

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

REPORT NUMBER 73 OF

THE PLANNING AND BUDGET COMMITTEE

June 27, 2001

To the Academic Board,
University of Toronto.

Your Committee reports that it met on Wednesday, June 27, 2001, 5:00 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, with the following members present:

Professor David Mock (In the Chair)
Professor Adel S. Sedra, Vice-President and
Provost
Professor Derek McCammond,
Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget
Professor Carl Amrhein
Professor Philip Byer
Professor W. Raymond Cummins
Mr. Brian Davis
Mr. Ljupco Gjorgjinski
Professor Susan Horton
Professor Robert McNutt

Mr. Fayez A. Quereshy
Professor Nancy Reid
Professor Kenneth Sevcik
Ms. Wendy Talfourd-Jones
Professor Fred Wilson
Professor Linda Wilson-Pauwels

Secretariat:

Mrs. Beverley Stefureak, Secretary
Ms. Cristina Oke

Regrets:

Mr. Muhammad Basil Ahmad
Mr. Brian C. Burchell
Professor Avrum Gotlieb, Vice-Chair

Professor Angela Hildyard
Professor Bruce Kidd

In Attendance:

Mr. Elan Ohayan, member of the Governing Council
Miss Janice Oliver, Assistant Vice-President, Operations and Services
Ms. Susan Addario, Director, Student Affairs
Professor Sandford Borins, Chair, Division of Management, University of Toronto at
Scarborough (UTSc)
Dean Wayne Hindmarsh, Faculty of Pharmacy
Dean David Naylor, Faculty of Medicine
Professor Edward Relph, Associate Principal for Campus Development, UTSc
Professor Wendy Rotenberg, Director, Commerce Programs, Rotman School of Management
Dr. Rowan Sage, Acting Chair, Department of Botany
Ms. Elizabeth Sisam, Director of Campus and Facilities Planning
Mr. Jorge Sousa, President, Graduate Students' Union

ITEMS 4 TO 12 ARE RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL

The Chair indicated that, although items 4 to 12 were recommended for approval, the last meeting of the Academic Board for this governance year had taken place. All items, except item 6, were subject to approval under Summer Executive Authority. It was important for the Committee to know this since consideration today could be the final committee scrutiny that these items received. Extra time had been scheduled for the

meeting to ensure that the Committee was able to discuss items as fully as members wished.

1. Report of Previous Meeting (Report Number 72, May 25, 2001)

Report Number 72 of May 25, 2001 was approved.

2. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting

The Chair reported that a member had asked for clarification of the intent with respect to review of the Policy on Capital Planning and Capital Projects. Professor Ron Venter had assured the member and the Chair that the administration intended to review the policy within two years. The Chair was reporting this for the information of the full Committee, in the event that any other member had been unclear following the last meeting, and for noting in the minutes today.

3. Senior Assessor's Report

Professor Sedra indicated his report would be short to allow time for the long agenda and for the Committee to meet informally at the Faculty Club following the business. He began his report with sincere thanks, on behalf of the administration, to all members of the Committee for a good year. This had been a strong Committee, asking probing questions and proceeding to good decisions.

Enrolment Expansion Update

Professor Sedra reported that the Working Group on Enrolment Expansion had been meeting weekly. The Group included vice-provosts and support individuals, the Dean of Arts and Science, the Principal of the University of Toronto at Scarborough, the Principal of the University of Toronto at Mississauga and the Principal of Victoria College. Their work was multifaceted, focusing on two related but separate issues. Enrolment expansion for 2001-02 was being considered to ensure that the University could claim its share of the funding. In that respect, preliminary data indicated that the University had a very high acceptance rate this year. Approximately 1,000 more first-year students were expected, 700 of whom were direct entry from the Ontario Academic Courses (OAC) program and 300 of whom were from other sources. This was particularly good news in light of data that showed other Ontario universities with traditionally high first-year intake were facing fewer first-year students this year over last year.

