UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

REPORT NUMBER 115 OF THE PLANNING AND BUDGET COMMITTEE

December 5, 2006

To the Academic Board,
University of Toronto

Your Committee reports that it held a meeting on Tuesday, December 5, 2006 at 4:10 pm in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, at which the following were present:

Professor Miriam Diamond (In the Chair)
Professor Vivek Goel, Vice-President and
   Provost
Ms Catherine J. Riggall, Vice-President,
   Business Affairs
Ms Diana A. R. Alli
Professor Philip H. Byer
Professor John Coleman
Professor Ellen Hodnett

Professor Brad Inwood
Professor David Mock
Ms Carole Moore
Mr. Tim Reid
Professor Andrea Sass-Kortsak
Professor Pekka K. Sinervo
Mr. Stephen C. Smith
Mr. Patrick Wong

Regrets:
Professor Stewart Aitchison
Mr. Kristofer T. Coward
Professor Jane Gaskell
Professor Avrum Gotlieb
Professor Gregory Jump
Ms. Theresa J. C. Pazionis
Professor Safwat Zaky

Non-voting Assessors:
Professor John R. G. Challis, Vice-
   President, Research and Associate
   Provost
Ms Elizabeth Sisam, Assistant Vice-
   President, Campus and Facilities
   Planning

Secretariat:
Ms Cristina Oke
Ms Mae-Yu Tan, Secretary

In Attendance:
Professor Jonathan Freedman, Interim Vice-President and Principal, University of
   Toronto at Scarborough, member of the Governing Council
Professor Gage Averill, Dean, Faculty of Music
Ms Sheree Drummond, Assistant Provost
Professor Charlie Keil, Director, Cinema Studies Program
Professor David Klausner, Vice-Dean, Interdisciplinary Studies, Faculty of Arts and
   Science
Ms Helen Lasthiotakis, Director, Policy and Planning, Office of the Vice-President and
   Provost
Dr. Jeanne Li, Special Assistant to the Vice-President, Business Affairs
Professor Roger Martin, Dean, Joseph L. Rotman School of Management
Mr. Marden Paul, Director, Strategic Computing
Mr. Henry Mulhall, Assistant Secretary, Office of the Governing Council
Professor Peter Pauly, Vice Dean, Research and Academic Resources, Joseph L. Rotman
   School of Management

In Attendance (cont'd)

Professor Susan Pfeiffer, Vice-Provost, Graduate Education and Dean, School of
   Graduate Studies
Professor Catharine Whiteside, Dean, Faculty of Medicine and Vice-Provost, Relations
   with Health Care Institutions
Ms Mary-Ellen Yeomans, Assistant Dean, Administration and Chief Administrative
   Officer, Joseph L. Rotman School of Management

ITEMS 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 ARE RECOMMENDED TO THE ACADEMIC BOARD FOR
APPROVAL. ITEM 12 CONTAINS A CONCURRENCE WITH A
RECOMMENDATION OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND
PROGRAMS.

ALL OTHER ITEMS ARE REPORTED FOR INFORMATION.

1.   **Opening Remarks**

The Chair welcomed Ms Mae-Yu Tan as Secretary to the Committee.

2.   **Report of the Previous Meeting**

Report Number 114 of the meeting of October 17, 2006 was approved.

3.   **Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting**

   Item 4 – Framework for Graduate Expansion

A member referred to page 5 of Report 114, and asked why only 92% and not 100% of
the proposed additional, domestic students would be eligible for funding. Professor Goel
explained that eligibility for funding was governed by the number of years a student had
been enrolled in a program. The University made plans according to the expected
numbers of students, but the government provided funding for a fixed duration. Students
enrolled in a Master's program were funded for a maximum of two years, while students
in a Ph.D. program were funded for a maximum of four years.

4.   **Senior Assessor's Report**

(a)   **Capital Plan Updates**

Professor Goel stated that, in January 2007, the revised Capital Plan would be brought
forward to the Planning & Budget Committee and to the Business Board. This would
update the Capital Plan that had been approved by governance in February 2005. A Real
Estate Strategy and revisions to the Borrowing Strategy would be provided to the
Committee for information and considered by the Business Board.

