

**UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO**  
**THE GOVERNING COUNCIL**

**REPORT NUMBER 113 OF THE PLANNING AND BUDGET COMMITTEE**

**September 18, 2006**

To the Governing Council,  
University of Toronto

Your Board reports that it held a meeting on Monday, September 18, 2006 at 4:10 pm in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall at which the following were present:

Professor Avrum Gotlieb (in the Chair)  
Professor Miriam Diamond (Vice-Chair)  
Professor Vivek Goel, Vice-President and  
Provost  
Ms Catherine J. Riggall, Vice-President,  
Business Affairs  
Professor Safwat Zaky, Vice-Provost,  
Planning and Budget  
Professor Stewart Aitchison  
Ms Diana Alli  
Professor Philip H. Byer

Professor John Coleman  
Mr. Kristofer Coward  
Professor Ellen Hodnett  
Professor Brad Inwood  
Professor Gregory Jump  
Professor Pekka Sinervo  
Mr. Stephen C. Smith  
Professor David Mock  
Ms Theresa Pazonis  
Mr. Timothy Reid  
Professor Andrea Sass-Kortsak  
Mr. Patrick Wong

**Regrets:**

Professor Jane Gaskell  
Ms Carole Moore

**Secretariat:**

Mr. Henry Mulhall  
Ms Cristina Oke, Secretary

**Non-voting Assessors:**

Mr. John Bisanti, Chief Capital Projects  
Officer  
Ms Elizabeth Sisam, Assistant Vice-  
President, Campus and Facilities Planning

**In Attendance:**

Ms Mary Jane Dundas, Special Assistant  
to the Vice-President, Human  
Resources and Equity  
Professor David Klausner, Vice-Dean,  
Interdisciplinary Affairs, Faculty of Arts  
and Science  
Ms. Helen Lasthiotakis, Acting Assistant  
Provost  
Dr. Jeanne Li, Special Assistant to the  
Vice-President, Business Affairs  
Ms Roseanne Lopers-Sweetman, Director,  
Special Projects, Office of the Vice-  
President and Provost  
Professor Peter Pauly, Vice-Dean,  
Research and Academic Resources,  
Rotman School of Management  
Professor Mark Stabile, Interim Director,  
School of Public Policy  
Mr. Nick Zouravlioff, Director, Project  
Management

ITEMS 5, 6 AND 7 ARE RECOMMENDED TO THE ACADEMIC BOARD FOR APPROVAL.

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

## 1. Chair's Introductory Remarks

The Chair called the meeting to order and welcomed members of the Committee to the first regularly scheduled meeting of the year. After introducing himself, Professor Diamond (Vice-Chair of the Committee), and Professor Goel (Senior Assessor to the Committee), the Chair invited members and assessors to introduce themselves.

The Chair reviewed the role and mandate of the Committee, highlighting the following points.

- The Planning and Budget Committee was the entry level of governance for a number of major items.
- As the entry-level body, the Committee was responsible for a detailed review of the matters brought before it, before making a recommendation for approval to the Academic Board.

### Budget

- With respect to budget matters, the Committee had broad responsibility for the overall allocation of university funds, through the Long-Range Guidelines and the annual Budget Report, and through review and approval of the allocation of specific University funds, such as the Enrolment Growth Fund and the Academic Initiatives Fund.
- The Business Board was responsible for considering policy and for monitoring matters affecting the business affairs of the University. With respect to the budget, the Business Board reviewed the Long-Range Guidelines and Budget Report to advise the Governing Council whether the proposals were financially responsible.

### Capital Projects

#### (a) Projects Costing \$2-million or more

- The *Policy on Capital Planning and Capital Projects*, approved in June 2001, required that all Capital Projects with a projected cost of more than \$2 million be approved by the Governing Council on the recommendation of the Planning and Budget Committee and the Academic Board. The Committee recommended approval in principle after considering the use of the site, the space plan for the project, the overall project cost and the sources of funding.
- The Planning and Budget Committee was also responsible for recommending approval of the allocation of any University funds or borrowing capacity used for Capital Projects costing \$2 million or more.
  - The total amount of borrowing that the University could undertake was approved by the Governing Council on the recommendation of the Business Board, but the Planning and Budget Committee was responsible for recommending approval of funding allocations for specific Capital Projects.
- If the capital project was a cost-recovery, ancillary project such as a residence or parking facility, the Business Board and the University Affairs Board each considered the project. The Business Board considered whether the revenues generated would cover the expenses, including the repayment of borrowing for the project. The University Affairs Board considered the impact of the project on campus life.