The second issue under consideration by the Working Group was the additional increase in student numbers over the next four or five years. Projections on these data would be shared with the Planning and Budget Committee either in July or in September.

Professor Sedra referred to his presentation at the last meeting that informed the Committee of the implications for the University of Toronto of the Provincial Government budget, the most serious of which was the absence of an inflation increase for past operating grants. The University's budget had been constructed on the assumption of a 2% increase for inflation. Without that, the University now faced an additional \$6.5 million shortfall in projected revenue for the current year. While the administration still held a slim hope that they could find more palatable ways to deal with this, he was informing the Committee that a communication had gone to Principals and Deans warning that, in all likelihood, the anticipated 3.2% one-time-only reduction would need to be implemented in the fourth quarter of this fiscal year.

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

In response to a member, Professor McCammond indicated that acceptances of offers of admission were strong across the University, but particularly so at the University of Toronto at Scarborough and at the St. George campus. With each update, acceptances to the University of Toronto at Mississauga were increasing to what, he noted, was an enhanced target enrolment. He said, too, that a large number of non-OAC applications were pending because of incomplete support documentation. He fully expected that the non-OAC acceptances would increase substantially over the summer as files were completed.

A member asked how much BIU funding would result from the additional intake of 1,000 students. Professor Sedra indicated that this was difficult to predict accurately. Funding would be based on the actual increase in enrolment over last year and some attrition could be expected before the Government's reporting date of November 1. The University could expect full average funding which calculated out, after application of the formula, to about \$2,700 per first-year Arts and Science student plus tuition fees. Cash flow of that funding was not guaranteed to come this year, but the balance would be flowed next year.

4. University Infrastructure Investment Fund: Allocation – Faculty of Arts and Science, University of Toronto Growth Facility for Plant Research

Professor McCammond said that the Department of Botany was the leading plant biology research department in Canada. To support the Department's rapidly expanding research efforts, a modern glasshouse facility was needed to replace the current 70-year-old facility. A proposal had been submitted to the Canada Foundation for Innovation (CFI) that identified the needs for the construction of a greenhouse facility on the roof of the Earth Sciences Complex (ESC), which currently housed the Department, and the expansion, including utilities, of the Department's growth chamber facility located in the basement of the ESC. Total estimated cost of the project was \$6.9 million.

The funding application had been successful, with \$2.8 million received from CFI and a matching \$2.8 million received from the Ontario Innovation Trust (OIT). The University contribution needed to complete the project was \$1.8 million, \$1.0 million (required to address the relocation of the current greenhouses in order that the Faculty of Pharmacy could proceed with its new building) of which had been included, as a secondary cost, in the estimated cost of the Pharmacy project. Of the remaining, \$167,000 would be funded from equipment venter discount, \$250,000 from the Faculty of Arts and Science and the Department of Botany, and a proposed allocation of \$374,000 from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT an allocation of \$374,000 from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund (UIIF) to the Faculty of Arts & Science for the University of Toronto Growth Facility for Plant Research be approved.

The Chair reported that the motion had been carried unanimously.

Documentation for this item is attached as Appendix "A".

5. **Academic Priorities Fund: Allocation - Faculty of Arts and Science and University of Toronto at Mississauga - Quality Enhancement in Undergraduate Commerce, Management and Business Programs**

Professor McCammond recalled that 65% of 70% of the revenue generated from the tuition fee increases in the deregulated programs flowed to the Academic Priorities Fund (APF) to be used for program quality enhancement in accordance with plans submitted by the units. Thirty percent of the revenue was reserved for student aid. This was as outlined in the *Long Range Guidelines for Planning and Budgeting, 1998-99 through 2003-04*. Tuition fees for the undergraduate programs in commerce, management and business had increased to \$6,000 for students entering in 2000-01. Revenue to APF would begin to flow from these programs this year and it was proposed to make a one-time-only allocation now to enable program improvements to begin. Base allocations would be made subsequently, following the submission of the divisional plan. Separate allocations were proposed for each of the St. George, Mississauga and Scarborough campuses to be used as outlined in Professor Sedra's memorandum of June 4 (attached as Appendix "B").