(b)   **Provincial Funding**

Professor Goel reported that the University and the Council of Ontario Universities
(COU) were working with the provincial government to resolve various funding issues.
Accessibility funding remained uncertain as there were more students in the

38010 v5

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

(b)   Provincial Funding (cont'd)

postsecondary system than had been forecast. Quality enhancement funds remained unallocated, and there was some concern that these funds would be redirected to meet increased enrollments for which there are no funds budgeted. The government had been distributing some money for postsecondary education during the fall via announcements for individual projects.

(c)   Federal Funding

Professor Goel noted that while the fall fiscal update from the federal government had not promised new money for post-secondary education, there were promising signals on the science and technology strategy. The University was focusing its advocacy efforts on increased funding for research grants and scholarship support.

(d)   Discussion

A member observed that allocations from the Academic Initiatives Fund (AIF) appeared to be moving away from base to one-time-only (OTO) allocations, and asked whether this was a result of the new budget model. Professor Goel noted that there would be an information session on the new budget model prior to consideration of the 2007-08 Budget Report. Professor Goel explained that the new budget model was revenue based, therefore base allocations were no longer relevant. Special requests from divisions had to be tied to new programs, advancement initiatives, or the University fund. Thus a new source of long-term funding was eventually required. Approaches for appropriately supporting interdisciplinarity were being explored. The member asked whether a new proposal for the allocation of the funds remaining in the AIF would be brought forward to governance. Professor Goel indicated that such a recommendation would be incorporated within the budget report.

5.   Restructuring of Life Sciences at the University of Toronto at Scarborough

The Chair welcomed Professor Jonathan Freedman, Interim Vice-President and Principal, University of Toronto at Scarborough, (UTSC) to the meeting for this item.

Professor Goel explained that the proposed disestablishment of the Department of Life Sciences had been brought forward by UTSC, with the intent to divide into two departments – the Department of Psychology and the Department of Biological Sciences. The Department of Life Sciences faculty members had unanimously supported the restructuring, and the proposal had been approved by the UTSC Council. These two programs already existed at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, and the new departments would align with the tri-campus graduate structure. A number of interdisciplinary units were currently housed within the Department of Life Sciences, and they would continue their cross-collaboration. Some modest investments for the new departments would be required in order to provide additional space and administrative staff, which the Dean of UTSC had committed to supplying.

5.   **Restructuring of Life Sciences at the University of Toronto at Scarborough**
        (cont'd)

        On motion duly moved and seconded

        YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

        THAT the Department of Life Sciences at the University of Toronto at Scarborough
        be disestablished coincident with the establishment of the new Department of
        Biological Sciences and the new Department of Psychology, effective July 1, 2007.

Documentation is attached hereto as Appendix "A".

6.   Policy on Information Technology

Professor Goel explained that the proposed *Policy on Information Technology* replaced
two older policies: the *Policy on the Use and Development of Computing Facilities* (April
16, 1984) and the *Computing Services Financial Policy and Accounting Practice in
Respect of Major Computer Mainframe Acquisitions* (December 21, 1978).   The
proposed new policy was a high-level policy statement and did not address logistics and
operational concerns. These topics would be addressed by the Information Technology
(IT) committees and related working groups, which would lead the development and
dissemination of guidelines and best practices for the community. Professor Goel noted
that appropriate use of computing services was already expected as a condition of use for
certain services; with the proposed policy, the requirement for appropriate use could be
applied to all information technologies.

A member asked how 'commercial uses' would be defined when implementing the
Policy. Professor Goel replied that the current *Policy on Conflict of Interest* would apply
to faculty members. The main areas where IT might be used for commercial purposes
were those overseen by the Vice-President, Business Affairs, such as food services. In
general, the relevant Vice-President would have to agree to such a use for University IT.

The member asked whether professional development activities offered by divisions
would be considered as commercial uses of University IT. Professor Goel replied that
such activities were continuing education initiatives and not considered to be commercial.
The member emphasized the need for clarity in communicating the proposed policy to
the University community.

        On motion duly moved and seconded

        YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

        THAT the proposed *Policy on Information Technology*, a copy of which is
        attached hereto as Appendix "1" to Appendix "B", be approved, replacing the
        Policy on the Use and Development of Computing Facilities (April 16, 1984) and
        the *Computing Services Financial Policy and Accounting Practice in Respect of
        Major Computer Mainframe Acquisitions* (December 21, 1978).