## 1. Chair's Introductory Remarks (cont'd)

### (b) Projects Costing less than \$2-million

- The *Policy on Capital Planning and Capital Projects* had delegated authority to the Accommodation and Facilities Directorate (AFD) to approve Capital Projects with an expected cost of less than \$ 2-million. Previously, AFD had delegated authority to approve capital projects with an estimated cost of \$500,000 or less.
- The Committee received an annual report from AFD on approved projects with an expected cost between \$500,000 and \$ 2-million.

### New Academic Programs

- New academic programs were recommended to the Academic Board for approval by the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs (AP&P). That Committee reviewed the curriculum and admission requirements and considered the academic integrity of the proposal and its fit within the overall academic mission of the University. The Planning and Budget Committee advised the Academic Board on the planning and resource implications of the proposal.

The Chair encouraged members to become familiar with the Terms of Reference of the Committee (<http://www.utoronto.ca/govcncl/bac/details/pb/pbtor.pdf>) and with the information on the Committee's responsibilities and procedures that was included in the *Frequently Asked Questions* document (<http://www.utoronto.ca/govcncl/bac/details/pb/faq.pdf>).

## 2. Reports of the Previous Meetings

Report Number 111 of the meeting of May 9, 2006 and Report Number 112 of the meeting of July 26, 2006 were approved.

## 3. Business Arising from the Previous Meetings

There was no business arising from the Reports of the Previous Meetings.

## 4. Senior Assessor's Report

Professor Goel provided an update to the Committee on several items.

### (a) Budget

Professor Goel reminded members that a new budget model was being implemented in the current academic year. The new model was intended to provide improved information on the budget to governance, including increased transparency concerning allocations, and better understanding of the relationship of expenditures to revenue. The current year was a transition year in which both systems were being used. The Planning and Budget Committee would continue to review the long-range budget assumptions, and it would consider recommendations for allocations from university funds in relationship to academic priorities.

Professor Goel explained that each university was required to enter into a multi-year bi-lateral agreement with the provincial government for the fiscal years 2006-07, 2007-08, and 2008-09, with defined goals for quality improvement and enrolment. The consultation process required of universities in the development of the agreement would be met through discussions at the Planning and Budget Committee and the Academic Board. A mid-term update on *Stepping UP* would be included in the Performance Indicators report to governance in 2007.

#### **4. Senior Assessor's Report (cont'd)**

##### **(a) Budget (cont'd)**

A member asked whether the principles of the new budget model would be brought forward to governance for approval. Professor Zaky replied that the new budget model reflected a change in methodology in the development of the budget, and, in his view, it did not require governance approval. Professor Goel added that the Budget Report itself would continue to come forward to governance for approval. The member suggested that the principles underlying the new budget model be considered for approval by governance. Professor Goel undertook to review the suggestion with the Secretary of the Governing Council.

##### **(b) Graduate Expansion**

Professor Goel informed members that the provincial government had made capital allocations and had given the University targets for 2007-08 graduate enrolment expansion. It was important for the University to take hold of this opportunity to rebalance the ratio of graduate/undergraduate enrolment.

##### **(c) Capital Projects**

Professor Goel highlighted three capital projects that were expected to proceed through governance in 2006-07.

###### **(i) Varsity Centre for Physical Activity and Health**

Phase 1 of the Varsity Centre project was well underway. Subsequent phases were currently being planned, and would proceed through governance in due course.

###### **(ii) Examination Centre on the St. George Campus**

There was an urgent need for an examination centre on the St. George campus. The Terms of Reference and membership of the Project Planning Committee would be received for information by the Committee later in the meeting.

###### **(iii) Student Activity Space**

The Report of the Committee to Review Student Activity Space on the St. George Campus would be received for information by the University Affairs Board at its meeting on September 26, 2006 (<http://www.utoronto.ca/govcncl/bac/details/ua/2006-07/uaa20060926.pdf>). It was anticipated that the Terms of Reference and membership of a Project Planning Committee for an additional large node of student activity space would be brought for information to the Committee at its October meeting.