A member queried what student activities would be supported. Professor Rotenberg was invited to respond. She indicated the funding supported many activities designed to assist these students, who belong to two faculties, to achieve a sense of belonging. There were orientation activities, seminars, special events and others activities, and the students were responding well.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the following allocations from the Academic Priorities Fund for quality improvements in undergraduate commerce, management and business programs be approved:

- (a) \$278,037 one-time-only to the Faculty of Arts and Science,
- (b) \$171,519 one-time-only to the University of Toronto at Mississauga, and
- (c) \$120,000 one-time-only to the University of Toronto at Scarborough.

The Chair reported that the motion had been carried with one abstention.

6. **Capital Project: University of Toronto at Mississauga – Parking Garage – Communications, Culture and Information Technology Building – Users' Committee Report**

Professor Venter recalled that the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM) Master Plan had been approved in 2000. In May, the Committee had considered the Users' Report for the first building proposed under the Master Plan, that being the Communications, Culture and Information Technology (CCIT) Building. The success of the Master Plan depended on a strong commitment to integrate parking and servicing and to manage vehicular access. It had been proposed that consideration be given to incorporating an underground parking garage in the CCIT complex to allow a total of 2,700 parking spots to be available on campus by 2004.

Total cost of the project was expected to be \$12.892 million, a breakdown of which was shown in Professor Venter's memorandum of June 20, 2001 (attached as Appendix "C").

6. Capital Project: University of Toronto at Mississauga – Parking Garage – Communications, Culture and Information Technology Building – Users' Committee Report (cont'd)

The project would be financed entirely with a 25-year mortgage to be repaid by revenues from the parking ancillary. Cash flow by quarter was outlined in an attachment to the memorandum, as were data on parking demand and supply at UTM. Professor Venter hoped that architectural investigation of the area and site inspection could be underway this summer to determine exactly how many parking spots could be accommodated.

On motion duly and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the construction of the underground parking garage in conjunction with the construction of the Communications, Culture and Information Technology Building (CCIT) at the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM) be approved in principle; and

THAT the project as identified be approved at a cost of \$12.892 million with financing carried by revenues from the UTM parking ancillary.

The Chair indicated that the motion had been carried with one abstention.

7. Capital Project: Southeast Infrastructure Upgrade

Professor Venter recalled that the Centre for Cellular and Biomolecular Research (CCBR) had been approved in principle in May; the Committee would consider a recommendation for approval in principle for the Pharmacy Building later in this agenda. These additional buildings would tax services in the southeast sector of the campus and approximately \$10.27 million would be required to upgrade the electrical and chiller infrastructure services.

In the allocation of these charges, some would be applied to the CCBR, some to the Pharmacy Building and some would be allocated from the Facilities Renewal Program (FRP) as outlined in Professor Venter's memorandum of June 20, 2001 (attached as Appendix "D").

A member asked for assurance that future capital projects would include, in their initial cost estimates and before they were approved in principle, allocations for upgrades to services. Professor Venter agreed that the allocation of \$3.77 million from the FRP was a concern. In future capital planning, the objective would be to allocate amounts for services and to return these to the FRP.

In response to a question for clarification on how this was different from what had been approved in May, Professor Venter said that the administration was identifying a previously approved expenditure. This was not a second allocation of the same amount of money.

7. **Capital Project: Southeast Infrastructure Upgrade** (cont'd)

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the electrical substation and chiller infrastructure upgrade required to provide the service for the CCBR Building and the Pharmacy Building, as well as other future projects in the southeast corner of the campus, be approved;

THAT the electrical substation and chiller infrastructure upgrade be approved in principle at a cost of \$10,270,000 with funding in the amounts of \$3,540,000 from the CCBR capital project, \$2,960,000 from the Pharmacy Building capital project and the balance of \$3,770,000 assigned from the Facilities Renewal Program; and

THAT the allocation of \$3,770,000 in total be approved toward the project from the Facilities Renewal Program, with \$3,000,000 and \$770,000 assigned from the 2001-02 and 2002-03 funds respectively.