38010 v5

7.   Policy on Interdisciplinary Education and Research Planning

Professor Goel presented the proposed *Policy on Interdisciplinary Education and Research Planning*, and the *Guidelines for Administrative Functions and Protocols of Extra-Departmental Units* (for information). He explained that the University's commitment to interdisciplinary education and research, and the current guidelines and structures for Extra-Departmental Units (EDUs) had been outlined in the Marsden Report (1984). The proposed policy was the result of work of the Interdisciplinarity Committee. The policy reaffirms the importance of excellent interdisciplinary and disciplinary teaching, learning and research at the University of Toronto.

EDUs facilitate interdivisional and interdepartmental work across boundaries of traditional areas of study and divisional budget lines. The Administrative Guidelines allow for the creation of units appropriate to the current needs of the University. For example, the administration of graduate programs without creating new stand-alone graduate departments.

A member asked how EDU:As differ from departments. Professor Goel acknowledged that the boundary between the two was blurred. An evolution towards an EDU:A was possible, although not every unit would be expected to evolve into an EDU:A. Departments generally offered a full range of undergraduate and graduate programs and research, whereas EDU:As would offer specific programs where the number, quality, and research support of the faculty could foster an established program, and where the resources available to faculty and students could guarantee a "critical mass" of scholarship and admissions. Professor Sinervo added that in the past there had been much discussion around the definitions of EDU:01 versus EDU:02 in the Marsden Report. The new taxonomy of EDUs was a much-improved structure which was easier to understand. Professor Sinervo referred to the Institute for Women's Studies and Gender Studies as an example of the evolution of a unit towards EDU:A status.

A member asked about the advantage of an EDU:C versus an EDU:D. Professor Goel explained that the creation of an EDU:A and B must be approved by Governing Council, while the creation of an EDU:C and D would be approved at the divisional level. While an EDU:D could be approved by the relevant academic unit or department, an EDU:C required the approval of the divisional or faculty council. Professor Goel added that many centres were created around a specific research area, and could be considered at the local level.

A member praised the proposed policy. The member then noted that the guidelines were not being approved, and asked whether this meant that a process through governance was being changed. Professor Goel replied that the existing processes were in the terms of reference for the Planning and Budget Committee. The guidelines clarified which units had to go forward to Governing Council – EDU:As and Bs would be considered by the Planning and Budget Committee. The member then asked whether the process could be changed in the future. Professor Goel replied that any modifications would still need to be reported through the Planning and Budget Committee. The member asked whether an EDU:C could make faculty appointments. Professor Goel replied that the primary appointment of faculty could not be to an EDU:B, C or D. The member then asked for further clarification about teaching staff in EDUs. Professor Goel explained that an

7.   **Policy on Interdisciplinary Education and Research Planning** (cont'd)

EDU:A does have the ability to make a faculty appointment. Since faculty members could not hold their primary appointment in an EDU:B, the department or college where they first started their appointment would be the unit of primary appointment, and the head of the unit involved would need to grant permission for any cross-appointment. A member asked where teaching staff would hold tenure. Professor Goel indicated that they could hold tenure in an EDU:A, but faculty would normally be cross-appointed to a cognate department.

Professor Sinervo commented that clarity of language was necessary, as the word "faculty" could be interpreted to mean teaching staff or tenure stream staff. He suggested a note to clarify the intent to be inclusive of all teaching staff might be used.

A member inquired about the disestablishment of an EDU. Professor Goel explained that the continuation of an EDU:A or B was dependent on periodic review of the unit. A member inquired about the difference in disestablishment of an EDU:A versus a department. Professor Goel explained that disestablishment of a department would involve governance approval.

> On motion duly moved and seconded
>
> YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS
>
> THAT the *Policy on Interdisciplinary Education and Research Planning*, a copy of which is hereto attached as Appendix "2" to Appendix "C", be approved, replacing the *Report of the Provostial Committee on Centres and Institutes,* approved by Governing Council in 1984.

8.   **Cinema Studies Institute: Establishment**

The Chair welcomed Professor David Klausner, Vice-Dean, Interdisciplinary Studies, Faculty of Arts and Science and Professor Charlie Keil, Director, Cinema Studies Program, to the meeting for this item.

