

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL
REPORT NUMBER 91 OF
THE PLANNING AND BUDGET COMMITTEE

September 16, 2003

To the Academic Board,
University of Toronto.

Your Committee reports that it met on Tuesday, September 16, 2003, 5:00 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, with the following members present

Professor Avrum Gotlieb (in the Chair)
Professor Edith Hillan, Vice-Chair
Professor Shirley Neuman, Vice-President
and Provost
Professor Safwat Zaky, Vice-Provost,
Planning and Budget
Mr. Sachin K. Aggarwal
Professor Rorke Bryan
Professor Philip H. Byer
Professor Sujit Choudhry
Professor Susan Horton
Ms. Shirley Hoy
Professor Ian McDonald
Professor David Mock
Professor Ian Orchard
Professor Susan Pfeiffer
Mr. Timothy Reid

Professor Pekka Sinervo
Professor J. J. Berry Smith

Non-voting Assessors:

Mr. John Bisanti, Chief Capital Projects
Officer
Professor John Challis, Vice-President,
Research and Associate Provost
Mr. Louis R. Charpentier, Secretary of the
Governing Council
Professor Ron Venter, Vice-Provost,
Space and Facilities Planning

Secretariat:

Mrs. Beverley Stefureak, Secretary

Regrets:

Mr. Felix Chee
Mr. Brian Davis
Professor Miriam Diamond
Mr. Nick Turk-Browne

In attendance:

Professor Angela Hildyard, Vice-President, Human Resources
Ms. Susan Addario, Director of Student Affairs
Ms. Sheree Drummond, Assistant Provost and Special Assistant to the Provost
Professor Connie Guberman, Status of Women Officer
Ms. Erin McGinn, Director of Operations and Government Relations
Ms. Mary Anne Mavrinnac, Chief Librarian, University of Toronto at Mississauga
Mr. Ashley Morton, President, Students' Administrative Council
Professor Edward Relph, Associate Principal, Campus Development, University of
Toronto at Scarborough
Mr. Mahadeo Sukhai, Vice-President, Internal Affairs, Graduate Students' Union

ITEMS 6, 7, 8 and 9 ARE RECOMMENDED TO THE ACADEMIC BOARD FOR APPROVAL.

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

1. Report of the Previous Meeting

Report Number 90 of June 17, 2003 was approved.

2. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting

There was no business arising from Report Number 90.

3. Senior Assessor's Report

Professor Neuman reviewed the **academic planning exercise** that had taken place over the past year, recalling that work had continued throughout the summer to craft the draft white paper. The green paper had declared the University's ambition to be among the world's top public research universities. Responding to comments and input during the planning stage, this ambition has shifted to that of being among the top public research and teaching universities in the world. In response to urging from many individuals in all constituencies, the newest draft included under Student Experience a significant section on teaching.

The draft white paper had been discussed among the senior administrators over the summer in two and a half days of retreats, the latest of which had been yesterday. Some revision was required as a result of very helpful feedback, after which the draft white paper would be distributed to the wider academic community. In that draft, she hoped to find the optimum balance between encouragement in planning direction and imperatives that had a high degree of accountability with timelines.

Professor Neuman outlined to the Committee her plan for having a briefer, more focussed version of the paper available for governance. Her hope was to have an off-line discussion of the draft white paper with members of the Committee for Academic Policy and Programs, the Planning and Budget Committee, Academic Board and the Governing Council, and with faculty governors. This would be part of a larger second round of consultation that would include focus groups and several town-hall meetings. Following input from those, the white paper would be revised and presented to governance for endorsement of its general direction. Individual items and appropriate policy issues would come forward for approval as they were developed.

Professor Neuman noted that the white paper would be the basis for academic planning at the divisional level. Real academic planning occurred at the faculty level, within the framework set by the University. She saw effective academic planning as evolving within a top-down framework with bottom-up and lateral detail. The faculties, some of whom had begun their planning exercises following release of the green paper and others of whom had done so in response to the draft white paper, could be expected to have completed their plans anytime between early 2004 and late spring 2004. Academic planning at the unit level would include self assessment and projections forward with respect to research direction, student/faculty recruitment and the setting of benchmarks for future evaluation.

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

Speaking to the **Long Range Budget Guidelines 2004-2010**, Professor Neuman indicated the intent that this document would be brought to the Planning and Budget Committee in December. Members would note some changes in budget planning. While significant funding would continue to be allocated to academic priorities, it would not be by way of a levy system. Also, an annual fund of \$10 million would be established to address basic maintenance so as to prevent escalating deferred maintenance. Professor Neuman said that, though she had originally planned to have the Long Range Budget Guidelines considered at this Committee during the fall, the document had been delayed to permit considered attention by the new Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget, and because the administration wished to evaluate anticipated improvements in the pension plan fund.