The Chair reported that the motion had been carried unanimously.

8. **Capital Project: Pharmacy Building – Users' Committee Report**
University Infrastructure Investment Fund - Allocation

Professor Venter presented the Users' Committee Report for a new Pharmacy Building (attached as Appendix "E") proposed to be located on the site currently housing the greenhouses. The Building would be facing College Street, between the Tanz and Fitzgerald Buildings. Because of its prominent visibility, the architectural design of the Building would need to have careful attention. He noted two corrections in the report. On page 35, the amount in the summary shown for Secondary Effects should have been \$1.450 million with the result that the total project cost estimate was \$70.080 million rather than \$69.080 million. The same change was to be reflected in Table 1, where the Secondary Effects amount should be \$1,450,000.

The space requirements of the Faculty of Pharmacy were approximately 9,500 net assignment square meters (nasm). About 1,000 nasm of the Faculty's needs would be accommodated in the CCBR Building, with the remainder planned for the new building. There was some concern that the Faculty's needs would not be entirely met within these two buildings. In that event, about 500 to 600 nasm of space within the Koffler Institute for Pharmacy Management building would remain under the Faculty of Pharmacy's space allocation.

Professor Venter reviewed the resource implications in his memorandum, noting that this project was one of three that had received SuperBuild funding. The estimated cost of the project was \$71 million, approximately \$50.0 million of which was secured. He said Dean Hindmarsh and Vice-President Dellandrea had a number of prospective donors and were fully confident that funding would be in place before construction was underway. It was timely to move forward to accommodate the planned expansion in Pharmacy enrolments.

A member asked about assignment of space in the Koffler Building when Pharmacy vacated. Professor Venter indicated some thought had been given to potential users, but there would be ample time for those decisions after Pharmacy had been relocated.

**8. Capital Project: Pharmacy Building – Users’ Committee Report
University Infrastructure Investment Fund - Allocation (cont’d)**

Preference was to have the Faculty completely accommodated in the CCBR and the Pharmacy Buildings and the possibility of going up an extra floor or constructing three floors below grade were being explored. Both were problematic. The first would require permission from the Committee of Adjustment; the second might be unfeasible because of ground conditions.

In response to a member’s question and at the invitation of the Chair, Ms. Sisam said that loading would utilize existing docks for the Fitzgerald and Tanz buildings. Access would be off College Street, proceeding north into the current Tanz courtyard. An overhead link between buildings would ensure that there would be no foot traffic through this loading area.

A member asked if costs for professional fees and landscaping were standard or enhanced, given the importance of the site. Ms. Sisam responded that \$2 million had been added for special exterior construction features because of the building’s location. Landscaping would not pose much additional cost because property owned by the University adjacent to the building was minimal.

Questions arose about plans for the relocation of the greenhouses. Professor Venter said that discussions were ongoing with respect to the disposition of the greenhouses. The greenhouses were not in good shape and no longer usable for research. Glass was single glazing and the buildings would be very difficult to move. He reported several options, including dismantling and storing them, relocating them to the Miller Lash property at the University of Toronto at Scarborough, and relocating them with the cooperation of the City of Toronto for public use.

A member asked if parking spaces would be lost by the construction of this building. Professor Venter responded that, while some may be lost, parking had been gained at the Bahen Centre for Information Technology, that this was an issue to be kept in sight, and that the objective with all construction at the St. George campus was to maintain a balance.

A member, noting that CFI and OIT applications were under consideration for this project, asked about the contingency plans in the event that these were not successful. Professor Venter said that a significant amount of the funding was secure on this project, that if an architect were to begin immediately it would be some fifteen months before construction could be underway and that the University was under considerable pressure to show progress on projects supported by SuperBuild and to be in a position to accept additional enrolment in Pharmacy. For all those reasons, it was critical to proceed with approval. If the project were not underway soon there could be pressure from the Government to return the funding.