Professor Goel explained that the proposed establishment of the Cinema Studies Institute as an extra-departmental unit (EDU) within Innis College arose as part of the Faculty of Arts and Science Stepping Up plan. This was a good example of an EDU that would bring together undergraduate and graduate activities with research opportunities. This was also an example of a college-based program that would remain housed in the College, even after the establishment of the Institute. A proposal for a Master of Arts program in Cinema Studies had been developed, and was being forwarded through the governance process for consideration.

8.   Cinema Studies Institute: Establishment (cont'd)

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the Cinema Studies Institute be established within the Faculty of Arts and Science, and,

THAT the Cinema Studies Institute be established as an EDU:B unit, subject to the approval of the *Policy on Interdisciplinary Education and Research Planning.*

Documentation is attached hereto as Appendix "D".

The Chair then asked that members agree to consider the proposal to expand the Rotman School of Management Facilities next, in order to accommodate the schedule of the guests in attendance.

9.   Capital Project: Interim Project Planning Committee Report: Expansion of the Rotman School of Management Facilities

The Chair welcomed Professor Roger Martin, Dean, Joseph L. Rotman School of Management, Professor Peter Pauly, Vice Dean, Research and Academic Resources, Joseph L. Rotman School of Management, and Ms Mary-Ellen Yeomans, Assistant Dean, Administration and Chief Administrative Officer, Joseph L. Rotman School of Management, to the meeting for this item.

Ms Sisam explained that, in September 2002, a Project Committee had been established to investigate the space requirements of the Rotman School of Management. From this investigation the most pressing need determined had been to address office accommodation for faculty members and instructors related to the expanded activities of the full and part-time MBA, Ph.D., Commerce and Executive MBA programs within the School. In response, additional offices had been constructed by adding 4th and 5th floors over the south wing of the building.

In the fall of 2004, classrooms had been completed to accommodate the Commerce program as primary users on the lower level of the Woodsworth Residence building. This had enabled dedicated Commerce classrooms in the Rotman building to be reassigned to the Rotman School of Management.

Most recently, approval to relocate the Commerce administrative offices from the Rotman building to ground level space in the Woodsworth Residence building had enabled additional space to be vacated for the use of the Rotman School.

Ms Sisam informed members that the Rotman School of Management continued to maintain impressive academic standing among the very best international schools of management and business. However, even with Commerce spaces being made available to the School, the rapid growth of Rotman programs and their need for additional facilities had far outpaced available space.

38010 v5

9.   Capital Project: Interim Project Planning Committee Report: Expansion of the Rotman School of Management Facilities (cont'd)

Plan 2004 had identified goals and strategies for the School, and their implications for the growth of faculty complement, graduate and undergraduate program development and delivery, research, and support infrastructure. In essence, the plan had involved a significant increase in the scale and scope of all the School's activities.

Much had been achieved since then. Strong support from the University, the Rotman Foundation, and other donors, had allowed the School to build on its academic strengths over the last seven years to significantly advance all the original objectives. In the short run, the plan focused on quality improvements, such as significant curriculum redesign, improved student experience, intensified recruiting efforts and improved selection criteria. At the same time, the plan outlined a staged process of programmatic expansion, in line with the University of Toronto's overall objective of expanding graduate enrolments and research focus.

The expansion plans of the School were fully in line, and had in part anticipated and pre-dated, the University's overall thrust towards graduate expansion. Most of the planned adjustment would be in place by the University's target date of 2009/2010 and it was expected to be well advanced in the current planning cycle.

This planned increase had been approved by the Vice-President and Provost as a part of long-term divisional graduate targets and would necessitate an additional increase in faculty complement, beyond the target levels envisioned in Stepping Up.

Rotman had also proposed substantial increases in its scholarly research activities involving the establishment or expansion of a number of centres and institutes which would engage scholars from across the University.

Ms Sisam explained that the space requirements that had been identified in the draft space program for the Rotman School exceeded the envelope capacity of the preferred approved development site (Site 11). This site and others on the St. George campus were being examined as part of the 10-year review of the Part II Plan. It was expected that additional capacity would be sought for this site during that review. Current occupants of the site, (CIUT, the Sex Ed Centre and the Department of Classics) would need to relocate, and a full plan with costs and proposed sites for relocation would be required. The interim project report identified a total of 920 nasm currently assigned to these activities. Detailed planning with Student Affairs and the Faculty of Arts and Science would occur, and a relocation plan and associated costs would be provided in the final project planning report.