Professor Neuman expected that the 2004-05 Operating Budget Report would come to the Planning and Budget Committee in early March. She expected that it would be another difficult year for the budget. A great deal of effort was going into understanding revenue and expenditures in the various cost centers and the implications of cross-subsidies. These data were necessary for effective decision-making on academic priorities. Her Office and the Office of the Vice-President, Business Affairs were continuing to work cooperatively on developing an achievable and fiscally sound capital plan and financial reports that were easier to understand and more clearly related to the annual budget.

Finally, she informed the Committee that there would be a number of capital projects coming throughout during the year. Within the effective scrutiny of the capital plan now underway, the Committee could be assured that each recommended capital project was, indeed, an academic priority and financially feasible.

In response to a question, Professor Neuman indicated that the analysis of revenue and costs for each faculty was information that, for the time being, may not be shared widely. However, each Dean would be fully informed as to their own faculty. It was important that within each faculty there was an understanding of what cross-subsidies were occurring relative to that faculty. The University community needed to understand that cross-subsidies were a result of government policy. A greatest issue related to those areas in which the basic income unit was inappropriately low.

A member cautioned against the expectation that divisional academic plans were expected by February or shortly thereafter. Although she was aware that many were well underway, Professor Neuman took the caution under advisement.

4. Capital Plan: Update

Professor Venter's memorandum of September 2, 2003 and the updated Capital Plan had been circulated with the Agenda package. He briefly explained the format changes and responded to questions of clarification.

A member asked what happened to excess funds if a project came in under budget. Professor Newman responded that the decision had just been made that those funds would return to the Capital Projects Fund. If the particular project were one on which there were a mortgage, the excess funds would go first to pay that down.

5. Report on Decisions under Summer Executive Authority

A memorandum from the Secretary dated August 27, 2003 informed the Committee of decisions made under Summer Executive Authority that related to the Committee's mandate. Professors Venter and Zaky were prepared to respond to questions. There were none.

6. Capital Project: University of Toronto at Scarborough, Management Building; University of Toronto at Scarborough, Academic Resource Centre – Changes in Funding Sources

Professor Venter reviewed his memorandum of September 2, 2003 (attached hereto as Appendix "A") recommending approval of changes in funding sources for previously approved SuperBuild 2002 projects as a result of receipt of the funding.

Noting the name of the funding program, a member asked what had caused the delay in actual receipt of the funding. Professor Venter indicated that the envelope was named SuperBuild 2002 to differentiate it from the original program established by the Province in 1999-2000 and because the announcement of and the request for applications to this program had taken place in 2002. He added that the actual transfer of funds was expected in installments which would necessitate carrying costs in some instances for these projects.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

1. THAT the funding for the Academic Resource Centre at UTSC and the Management Building at UTSC be adjusted, as recorded below, to allow for a contribution from the SuperBuild 2002 funding to the University of Toronto in support of these two capital projects.
 - (i) Replace \$4.66 million of the Enrolment Growth Fund (EGF) allocation to the Academic Resource Centre at UTSC with \$4.66 million from the SuperBuild 2002 funds to be received by the University of Toronto.
 - (ii) Replace \$9.8 million of the EGF allocation to the Management Building at UTSC with \$9.8 million from the SuperBuild 2002 funds to be received by the University of Toronto.
2. THAT the EGF allocations now unencumbered as a result of the SuperBuild 2002 fund allocation to these projects be directed to the three additional SuperBuild 2002 projects, namely the Arts Classroom at UTSC, the Academic Learning Centre at UTM and the Science Laboratory Upgrades at UTSC.

7. Capital Project: University of Toronto at Scarborough – Arts Classroom Building - Project Planning Report

The Chair welcomed Professor Ted Relph to the meeting for this item.

7. Capital Project: University of Toronto at Scarborough – Arts Classroom Building - Project Planning Report (cont'd)

Professor Venter spoke to the highlights of his memorandum of September 2, 2003, (attached hereto as Appendix “B”) outlining the recommendation for approval of the Project Planning Report for the Arts Classroom Building at the University of Toronto at Scarborough. He noted that this project had been previously approved by governance but, without sufficient funding for both, the project was shelved to advance the construction of the Management Building. With approved funding, the project was revived and the Committee was being asked to approve a revised project report for a building that was strategically located and urgently needed.