A member agreed, noting that fundraising became much easier when donors could see a building underway. Although he shared the member’s anxiety about expending \$7.2 million now and the prospect of a mortgage, he noted that Pharmacy had had to commit to accepting additional students and that recruitment of faculty was underway.

Disappointment was expressed by a member that any money was to be spent on keeping the old greenhouses. He hoped there would be a way to avoid this. With respect to the project, the member was certain there would be no difficulty finding donors to support this project from among the large pharmaceutical industry in Canada and with a very able

**8. Capital Project: Pharmacy Building – Users’ Committee Report
University Infrastructure Investment Fund – Allocation (cont’d)**

Dean working toward the objective. Professor Sedra agreed noting that several proposals for funding were out. The worst-case scenario was that a mortgage would need to be taken

on the amount remaining, costs of which would be offset by the considerable increase in operating income from the increased enrolment.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the Users’ Committee Report for the Pharmacy Building be approved in principle, and

THAT the Pharmacy Building project scope of 8,406 net assignable square meters, the site on College Street (near University Avenue), the project cost of \$70.080 million and funding as follows be approved:

| | |
|---|------------------|
| SuperBuild | \$28.800 million |
| Super Build Interest | 1.639 million |
| Leslie Dan contribution | 8.000 million |
| Herb Binder contribution | 2.000 million |
| UIIF contribution | 7.200 million |
| Additional funding to be sought from the Canada | |
| Foundation for Innovation (CFI), the Ontario Innovation | |
| Trust (OIT) and future donations to be sought through | |
| The Campaign, including naming opportunities | 20.531 million |
| CFI and OIT (under consideration) | 1.830 million; |
| and | |

THAT an allocation of \$7,200,000 from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund (UIIF) for the Pharmacy Building be approved.

The Chair reported that the motion had been carried with 1 opposed and 1 abstention.

9. Capital Project: University of Toronto at Scarborough - Academic Resource Building – Change of Scope

Professor Venter recalled that the Users’ Committee for the Academic Resource Centre at the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSc) had been approved first in 1996, with an updated version approved in February 2001. The Provincial Budget announcement in May 2001 confirmed funding support for enrolment growth, a considerable portion of which would be directed to the UTSc. Professor Venter’s memorandum of June 21, 2001 (attached as Appendix “F”) outlined a proposal whereby the library facilities at UTSc could be enhanced, and classroom space could be increased to accommodate increased enrolment. The proposal envisioned transferring a number of classrooms and offices from the original plan to another building for which a separate Users’ Committee would be struck. This would result in minimal changes to the overall scale of the Academic Resource Centre while at the same time increasing those facilities for which there would

be greatest demand. The new Users' Committee, terms of reference for which were provided for information under item 14, would review the Master Plan and recommend changes to the Academic Resource Centre that would best meet the long-range plans for the campus.

9. **Capital Project: University of Toronto at Scarborough - Academic Resource Building – Change of Scope** (cont'd)

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the June 2001 Revisions to the Users' Committee Report for the Academic Resource Centre at the University of Toronto at Scarborough be approved in principle,

THAT the project scope of 3,104 net assignable square meters (nasm) of new space and 2,978 nasm of renovated space at a cost of \$19,980,500 with the funding sources as outlined below be approved:

| | |
|--|----------------------|
| SuperBuild/Centennial Lease | \$10.30 million |
| Private Sector Funds or Enrolment Revenue | 9.91 million |
| Institutional Contribution | 1.20 million |
| Gross Income | 21.41 million |
| Remediation Cost Centennial | (1.25) million |
| Access to Opportunities Program Lab Commitment | (0.10) million |
| Due Diligence Costs | (0.08) million |
| Net Income | 19.98 million |

The Chair reported that the motion had been carried unanimously.