##### **(d) Debt Position**

Ms Riggall provided an update on the debt position of the University. She reminded members that, in June 2004, the Governing Council had approved a debt management strategy and policy designed to permit the university to continue with a very ambitious capital construction plan, while ensuring the long-term financial viability of the organization. The policy limited borrowing from external sources to 40% of net assets, smoothed over five years. At the time, this meant that the total external debt amount was limited to \$587 million. Internal funds could be used to finance another \$200 million of debt.

#### 4. Senior Assessor's Report (cont'd)

##### (d) Debt Position (cont'd)

The total amount of authorised external debt was currently \$561 million. While not all of the initial authorised debt had been allocated, the University was fast approaching the limit, with only about \$30 million still to be allocated. The demand for additional debt to finance continued capital expansion remained strong, and the provincial support for both the UTM Medical Academy and the graduate expansion was predicated on the University being able to borrow approximately a further \$100 million.

Under the policy, there was now room for external debt of \$621 million since net assets had increased. A detailed review of the debt strategy and policies was being undertaken, which was expected to be brought forward in January for Business Board approval. The growth of the University continued, and the administration was confident that there would be room for future capital projects to be financed using debt.

The recent credit rating by Moody's confirmed the basic financial strength of the University of Toronto and this increase was not expected to have any impact on ratings because it remained within the limits of the existing policy. Ms Riggall noted that while the authorization to borrow would be requested of the Business Board in due course, the University would not need to borrow for quite some time, as the funds were not required until after the construction had been largely completed. As of April 30, 2006, the University had only \$484 million of external debt outstanding, versus the \$561 authorised.

Ms Riggall also noted that the University borrowed by way of issuing a debenture, which had a fixed interest rate over a period of 30 to 40 years. A sinking fund had been created to provide for repayment of the debenture.

A member asked what the rate of repayment was on the debt. Ms Riggall replied that interest was paid twice a year, while the capital was repaid at the end of the term. Professor Goel added that an internal mortgage had a repayment schedule of 20 to 25 years. As the principal was paid down, debt capacity became available. Debt capacity also increased as divisions received donations and grants to offset internal mortgage expenses.

The member asked about the rate at which the debt was decreasing. Ms Riggall replied that the analysis of the debt strategy and policies that was currently underway would provide such information.

A member asked whether the funds being set aside for the repayment of the University's debt were being invested. Ms Riggall replied that the University of Toronto Asset Management Corporation (UTAM) was responsible for investing the funds. The member asked if the sinking fund was protected from being used for other purposes. Ms Riggall replied that she and the Chief Financial Officer ensured that the sinking funds were not used for any other purpose.

#### 5. *Ontarians with Disabilities Act: University of Toronto Accessibility Plan, 2006-07*

The Chair reminded members that the Committee's responsibilities included reviewing and recommending approval of reports that outlined new policy positions to external agencies. He welcomed Professor Hildyard, Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity, to the meeting and invited her to present the report.

Professor Hildyard informed members that the Plan reported on and built upon the initiatives that had been included in the 2005-06 Plan approved by Governing Council.

## 5. *Ontarians with Disabilities Act: University of Toronto Accessibility Plan, 2006-07* (cont'd)

This was the fourth year that the University of Toronto had submitted an Accessibility Plan as required by the *Ontarians with Disabilities Act* (ODA), 2001. The *Act* required institutions within the broad public sector to review their policies, programs and services as they impacted upon persons with disabilities, and to develop annual accessibility plans that were intended to address existing barriers and prevent new barriers from being established.

The process of developing the Accessibility Plan had been highly inclusive. A broadly representative ODA Accessibility Planning Committee had been established, consisting of seventy-eight members and including faculty, staff, students, and alumni representing a range of stakeholders and constituencies. Some members of the Committee had been selected because of their professional expertise in such areas as information technology, instructional design and architecture; others for their professional knowledge of disability and accommodation issues. In the preparation of the 2006-2007 Plan, a number of people with disabilities, both visible and invisible, had been involved in identifying barriers and proposing initiatives.

The Accessibility Planning Committee had been divided into eight working sub-committees: Attitudes, Policy, Physical Facilities, Technology – Adaptive and Informational, Instructional Design, Student Life/Student Experience, Human Resources and Mental Health. These sub-committees assumed responsibility for developing the 2006-07 accessibility initiatives.

Each of the fifty-seven initiatives identified in the 2005-2006 Plan had been responded to and/or acted on in the past year. In the 2006-07 Plan, twenty-seven initiatives had been developed and had been grouped into four broad themes: Built Environment; Access to/Delivery of Academic Programs; Awareness/Education and Professional Development; and Accommodation/Services for Persons with Disabilities. This regrouping was intended to convey more adequately the coherent picture of the University's commitment to issues of accessibility.