In addition, there were currently 44 parking spaces on this site that had to be replaced on the St. George Campus to maintain compliance with the City of Toronto parking by-law requirement of 2160 parking spaces. The final project report would identify options for relocating these spaces.

9.   Capital Project: Interim Project Planning Committee Report: Expansion of the Rotman School of Management Facilities (cont'd)

Ms Sisam advised members that the total projected cost of the new building planned for Site 11 was approximately $100,000,000. The funding for this project would be assembled from a number of sources. The report was being brought forward for approval at this time in order to allow fundraising to proceed. This was consistent with other interim reports that had been recently brought forward.

Professor Goel noted that this was an Interim Project Planning Report. He stated that it was more transparent not to wait until a project planning report was completed before proceeding, even though some details such as the secondary effects and total project cost estimates were not yet available; these would be included in the final report. In accordance with the Policy on Capital Planning and Capital Projects, the final report would be submitted to the Planning and Budget Committee. The current recommendation was for the assignment of the site to this project and for approval in principle for increased space.

A member asked whether the Committee was being asked to approve the $100 million cost of the new building. Professor Goel explained that the cost was subject to the completed project planning report, and that amount was a top-level estimate. This project was contingent on resources being identified externally, and the Dean was aware of this. It was not anticipated that there would be long-term debt allocated for this project, although some short-term financing might be required depending on how donations towards the project were received.

A member inquired about the magnitude of the plan and the expected increase of about 50% in the faculty complement by 2014. Professor Goel reminded the Committee of the approved graduate expansion plan, and stated that there had been a need to revise the academic plan in light of the increase. The increase in faculty complement had taken this into account.

A member asked about the secondary effects of the project, and whether 91-97 St. George Street was a potential heritage site. Ms Sisam responded that this was an approved development site, but that there was an agreement to retain certain building facades. It was possible to build additional space on the site. A member wondered whether a request could be made to vary the density. Ms Sisam stated that it was possible. Since the University of Toronto Area Part II Plan had been implemented in 1997, there had been changes in the downtown core, so the University was now reviewing all remaining development sites. Professor Goel clarified that there might be a need to obtain any variance on the density, but there was already clarity on what was required from a heritage perspective.

A member pointed to past problems between the neighbouring community and the building of the Bahen Centre for Information Technology, and wondered whether similar problems might be expected with this project. Ms Sisam indicated that the Huron-Sussex Residents' Association had been consulted on the 1997 development plan. Professor Goel added that the University's Community Liaison Committee held regular, quarterly meetings, and that all project plans in progress were identified to the Committee.

38010 v5

9. Capital Project: Interim Project Planning Committee Report: Expansion of the Rotman School of Management Facilities (cont'd)

Ms Sisam, as Co-Chair of the Committee, would now be able to discuss this project plan with the Committee.

Concern was expressed by a member that the character of St. George Street was being lost with developments. Professor Sinervo countered that the Chair of the Classics Department had expressed a desire to have an appropriate space, and that 97 St. George Street was not well-suited for a department. The current space was inadequate, and graduate students could not be well accommodated. Professor Goel added that the character of St. George Street had changed over the last few years, and would likely continue to do so. The issue of accessibility was a large one when considering older buildings and maintenance costs could be quite considerable.

A member inquired about the wording around financing of the project used in the cover sheet, which stated that "It is not anticipated that there will be long-term debt…". The member commented that the statement was not very definitive, and questioned whether the intent was to keep the possibility of long-term debt open. Professor Goel responded that the need for a borrowing allocation might emerge in the process of capital planning, for example if the graduate expansion stream of payments was a source of funding. He then invited Professor Martin to speak on the issue. Professor Martin explained that the funding strategy included a plan to obtain $60 million through funding from private sources which would be matched by the government. Although this was not guaranteed at this point, interest had been expressed. A signed commitment of $10 million had already been provided, and another $10 million opportunity was very strong. It was felt that the Rotman School would have about $40 million when entering in discussions with the government, and it did not intend to call upon University resources.

Another member returned to the issue of heritage buildings. He pointed out that while it was important to preserve the best examples of the past, not every old building necessarily needed to be preserved. The architectural significance should be considered when making such decisions. The member suggested that expert testimony regarding the significance of architecture for Site 11 be provided. Ms Sisam thanked the member for the input. She recalled that during the review of Site 11, the University had held detailed discussions with the City of Toronto and the Heritage Toronto board; both had given approval for the development.

