrowing of \$320,000. Finally the St. George Campus Energy Efficiency – Lighting Retrofit and Chiller – Project would cost \$19.87-million with borrowing of \$16.94-million required. As a result, the borrowing requirement had increased from \$693.38-million to \$730.49-million, and the current borrowing capacity had declined from \$67.22-million to \$30.11-million.

**11. Capital Project Closure Report**

Mr. Bisanti said that the University was working hard to close further projects. Four additional projects had been closed for the current report, as at April 27, 2006. The \$15.4-million Management Building at UTSC had been completed with a small positive variance. The Phase VII Residence at UTM had originally been approved at a cost of \$14.059-million. The approved cost had been increased to \$15.315-million, and the project had been completed at about \$75,000 below the revised cost. The Woodsworth College basement and first floor renovations had been completed for \$3.49-million, which was \$97,000 under the approved cost. Finally, the project at the Woodsworth College Residence to shell in basement space and to construct classrooms and library storage space had been completed at a cost of \$3.14-million, on budget. Twenty projects on the current capital plan had now been closed. Mr. Bisanti and his

**REPORT NUMBER 149 OF THE BUSINESS BOARD – May 3, 2006****10. Capital Projects Report as at April 5, 2006 (Cont'd)**

colleagues were working with the Financial Services Department to close others. There had been some challenges leading to delays caused by such factors as bankrupt contractors and the need for the correction of deficiencies.

**11. Design Review Committee: Annual Report**

Ms Sisam recalled that the Design Review Committee had been active for six years. Most of the projects on the capital plan came before the Committee a minimum of three times. The Committee was charged to look at each project from the point of view of its contribution to the University as a whole. Project committees in general tended to focus their attention on the needs of the academic division that would be occupying the project. The Design Review Committee took into account the needs of the broader University community. It was, therefore, a very important committee.

Ms Sisam reported that the Committee was currently considering the St. George Campus Master Plan to determine how the Campus might best accommodate the remaining needs for capital development to implement the University's academic plan. The Committee was very conscious of the need to maintain civic space on the Campus, which tended too often to be the first thing removed from capital planning to save costs. The Committee had to complete its work without having resources it could assign to various purposes. It consisted of University experts, including faculty from the Faculty of Architecture, Landscape, and Design, and staff architects, as well as external members including members of the Governing Council and external design professionals. The external professionals volunteered their time because they enjoyed the work of the Committee, because they were friends of the University, and because they recognized the importance of the Committee's work.

Ms Sisam commented on the projects that had been reviewed by the Committee during the past year. She noted that most happened to be on the St. George Campus. In the current year, the Committee was considering more projects on the Mississauga and Scarborough campuses.

- **Varsity Centre.** Following a very difficult process, including consultations with the community, the Committee was not able to support the original proposal for the new Varsity Centre project. The project had been too large for the space available, and the design would have involved intrusion above the building housing the Office of Admissions and Awards. As a consequence, the University developed a more balanced plan which included more open space. Although it was intended only to seek approval for Phase I of the plan, the Committee had required information on positioning of all of the project's elements before it would consider approval. The new plan was one that met high standards for civic space, especially for the Bloor Street frontage which was a significant portion of the northern entrance to the St. George Campus.