Costs associated with the implementation of the plan were allocated from a variety of sources. The only offices that received targeted government funding were the three Accessibility Offices that had as their prime focus the provision of services to support the academic needs of the University's students. This past year, the University had received approximately \$1.8 million but had spent \$2.5 million across the three offices. The cost for the provision of the required services regularly exceeded the funding provided by the government, and the shortfall increased each year. Costs for examination space and sign language interpreters were particularly high.

All other offices involved in addressing accessibility issues, including Facilities and Services, Capital Projects, the Office of Teaching and Learning, Health and Wellbeing Programs and Services, Student Affairs, the Information Commons, and the academic divisions, did so as part of their normal university responsibilities. For some offices, for example, Health and Wellbeing, a significant portion of the work was focused on accessibility and accommodation. This past year an estimated \$370,000 had been required to cover staff costs and special project needs related to accommodation, broadly defined, for faculty and staff.

A member noted that students with special needs were often dealt with at the divisional level, and asked why funding for accessibility and accommodation flowed to central offices rather than to the Faculties that were providing such services for their students. Professor Hildyard took the matter under advisement. Professor Goel added that the costs referred to in the Accessibility Plan were the lowest possible costs. There were additional costs for examination space, invigilators, and instructors.

## **5. *Ontarians with Disabilities Act: University of Toronto Accessibility Plan, 2006-07*** (cont'd)

A member noted that the Appendices listed in the Table of Contents were different from the list of Appendices included at the end of the report. Professor Hildyard thanked the member for bringing this to her attention and noted that it would be corrected in the final report.

A member commented that fall orientation activities provided an opportunity to make members of the University community aware of the issues and services regarding accessibility. Professor Hildyard noted that workshops that had been held over the summer by student groups and by Student Services had included information on accessibility services.

A member described the pilot project of the Faculty of Medicine in which the Faculty worked with the Accessibility Centre to make students aware of the services that were available and to encourage students to volunteer.

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the *Ontarians with Disabilities Act: University of Toronto Accessibility Plan, 2006-07* be recommended to the Governing Council for approval in principle.

## **6. School of Graduate Studies: Proposal for a Master of Finance (M.F.)**

The Chair reminded members that the Committee was responsible for advising the Academic Board on the planning and resource implications of plans and proposals to establish new degree programs. He welcomed Professor Peter Pauly, Vice-Dean, Research and Academic Resources, Rotman School of Management to the meeting.

Professor Zaky explained that the proposal was for a Master of Finance [M.F.] professional degree program at the Rotman School of Management. The program would be offered over 20 consecutive months using a cohort-based model. It would fill a void in the financial services industry in Toronto and in Canada, build on the strength of the Rotman School, and serve a need for quality academic instruction of graduate students in the field of finance.

Professor Zaky noted that the proposal flowed directly from the Rotman School's academic priorities, as part of the University of Toronto's *Stepping UP* planning exercise. The School's graduate expansion plans had been approved by the Vice-President and Provost, and the Planning and Budget Office had reviewed the financial plan for the program. Funding for the program would be through a combination of tuition revenue and operating grant funding from the government. The latter would be provided from the graduate expansion envelope. The program would be offered in existing facilities in the Rotman School of Management Building, and would be financed within the Responsibility Centre Management (RCM) framework established between the University of Toronto and the Rotman School of Management. There would be no implications for the University budget.

A member asked what the difference was between the proposed degree, and the existing Master of Mathematical Finance (MMF) and Master of Financial Economics (MFE) programs. At the invitation of the Chair, Professor Pauly replied that the curriculum of the proposed degree program would be focused on finance, while the curriculum of the two existing Master's programs only included two courses in finance.

**6. School of Graduate Studies: Proposal for a Master of Finance (M.F.) (cont'd)**

A member commented that he had found the proposal well-written, and asked whether students enrolled in the program would remain employed. Professor Pauly replied that courses in the program would be offered in the evenings and on the weekends to allow students to be employed full-time.

A member asked about the program's implications on future enrolment growth and space. Professor Goel replied that the Project Planning Committee would address such implications. Professor Pauly added that an entering class of 60 students was anticipated, but two sections of 60 students would be viable, if required.