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

Subject to approval by the Governing Council of a completed Project Planning Report,

THAT the Interim Project Planning Report for the Rotman School of Management, a copy of which is hereto attached as Appendix "E", be approved in principle to accommodate the activities and functions described for the expansion of the School's programs on 91-97 St. George Street (site 11).

10. **Template for Full Affiliation Agreements between the University of Toronto and the Member Hospitals of the Toronto Academic Health Science Network**

The Chair welcomed Professor Catharine Whiteside, Dean, Faculty of Medicine and Vice-Provost, Relations with Health Care Institutions, to the meeting for this item.

Professor Goel informed members that between 1979 and 2002, full affiliation had been established with all current full member hospitals of the Toronto Academic Health Science Network (TAHSN). Professor Whiteside had led the development of an updated affiliation template agreement which would better reflect new policies at the University and provide savings of resources. Consultation with all TAHSN full member hospitals had involved individual and group meetings with key hospital leaders and their legal counsel.

The proposed new template agreement would provide greater clarity regarding the application of hospital versus University policies, the resolution of disputes, and the status of faculty working on hospital sites. The agreement would be customized and signed by each of the full member TAHSN hospitals. Professor Goel pointed out that one detail in the agreement dealing with indemnification and insurance was subject to change. Concern about language with respect to insurance had been expressed by the hospitals, and the University had agreed to the insertion of the following statement (section X1V.2, Indemnification) in the agreement, and the removal of the current insurance statement:

> For clarity, the Hospital will indemnify Students assigned to the Hospital with respect to legal liability incurred by them while acting within the scope of their duties.

Professor Whiteside had worked with the community hospitals, who preferred the insurance language. At this point, efforts were being made to persuade the community and full member TAHSN hospitals to agree to the same language around this issue. If a revision was made, through agreement from each affiliated hospital, it would be tabled at the Academic Board. It was the opinion of the lawyers that such a revision would not be considered a material change to the agreement.

A member asked whether it would be possible to approve two versions of the agreement, one with the indemnification language, and one with the insurance language. Professor Goel answered that it was possible to have two versions, and both would still conform with the template. It would be desirable to obtain agreement from all participating hospitals before seeking approval from the Academic Board.

A member asked why the Trillium Health Centre and Credit Valley Hospital were not included on the list of full member TAHSN hospitals. Professor Whiteside explained that there were ten hospitals that were currently fully-affiliated with the University, and there were eleven current and four upcoming community sites. The two sites identified were in the last category. The main difference between the two categories was that with the former, physicians had a full academic appointment with University.

10.   **Template for Full Affiliation Agreements between the University of Toronto and the Member Hospitals of the Toronto Academic Health Science Network** (cont'd)

A member referred to section III.3.4, *Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters*, and wondered if protection for students was provided. Professor Whiteside commented that patient safety was always a priority, and the hospitals would have the right to ask a student to desist from practice, if necessary; this provision was important and appropriate. Students would fall under the University's *Code of Student Conduct*, and the University had asked that any problematic student behaviour be communicated immediately so that proper procedures could be followed.

A member suggested that the first motion be clarified, by adding the word "currrent" to the description of the full member hospitals. The Chair made note of the friendly amendment.

Professor Sinervo spoke about the Inventions and Intellectual Property agreement. He explained that there should be no violation of the *Inventions Policy*, and the percentage share would be subject to the *University Policy*. Professor Challis indicated that the *Inventions Policy* was being revised, to work more harmoniously with the hospitals, and this was an ongoing process. A member then asked about the termination section of the agreement, and whether termination would need to be considered by Governing Council. Professor Goel responded that if an agreement reached the end of its term, it would not be necessary to forward it to Governing Council, however, if the termination arose during the course of the agreement, Governing Council would need to be engaged.

A member asked for clarification of section 3, Ownership, of the Appendix to the agreement which dealt with inventions and intellectual property. Professor Whiteside explained that a faculty member who had received funding and had an appointment to a hospital would be required to follow the intellectual property policies of the hospital. If the faculty member were on campus, then the *Inventions Policy* would apply. In cases where faculty members had a joint function, guidelines were in place, and collegial negotiation would determine where the Invention was made and where rights to it would reside. Professor Goel stated that this agreement would apply to both faculty and students, and Professor Challis added that negotiations would occur on a case-by-case basis.