10. **Enrolment Growth Fund: Allocation – Faculty of Arts and Science: New Program, Master of Financial Economics**

Professor McCammond referred to his memorandum of June 12, 2001 (attached as Appendix "G") and reported that the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs had recommended approval of the proposed new graduate program, Master of Financial Economics. It was the responsibility of the Planning and Budget Committee to consider the resource implications of the new program. The first enrolment to the program was expected in 2002-03, increasing up to a steady state of 22. The program was 16 months in duration and would be delivered by the Department of Economics and the Rotman School of Management. The projected budget indicated that the program could be delivered from the revenue generated by its tuition fees, 100% (net of student aid) of which would flow to assist with start-up funds for the first three years of operation, after which a base allocation of \$255,255 would be transferred conditional on achieving the projected steady state enrolment. The proposed allocation was consistent with the long-range budget projection.

A member asked why a special degree had been established when there were already master's degrees in Economics. At the invitation of the Chair, the Dean responded by saying that the current masters programs were designed for proceeding to a doctoral program. The proposed Master of Financial Economics was a professional masters program, not designed to lead into doctoral studies. In response to a further question, the Dean confirmed that this program would be eligible for the higher deregulated fees.

10. Enrolment Growth Fund: Allocation – Faculty of Arts and Science: New Program, Master of Financial Economics (cont'd)

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT an allocation of \$255,255 from the Enrolment Growth Fund to the Faculty of Arts and Science in support of the Master of Financial Economics Program be approved, conditional on meeting the enrolment target.

The Chair reported that the motion had been carried with one abstention.

11. Capital Project: Energenius Centre for Advanced Nanotechnology/Renovations of the Haultain Building – Users' Committee Report

Professor Venter described a project that would re-assign the research space vacated by the removal of the Slowpoke reactor from the Haultain Building. The Users' Committee report, together with his memorandum of June 20, 2001, (attached as Appendix "H"), outlined a project estimated to cost \$970,000 that would generate 315 net assignable square meters of office, laboratory and general space on the first and second floors of the Building. Capital funding had been committed by the Ontario Research and Development Challenge Fund (ORDCF), and further funding would come from the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering.

Professor Venter reminded the Committee of the Policy on Capital Planning and Capital Projects recommended for approval at the last meeting, and indicated that the Users' Committee for this project had been prepared according to the new format outlined in the Policy for projects under \$2 million. Following adoption of the Policy, projects of this magnitude would not come through the Planning and Budget Committee, although the Committee would receive annual reports on them.

In response to a question, Professor Venter assured the Committee that the Haultain Building was a valued structure, well used, and with an estimated life expectancy of at least 15 to 20 more years.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the Users' Committee Report to renovate 143 net assignable square metres of new space and 172 net assignable square metres of upgraded space within the Haultain Building to accommodate the Energenius Centre for Advanced Nanotechnology be approved in principle, at a cost of \$970,000 (\$680,000 provided by the Ontario Research and Development Challenge Fund and \$290,000 by the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering).

The Chair reported that the motion had been carried unanimously.

12. Affiliation Agreement – Bloorview McMillan Centre

Dean Naylor was welcomed to the meeting and, at the request of Professor Sedra, he presented the proposal to enter into an affiliation agreement with the Bloorview MacMillan Centre. The

12. Affiliation Agreement – Bloorview McMillan Centre (cont'd)

proposed agreement was attached to Professor Sedra's memorandum of June 20, 2001 (attached as Appendix "I").

Dean Naylor explained that the proposed agreement was the result of two years of discussions that would see the merger of Bloorview and McMillan Hospitals into a multi-site, specialized rehabilitation facility which would be unique in Ontario and Canada. Bloorview McMillan was prepared to have all medical staff qualified to hold University of Toronto appointments. The facility would be a complement to the current medical institutions with which the University was affiliated. Bloorview McMillan was committed to staying in their current location and to further development close to the Sunnybrook campus. He thought it would be timely for the University to enter into what would be a full affiliation with Bloorview McMillan Centre, noting that this would probably be the last affiliation agreement for the University for some time.