In response to a question, Professor Venter explained the rigorous process that was in place to appropriately estimate the operating and maintenance costs associated with each capital project. These costs were now included in the capital cost and were part of the consideration of each project at the Design Review Committee where Ms. Catherine Riggall, Assistant Vice-President, Facilities and Services, was in attendance to pose the critical questions. Following up, a member queried why the costs estimated for this project seemed low compared to those on the downtown campus. Professor Venter took the request for specifics under advisement and by way of an interim response indicated that costs at the Scarborough campus tended to be lower than those at St. George.

A member expressed the wish that details on the Enrolment Growth Fund, including total revenue and specifics of expenditure, could be evident in projects such as this. Professor Neuman indicated that data were available to her office and that she was satisfied encumbrances on the EGF were manageable. Cumulative data were somewhat less satisfying. She reminded members that the Fund accumulated as a result of the distribution to the divisions of 70% of revenue from enrolment growth, with 30% retained in the central budget. Details of the EGF were transparent in the Deans’ budgets, and this level of detail was rarely, if ever, part of what the Planning and Budget Committee considered.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

1. THAT the Project Planning Report for the Arts Classroom Building be approved in principle;
2. THAT the project scope, totaling some 5130 gross square meters, be approved allowing for the construction of the Arts Classroom Building with linkages to the Student Centre, Bladen Building and the Science Wing; and
3. THAT the funding arrangements, including furnishings and finance costs, for the Arts Classroom Building be approved at an estimated cost of \$20,380,000 with the funding as follows:
 - (i) \$12,620,000 from the SuperBuild 2002 funding to be received by the University of Toronto, and
 - (ii) \$7,760,000 from the Enrolment Growth Fund.

8. Capital Project: University of Toronto at Mississauga – Academic Learning Centre – Project Planning Report

The Chair welcomed Ms. Mary Anne Mavrinac to the meeting for this item.

Professor Venter presented his recommendation for approval of the Project Planning Report for the Academic Learning Center at the University of Toronto at Mississauga (memorandum of September 2, 2003 attached hereto as Appendix “C”). Completion of this project would be followed by extensive renovations of the South Building to provide space for other student needs.

Professor Orchard echoed comments by Professor Venter, acknowledging the work of a broadly-based project planning committee for a building that was desperately needed. He noted, too, that the contribution from the Library Enhancement Fund was a decision of the students. He applauded the student leadership that initially established the fund and, then, that made the decision to contribute the entire fund toward the capital cost of this project.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

1. THAT the Project Planning Report for the Academic Learning Centre at the University of Toronto at Mississauga be approved in principle;
2. THAT the project scope identified in the Project Planning Report, with new construction of approximately 5,317 net assignable square metres or to a maximum of 9,173 gross square metres, be approved at a total project cost of \$34,000,000. Funding sources for the project are as follows:

SuperBuild 2002	\$26.610 million
Enrolment Growth Fund	\$ 7.176 million
Students’ Library Enhancement Fund	\$ 0.214 million
3. THAT the site for the Academic Learning Centre be to the north of the Communication, Culture and Information Technology Building as identified in the UTM Campus Master Plan 2000.

9. Reports to External Agencies: Submission on *Ontarians with Disabilities Act*

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

Professor Hildyard began by acknowledging members of the working group and the sub-committees who had worked so hard to ensure that the Plan was prepared in time to meet the deadline for submission to the Government. In particular, she thanked those members of the Committee who were present: Susan Addario, Louis Charpentier, Connie Guberman and Mahadeo Sukhai. She said the Committee had been broadly consultative, focusing on ableism rather than disability and working toward a plan that was achievable within limited resources.

9. Reports to External Agencies: Submission on *Ontarians with Disabilities Act* (cont'd)

Professor Hildyard reviewed the “University of Toronto *Ontarians with Disabilities Act* Accessibility Plan, 2003-04” (attached hereto as Appendix “D”) using a PowerPoint presentation (attached hereto as Appendix “E”).

A member asked what could be expected next. Professor Hildyard explained the governance route that the Plan would follow and that it would be submitted to the Government of Ontario following consideration by the Academic Board. This was the first of a multi-year plan, which would be updated annually and measured against the goals set out in the previous year. New goals would be set and this annual process would continue until the Government revised its requirements.