> On motion duly moved and seconded

> YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

> 1. THAT the template for full affiliation agreements between the University of Toronto and the current full member hospitals of the Toronto Academic Health Science Network, hereto attached as Appendix "F", be approved, effective immediately;

> 2. THAT the President, or designate, be authorized to sign such agreements on behalf of the Governing Council, provided that the agreements conform to the approved template; and

10.   **Template for Full Affiliation Agreements between the University of Toronto and
        the Member Hospitals of the Toronto Academic Health Science Network** (cont'd)

      3. THAT the agreements signed under the provisions of this resolution be filed
         with the Secretary of Governing Council.

11.   **Capital Plan for Buildings and Projects in excess of $2 million**

Ms Sisam informed members that since the September 25, 2006 Capital Projects Table
had been provided at the October 17, 2006 Planning and Budget Committee meeting,
three projects had been added. The updated table now indicated a borrowing requirement
of $767.96 million, an increase of $24.097 million from the previous $743.86 million.
The adjustments to the Capital Plan included the UTSC Science Building Energy
Efficiency project, with a total project cost and borrowing required of $2 million, the
Campus Lighting Retrofit and Chiller Replacement ($1.987 million) and the UTM
Medical Academy ($20.11 million).

12.   **School of Graduate Studies: Proposal for Master of Music (M.Mus.) and Doctor
        of Musical Arts (D.M.A.) in Music Performance Program**

The Chair welcomed Professor Gage Averill, Dean, Faculty of Music, to the meeting for
this item.

Professor Goel explained that the proposal brought forward by the Faculty of Music to
restructure its graduate programs was the result of a three-year process of consultation,
discussion and planning. While the number of programs (two) would remain the same
under the proposed structure, there would be a clearer division between the new Program
of Music and the Program of Music Performance (changed from the Program of Music
and Program of Music Education). The degrees of Master of Arts (M.A.) and Master of
Music (Mus.M.) would be separated according to the above programs. Ethnomusicology
was now recognized as a field of research that was separate from Musicology. This
division fit well with faculty areas of specialization within the University and areas of
interest expressed by undergraduate students.

Professor Goel commented that this proposal was an example of a comprehensive review
of a graduate program. He explained that the Committee on Academic Policy and
Programs often spent a great deal of time on program review, as it had responsibility for
considering the curricular aspects of academic program proposals, while the mandate of
the Planning and Budget Committee was to look at the planning and financial
implications of such proposals.

A member asked why opera and jazz were created as fields separate from voice within
the Music Performance Master's degree program. Professor Averill explained that for
historical reasons, different pedagogies and curricula had emerged, and these independent
fields had been developed.

12.   School of Graduate Studies: Proposal for Master of Music (M.Mus.) and Doctor of Musical Arts (D.M.A.) in Music Performance Program (cont'd)

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR COMMITTEE CONCURS

With the prospective recommendation of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs

THAT the restructuring of graduate programs as outlined in the proposal from the Faculty of Music, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 126 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs as Appendix "A", be approved, effective September 2007, and

THAT the proposal from the Faculty of Music to introduce a Master of Music (Mus.M,) and a Doctor of Musical Arts (D.M.A.) in the Music Performance Program be approved, effective September 2007.

Documentation is attached as Appendix "G".

13.   Capital Project: Project Planning Committee – Terms of Reference and Membership: SciNet

The Committee received for information the membership and terms of reference for the Project Planning Committee for the space requirements for the computing and personnel infrastructure associated with the High Performance Computing network, commonly referred to as SciNet. There were no questions.

14.   Date of the Next Meeting (Tuesday, January 30, 2007)

15.   Other Business

The Chair noted that Professor Phil Byer was stepping down from the Governing Council and the Planning and Budget Committee, effective December 31, 2006, to go on research leave. She acknowledged his contributions, remarking that his keen eye and critical assessments had helped the Committee to move business forward. On behalf of the Committee, she wished him well and added that he would be missed.

The Chair wished all members a safe and restful holiday season.

<div align="center">The meeting adjourned at 5:55p.m.</div>

_____   _____
Secretary   Chair

January 11, 2007