A member expressed his gratitude at receiving additional documentation concerning the budget of the proposed program in response to his request to the Chair and assessors. Professor Goel reminded members that the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs had primary responsibility for recommending the approval of the proposed program. The role of the Planning and Budget Committee was to consider the resource implications of the program. It had been the decision of the Agenda Planning Group of the Planning and Budget Committee that the Committee should receive information from the Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget concerning the resource implications, along with an Executive Summary of the proposed program, rather than the documentation concerning all the details of the program that was received by the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs. The member suggested that, in future, budget information included in the program details be excerpted and distributed to members of the Planning and Budget Committee.

The member expressed his concern that increased control of budgets at the divisional level would lead to less control at the university-wide levels with resulting implications for governance. Professor Goel replied that he was confident that the revenue of the proposed M.F. program would cover its costs, including overhead.

On motion duly moved and seconded

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

THAT the Master of Finance Program, leading to the degree of Master of Finance (M.F.) within the Rotman School of Management, commencing September, 2007, be approved.

**7. School of Graduate Studies: Proposal for a Master of Public Policy (M.P.P.)**

The Chair welcomed Professor David Klausner, Vice-Dean, Interdisciplinary Affairs, Faculty of Arts and Science and Professor Mark Stabile, Interim Director, School of Public Policy to the meeting.

Professor Zaky explained that an initiative in public policy had been identified as a priority in the University's Stepping UP plan as well as in earlier planning cycles, and a Task Force on Public Policy had recommended the creation of a School of Public Policy.<sup>1</sup> The School of Public Policy and Governance would be brought forward to University governance for approval this fall, as an extra-departmental unit with its own budget and authority to offer academic programs, enrol students and administer research

---

<sup>1</sup> Report of the Task Force on Public Policy Studies at the University of Toronto, January 2004  
<http://www.provost.utoronto.ca/English/Task-Force-on-Public-Policy-Studies---July-2001.html>

## 7. School of Graduate Studies: Proposal for a Master of Public Policy (M.P.P.) (cont'd)

grants and a program. The Director would report administratively to the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Science and academically to a Council of Deans, chaired by the Dean, Faculty of Arts and Science. The Council would oversee all critical academic decisions, including major program changes. The Director would, in addition, establish a Program Committee to deal with admissions and curriculum development on an on-going basis.

Professor Zaky informed members that the proposed Master of Public Policy would be offered by the School of Public Policy and Governance, beginning in September 2007, in a 20-month format with an eight-month advanced standing option. The resources necessary to support the School would be provided by a combination of funding from the Academic Initiatives Fund, and tuition and Basic Income Unit (BIU) revenue generated by student enrolment. The latter would be available from the graduate expansion envelope. The financial plan had been reviewed, and approved by the Faculty of Arts and Science and by the Planning and Budget Office and the space needed had been arranged through the Office of the Assistant Vice-President, Campus and Facilities Planning.

A member commented that he had been unable to find any budget information in the documentation that was available on the Governing Council website.<sup>2</sup> Professor Zaky undertook to provide budget information to Committee members.<sup>3</sup>

A member noted that the program was being established within the Faculty of Arts and Science. Professor Goel replied that the Faculty of Arts and Science would be the home unit for the School of Public Policy and Governance. In order for the program to commence in September 2007, it required approval by University governance and by the Ontario Council of Graduate Studies (OCGS). Therefore, it had been necessary for the program to proceed through governance before the establishment of the School of Public Policy and Governance had been considered for approval by governance.

A member noted that the housing of graduate extra-departmental units (EDUs) appeared to be moving away from the School of Graduate Studies (SGS). Professor Goel replied that such units were being aligned with divisions having budgetary accountability for them.

The member raised questions concerning the cost per student for the program and budgeted amounts for administrative staffing and seminars and conferences. Professor Goel observed that the budget to which the member was referring was for the School of Public Policy and Governance as a whole, including all its programs, and not for the proposed program alone. The revenue stream from the proposed program would support other activities of the School. Invited to reply, Professor Stabile explained that, while the proposed M.P.P. program would be a major activity, the School would be actively involved in outreach programs. Some funding for conference and symposia would be provided by the Federal and Provincial governments, as well as by the City of Toronto and the City of Mississauga.