Many members commended Professor Hildyard and the Committee on an excellent overall report. A member noted that it would be useful for next year’s Plan to report back on each item. He found it somewhat difficult to judge how appropriate some of the initiatives outlined in the report were and so he had focused on the process. He found that to be sensible and generally inclusive. He cautioned, however, that where it appeared to have been less so, the report might indicate on what the results were based. He referred, in particular, to the sub-committee on faculty accessibility.

Professor Hildyard agreed that, though the sub-committees had been urged to consult broadly, in some cases the report was informed by broad prior experience. “Faculty Accessibility” had been one of those and she agreed that it was appropriate to indicate this in the Plan.

A member asked how the Plan had been approved. Professor Hildyard responded that each sub-committee had approved its section and the Co-ordinating Committee had signed off on the full Plan. The full Committee had not approved the final Plan, but had been heavily involved in the early part of the process. In response to a request that this be made evident in the Plan, she agreed.

A member suggested that the continuing process might take a look at the area of student exemptions from University regulations on the basis of special needs. Some of these were addressed by the accessibility offices but he believed there was a need for a better policy base for these decisions. Professor Hildyard took this under advisement.

In the view of a member, some of the recommendations were difficult to measure (e.g. 6.4.2). He suggested that future plans might have more measurable objectives.

A member extended compliments to the sub-committees, expressing his view that the Plan was a remarkable document derived out of a process that engaged so many offices on all three campuses. In his view, the Plan’s message was that each of us needed to take responsibility for achieving the outlined objectives.

A member asked what the anticipated cost of implementation would be. Professor Hildyard stated that the Committee had been very careful to define objectives that could be achieved at no additional cost. She believed it was important to show in the first year that much could be achieved without additional funding. There would, therefore, be no direct costs to achieving anything in this Plan. There may well be cost in terms of individuals’ time or the opportunity cost of choosing to meet one of these objectives rather

9. Reports to External Agencies: Submission on *Ontarians with Disabilities Act* (cont'd)

than achieving an alternate task. Her office would be supporting those choices to ensure that the Plan was implemented over the next year.

A member applauded the cost-free intent but thought this had not been highlighted in the Plan, suggesting that it should be. Professor Hildyard indicated that an appropriate revision would be made if necessary.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the Academic Board recommend that the Governing Council approve in principle the University of Toronto *Ontarians with Disabilities Act* Accessibility Plan 2003-2004.

10. Accommodation and Facilities Directorate

10.1 Annual Report on Approvals on Projects between \$0.5 M and \$2 M (2002-03)

Professor Venter's report of September 2, 2003 on approvals during the period July 1, 2002 and June 30, 2003, by the Accommodation and Facilities Directorate (AFD), for projects between \$0.5 million and \$2 million had been distributed with the Agenda package. The report was for information and there were no questions.

10.2 Interim Report - Special Committee on Barrier Free Access

Professor Venter referred to the Interim Report that had been circulated with the Agenda and noted that there was a strong commitment across the University to advance barrier-free access. The report documented areas in which funds had been expended to improve accessibility; however, he stressed that much more had been accomplished than was evident by the numbers presented. Some of the successful initiatives did not have dollar amounts associated with them and, so, had not shown up in this report. Others were integrated into the capital project and also had not been included in this report.

Professor Venter acknowledged the tremendous contribution of the Students' Administrative Council Wheelchair Access Committee (SAC WAC), as well as the support from the Office of the Vice-President, Human Resources. He cautioned that funding issues continued to be critical on a number of fronts.

Ms. Addario was invited to comment and did so briefly. She emphasized that this document reported only those projects that were funded by the Accommodations and Facilities Directorate. Many other major retrofits had been completed as part of the capital project to which they related. The fume hoods designed for wheelchair access, and part of the Lash Miller renovation, were an example.

11. Capital Project: Library Storage Facility – Project Planning Committee, Terms of Reference and Membership

Professor Venter’s memorandum of September 2, 2003 had informed members of the terms of reference and membership of the Project Planning Committee for the Library Storage Facility. There were no questions.

12. Calendar of Business for 2003-04

The proposed Calendar of Business for the upcoming year was included in the Agenda package. The Chair reminded members that this was a living document and part of a consolidated Governing Council Calendar of Business. The continuously updated version of the consolidated version was available on the web on the Governing Council homepage. He encouraged members to review the Calendar carefully to identify items in which they would want to participate at an early stage in the formulation of recommendations coming forward.

13. Other Business

There was no other business.

14. Date of the Next Meeting

The Chair reminded members that the next regular meeting was scheduled for Tuesday, October 21, 2003 in the Council Chamber.

The meeting adjourned at 7:16 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

October 7, 2003