## REPORT NUMBER 149 OF THE BUSINESS BOARD – May 3, 2006

## 11. Design Review Committee: Annual Report (Cont'd)

- **Philosopher's Walk.** The Committee had worked with the Royal Ontario Museum and the Royal Conservatory of Music on this project. In their construction, two memorial trees had inadvertently been killed, and the three institutions had worked on both remediation and improvement of the northern part of the Walk. The first phase of University's own work was the installation of the gates at the south end. They had been moved from the west of the previous Botany greenhouses, which had been moved to make way for the new Leslie Dan Pharmacy Building. (The greenhouses had been donated to the City of Toronto and, using a donation and matching funding from the University, had been reconstructed in Allen Gardens.)
- **Mercurio's Restaurant.** This restaurant in the new Woodsworth College Residence building was an important public interface between the University and the community, and it was important that its design make both the University and the community feel welcome.
- **Davenport Garden.** The open space beside the Davenport wing of the Lash Miller Chemical Laboratories and the McLennan Physics Laboratories had been covered by concrete pavers, which had made the area unsuitable for use - icy in the winter and hot and the summer. The area was now a welcoming garden with sustainability features.
- **Terrence Donnelly Centre for Cellular and Biomolecular Research.** A new sculpture, replacing a driveway, had provided a wonderful addition to the forecourt – enhancing the southern interface of the Campus and the City.
- **King's College Road.** A number of important sustainability details that had been used in the King's College Road project had been omitted in the earlier St. George Street project. There had been real problems on St. George Street, which the City would reconstruct. In doing so, it would look carefully at the features built into the King's College Road project.
- **University of Toronto at Mississauga Residences, Phase VIII.** The Design Review Committee had reviewed the massing, materials and design for the new U.T.M. Residence project.
- **Centre for Biological Timing and Cognition.** The project, to be located between Sidney Smith Hall and the Ramsay Wright Zoological Laboratories on St. George Street, was not an original master-plan building site. The project, being constructed with the aid of a \$15-million grant from the Canada Foundation for Innovation, was to be placed on a very tight site between two buildings. Following a long debate in the Design Review Committee, the architects had been directed to place the building in a manner that would provide the best outcome for the site.

**REPORT NUMBER 149 OF THE BUSINESS BOARD – May 3, 2006****11. Design Review Committee: Annual Report (Cont'd)**

Ms Sisam noted that the project architects were generally very pleased to receive peer review of their projects, which would lead to their improvement. The City of Toronto was establishing its own Design Review Committee, adopting many of the features of the University committee.

On behalf of the Board, the Chair has asked Ms Sisam to convey the Board's gratitude to the members of the Design Review Committee for their work.

**12. Environmental Protection Advisory Committee and Sustainability Office Annual Report**

The Chair noted that the Environmental Protection Policy required the preparation of an annual report concerning the University's impact on the environment, summarizing initiatives undertaken and identifying matters which required particular attention. The annual report of the new Sustainability Office was being presented along with the report of the Environmental Protection Advisory Committee.

Ms Sisam recalled that the Environmental Protection Advisory Committee (EPAC) had been established a number of years ago. Its mandate included the establishment of an environmental policy for capital projects to ensure their energy efficiency and the University's contribution to sustainability. In 2004, the University, guided by the Committee, had applied for and received funding from the City's Toronto Atmospheric Fund to establish the Sustainability Office, which had been a very great success. That Office brought together students, faculty and staff to work together on enhancing sustainability efforts on the St. George Campus. The outcome had not only been a very worthwhile contribution to the University's operations but also a valuable enhancement of the experience of about 150 students working with the Office and the achievement of other aspects of the University's *Stepping UP* academic plan, including the integration of teaching and research and interdisciplinary collaboration.

Invited to speak, Professor Savan said that the Environmental Protection Advisory Committee (EPAC) had been established to formulate and oversee implementation of the Environmental Protection Policy. It provided a very worthwhile forum for the exchange of information and it served as the advisory body for the new Sustainability Office. Its membership included students, faculty, staff, alumni and representatives of external organizations, in particular the City of Toronto. The Committee had provided very useful advice and it had coordinated communication among the three campuses. Although the City's funding for the Sustainability Office had covered only the St. George Campus (not including the federated universities), Professor Savan hoped that EPAC would be able to coordinate concerted action among the three campuses.