A member commented that he found it difficult to support a recommendation concerning the resource implications of the proposed program when the costs of the program and of the School were unclear. Professor Sinervo replied that the additional funding for the School had been approved by the Governing Council in May 2006 as part of the allocations from the

---

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.utoronto.ca/govcncl/bac/details/ap/2006-07/apa20060920-07ii.pdf>

<sup>3</sup> Budget information was distributed electronically to Committee members on September 19, 2006.

**7. School of Graduate Studies: Proposal for a Master of Public Policy (M.P.P.) (cont'd)**

Academic Initiatives Fund (AIF).<sup>4</sup> The budget had been reviewed carefully by the Faculty of Arts and Science, and the Faculty had undertaken to cover any deficits. Professor Goel observed that the University did not receive sufficient revenues to cover the full cost of many academic programs. The provincial government provided operating funds based on Basic Income Unit (BIU) weights, and had set limits on the amount of tuition that could be charged for programs. The new budget model was intended to realign academic expenses with revenues to more accurately reflect program costs, but it would not be appropriate to completely align revenues and expenses, as the Governing Council would give up the ability to support academic priorities.

A member expressed his concerns about the role of governance in considering the resource implications of this program, which were being considered for approval before the School of Public Policy and Governance had been established. In his view, the documentation provided for the AIF allocation to the School had not been complete, and the budget information that had been provided to him did not indicate additional sources of funding. He believed that this was a significant matter that required discussion. Professor Goel replied that each unit decided how to allocate its resources. It was intended that the School would become self-sustaining over time, but it was recognized that it would take time for the School to achieve its complete revenue.

A member suggested that the establishment of the School of Public Policy and Governance and the approval process were two separate issues. The points that had been raised by members were well-taken because the unit that would be offering the proposed program had not yet been created. Circulating the budget of the School to members of the Committee would provide members with a more informed view.

Professor Sinervo emphasized that the budget for the School had been subjected to review and approval by the Faculty of Arts and Science, the Planning and Budget Office, and the Office of the Vice-President and Provost.

Professor Goel stated that he would take all the comments under advisement, and would take them into account when the recommendation for the establishment of the School came forward. The Provost undertook to withdraw the M.P.P. program if the proposal for the establishment of the School was not approved by governance.

On motion duly moved and seconded

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

**THAT the Master of Public Policy program leading to the degree of Master of Public Policy (M.P.P.) be established within the Faculty of Arts and Science, commencing September 2007.**

---

<sup>4</sup> <http://www.utoronto.ca/govcncl/bac/details/pb/2005-06/pba20060307-05.pdf>

## **8. Capital Projects: Project Planning Committee Membership and Terms of Reference**

### **a) University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC): Classroom Building**

Members received for information the membership and Terms of Reference for the Project Planning Committee for a classroom building at UTSC. There were no questions.

### **b) Examination Centre on the St. George Campus**

Members received for information the membership and Terms of Reference for the Project Planning Committee for an Examination Centre on the St. George Campus. A member asked whether the examination centre would be available for use at times when examinations were not scheduled. Ms Sisam replied in the affirmative.

### **c) Faculty of Law**

Members received for information the membership and Terms of Reference for the Project Planning Committee for the Faculty of Law. A member asked about the implications on the Faculty of Music of the decision of the Faculty of Law to remain in its current location. Ms Sisam replied that a Project Planning Report for the Faculty of Music was nearing completion. Professor Goel added that discussions with the Royal Ontario Museum were ongoing with respect to developing a precinct plan.

## **9. Accommodation and Facilities Directorate: Annual Report on Approvals of Projects between \$0.5 M and \$2.M (2004-05)**

The Chair noted that the *Policy on Capital Planning and Capital Projects* required that the Accommodations and Facilities Directorate report annually to the Planning and Budget Committee on projects that fell within the approval authority delegated under the *Policy* to the AFD.

There were no questions.

## **10. Calendar of Business 2006-07**

The Chair noted that the proposed Calendar of Business for the upcoming year had been placed on the table. It was a living document that would be updated following each Agenda Planning meeting and again after each Committee meeting. The Calendar was part of a consolidated Governing Council Calendar of Business that was available on the Governing Council website.

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

There were no questions.

## **11. Report on Decisions under Summer Executive Authority**

The Chair reported that no decisions that fell within the Committee's terms of reference had been made under Summer Executive Authority.

**12. Date of the Next Meeting**

The next meeting of the Committee was scheduled for Tuesday, October 17, 2006 beginning at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber.

**13. Other Business**

There was no other business.

The meeting adjourned at 5:55 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

October 10, 2006