A member asked if wording in the proposed agreement had been drafted to recognize issues that had arisen out of recent grievances. Dean Naylor said that the agreement contained the language of other equally affiliated hospitals, with respect to publication of research, use of human subjects and ethical conduct of research. However, this agreement started at a higher playing field. With respect to issues around the hiring of clinical appointments, there would be an overall review of the process next year. In the meantime, the Faculty of Medicine had taken steps to avoid a repetition of an incident earlier this year. Templates had been developed for letters of offer and language had been amended. While there might always be the possibility of another difficult situation, he believed the improved processes would eliminate those.

A member noted the reference to the applicability of the *Code of Student Conduct* to students in training situations at the Bloorview McMillan Centre, and asked if it was the intent that both the University and the Hospital would act in the case of unacceptable behaviour. Dean Naylor responded that clearly in clinical issues the Hospital would assume lead responsibility; in educational issues the University was the primary authority.

In response to a final question, Dean Naylor indicated that in research issues the Hospital was highly autonomous and subject to its own policies. Efforts had been made to harmonize the intent of research policies in the contract.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the affiliation agreement between the University of Toronto and Bloorview MacMillan Centre be approved effective July 1, 2001.

The Chair reported that the motion had been carried unanimously.

13. Accessibility – Report of the Accessibility Working Group, St. George Campus Administrative Response

The Chair noted that the Report of the Accessibility Working Group had been presented to the University Affairs Board on June 5. Several meetings ago, Professor Sedra had undertaken to the Committee that the Report would also be brought to Planning and Budget, together with an administrative response. The Report and the administrative response were before the Committee for information.

13. Accessibility – Report of the Accessibility Working Group, St. George Campus Administrative Response (cont'd)

Professor Venter referred to the Report of the Accessibility Working Group that had been enthusiastically endorsed at the University Affairs Board meeting of June 5. He expressed sincere thanks to the members of the Working Group for an extremely useful and timely report on how the University might approach renovations and new capital projects in a fair and equitable way. He noted, in particular, the checklist which had been developed and which was already being utilized.

Professor Venter was pleased to address the administrative response to the Report. Speaking to the substance of the Report, he first focused on the sample listing of projects that could be addressed to improve barrier-free accessibility. He found the list to be indicative of what could be done, acknowledging that it was limited and could not evoke a response until it was inclusive of all areas of the University. As well, input from student bodies was needed. He recognized the tremendous assistance that had already been forthcoming from the student body. This was not an issue that could be solved and left alone, but one that entailed a long-term undertaking to make difficult choices.

Accordingly, the administration had responded with the establishment of a Standing Committee on Barrier-Free Accessibility, chaired by Ms. Susan Addario, who was a long-time champion for barrier-free accessibility. The Committee would include accessibility representatives as well as representatives of the student body, UTSc, UTM, and Faculties; one individual appointed by the Vice-Provost, Students; and two academic appointments named by the Provost. Ms. Addario would sit as an *ex officio* member of the Accommodations and Facilities Directorate, which met approximately every six weeks to consider requests for the allocation of Facilities Renewal and SuperBuild Funds. These funds were received annually in limited amounts for distribution to the three campuses, and to Trinity College, the University of St. Michael's College and Victoria University. Input from senior administration was taken into account when funds were allocated and priorities were decided based on the amount available, the greatest need and where the expenditure would have the greatest effect. In conclusion, Professor Venter said he believed the administration had proposed a comprehensive plan to maintain the momentum of the Accessibility Working Group.

The Chair recognized Mr. Sousa who had asked permission to speak. Mr. Sousa expressed, on behalf of the Graduate Students' Union (GSU), appreciation to the members of the Accessibility Working Group for their hard work in producing a thorough report. He recalled that the GSU had long urged the administration to address the needs of those who were not able to participate fully on campus. He recognized that good changes required a long-term commitment, but thought that many were overdue and he urged the administration and the new standing committee to take up the challenge by proceeding immediately with the projects named in the Report. In closing, he especially thanked Mr. Elan Ohayon, and his fellow governors, for maintaining a focus on barrier-free accessibility.