Professor Savan said that the Sustainability Office had been funded for three years by the Toronto Atmospheric Fund. The Office had received that Fund's second largest grant, and it worked very closely with the Fund's staff. The Sustainability Office had a dual function. A part of its function was academic: promoting student engagement, assisting the University's teaching

**REPORT NUMBER 149 OF THE BUSINESS BOARD – May 3, 2006****12. Environmental Protection Advisory Committee and Sustainability Office  
Annual Report (Cont'd)**

function, providing internships and volunteer opportunities, and fostering research projects. The second half of its function was operational, and the Office worked closely with the Facilities and Services Department. It had participated in the design of the electrical retrofit project. It was conducting an inventory of each University building on the St. George Campus to determine the financial and greenhouse-gas-emission cost of its energy consumption. The Office was cooperating with the Facilities and Services Department in the development of policies and procedures to promote the “greening” of the campus. The heart of the Office’s activities was student engagement, with between about 50 and 100 students participating in the work of the Office under the direction of Professor Savan (devoting a part of her time whilst also teaching and conducting research). The Office played a role in a number of courses. It employed 33 work-study students for one day a week, and it provided volunteer opportunities. Students were invited to propose ideas to the Office. If the ideas fit the Office’s strategic plan, the Office would help the students to present their ideas for funding and implementation. Examples of ideas that were adopted were projects to rewire Whitney Hall and Trinity College, leading to a 10% reduction in their electrical consumption during peak hours. Other projects included a campaign to reduce automobile-engine idling, a self-help bicycle repair shop to encourage the use of bicycles, and a project to foster the use of bio-diesel in University grounds vehicles. The Vice-President and Provost had made a commitment to provide base-budget funding to the Office to enable it to continue when its three-year grant from the Toronto Environmental Fund ended. The Office would, however, continue its aggressive efforts to win outside funding. For example, an application had been submitted to the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council for a project on implementing and monitoring community-based programs to achieve behavioral change with respect to energy consumption. Professor Savan stressed a unique feature of the Office - that all of its programs linked academic and operational features.

A member asked about the role of the Sustainability Office in the planning of capital projects. Did the Office review each project? How were choices made between including sustainability features in projects and achieving cost savings? Ms Sisam replied that while the Office was not consulted on individual capital projects, it was working on the design standards which were used to instruct the consultants who designed the projects. Professor Savan added that the design standards were very detailed and that the Sustainability Office was confident that their use would lead to the “greening” of the projects. With respect to trade-offs between sustainability features and cost savings, Ms Sisam, Mr. Swail and Mr. Bisanti said that while sustainability features had an initial cost, they did lead to operating-cost savings in the long run. With the divisions occupying buildings now being responsible for paying the costs of building operations, they were much more amenable to incurring the initial costs to achieve the operating savings. For example, roofs meeting new standards were more expensive but they also included a twenty-five-year warranty rather than the usual ten- to fifteen-year warranty. Green roofs added further costs, but those costs had been included in recent projects. A further example was the use of carpeting with both the carpets and the backing material being recyclable. Such carpeting was available at no extra cost.

**REPORT NUMBER 149 OF THE BUSINESS BOARD – May 3, 2006****12. Environmental Protection Advisory Committee and Sustainability Office  
Annual Report (Cont'd)**

A member commented that the work of the Sustainability Office represented an outstanding example of work to improve both campus outcomes and the student experience. He urged the University to give publicity to such efforts. Professor Savan agreed. She added that it had proven very rewarding to work with the Sustainability Office. The students participating in its work were highly diverse, enthusiastic and passionate about the environment. The Office was currently hiring summer students to work on evaluations of building retrofits and new building technologies.

In response to a member's question, Professor Savan said that the Sustainability Office was continuing its efforts to obtain outside funding. For example, a portion of the cost of the St. George Campus lighting retrofit and chiller replacement project had been provided by external sources. The University had received one of the first grants from Ontario Power Generation Inc. (formerly Ontario Hydro) and from Toronto Hydro.

The Chair asked Professor Savan to convey the Board's gratitude to members of the Environmental Protection Advisory Committee and the Sustainability Office for their outstanding work.

**13. Date of Next Meeting**

The Chair said that there would be need for a meeting on the reserve date of May 29, 2006 to consider proposals from the Audit Committee and a number of capital projects. The final regular meeting for 2005-06 was scheduled for Thursday, June 22, 2006. That meeting would, among other things, review the audited financial statements, consider the recommendation for the appointment of auditors, and review the annual report on borrowing.

The meeting adjourned at 7:10 p.m.

---

Secretary

---

Chair

May 29, 2006