The Chair recognized Mr. Ohayon who had asked permission to speak. Mr. Ohayon reviewed the history of the accessibility issue within governance and recognized the work

of the Accessibility Working Group, of which he was a member. He commended the administration on the formulation of a new standing committee and saw it as a model in terms of composition. He welcomed the implementation of a checklist and saw the report as the first iteration of a living document.

13. Accessibility – Report of the Accessibility Working Group, St. George Campus Administrative Response (cont'd)

Mr. Ohayon indicated that working with the Accessibility Working Group had been a learning experience which had broadened his perspective. He expressed disappointment, though, that some of the projects listed in the Report had been identified by the Students' Administrative Council Wheelchair Access Committee in the early '90s. He noted that there had been discussion at Governing Council in May, allocations had been made in November, a notice of motion had come forward in March and the University Affairs Board had heartily endorsed the Report. He thought the projects listed in the Report could be accomplished with less than \$4 million, which he thought was a small sum to make a significant movement toward an accessible campus.

In closing, he hoped that the Committee would bring these matters forward and that the Accommodation and Facilities Directorate would engage in planning over the summer. The Chair noted that the administration would take the request under advisement.

A member commented that the Report was excellent and applauded the administration for its response. The member saw this as a complex matter which required a long-term undertaking.

In response to a question, Professor Venter said that progress reports would come forward through the annual report of the Accommodation and Facilities Directorate. At the urging of a member, he agreed that there could also be annual reports from the Standing Committee direct to governance and that this could be included in the Committee's terms of reference.

14. Items for Information

14.1 Capital Project: University of Toronto at Scarborough – Residences – Project Committee Membership and Terms of Reference

Professor Venter referred members to the Project Committee Membership and Terms of Reference of the University of Toronto at Scarborough, Student Residence Building, Phase Five.

14.2 Capital Project: University of Toronto at Scarborough - Arts Building - Project Committee Membership and Terms of Reference

Professor Venter referred to item 9 and informed the Committee that the Arts Building for which this Project Committee had been established was the building into which some elements displaced from the Academic Resource Centre would be incorporated. In response to a question, Professor Relph said that the building would house a combination of Humanities, Social Sciences and Fine Arts programs.

14.3 Capital Project: University of Toronto at Scarborough – Management School – Project Committee Terms of Reference and Membership

Professor Venter outlined the terms of reference and membership of the Project Committee for the Management Building at the University of Toronto at Scarborough, noting that work of the Committee would begin soon.

15. Reserve Date for Summer Meeting

The Chair reminded members that July 24 at 5 p.m. was a reserve date in the event that a summer meeting were necessary. The Committee would be updated by the Secretariat next week.

16. Other Business

There was no other business.

Professor Sedra, on behalf of the administration and the Governing Council, expressed his sincere thanks to Professor Mock for exemplary service as Chair of the Planning and Budget Committee for the past five years. Professor Mock had led the Committee through difficult and challenging times and had done so with fairness, patience and respect for the role of the Planning and Budget Committee as an entry-level committee where extensive discussion and review of background documentation was critical to effective governance. The Committee was fortunate that Professor Mock would remain as a member next year, as he assumed the demanding role of Dean of the Faculty of Dentistry.

For his outstanding contribution, Professor Sedra presented Professor Mock with a University of Toronto chair, with an engraved plaque of recognition.

Professor Mock expressed his appreciation for the kind words and the chair. He thanked the members of the Committee for their hard work throughout the year and the assessors for the depth and breadth of support to the Committee's decision-making. He noted that in his five years as Chair a scheduled meeting had never lacked a quorum, which was indicative of the commitment of members to the work of this Committee.

The meeting adjourned at 7:15 p.m., with an invitation from Professor Sedra to proceed to the Faculty Club to show appreciation to the outgoing Chair in a less formal setting.

Secretary

Chair

September 12, 2001