

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

REPORT NUMBER 147 OF THE PLANNING AND BUDGET COMMITTEE

January 11, 2012

To the Academic Board,
University of Toronto

Your Committee reports that it held a meeting on Wednesday, January 11, 2012 at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, at which the following were present:

Dr. Avrum Gotlieb (In the Chair)
Professor Miriam Diamond (Vice-Chair)
Professor Cheryl Misak, Vice-President and
Provost
Professor Scott Mabury, Vice-President,
University Operations
Mr. Don Andrew
Professor William Russell Cluett
Professor Elizabeth Cowper
Professor Meric Gertler
Mr. Peter A. Hurley
Dr. Chris Koenig-Woodyard
Professor Henry Mann
Professor Amy Mullin
Professor Yves Roberge
Professor Locke Rowe

Non-voting Assessors:

Mr. Paul Donoghue, Chief Administrative
Officer, University of Toronto Mississauga
Ms Sally Garner, Executive Director, Planning
and Budget
Ms Gail Milgrom, Acting Assistant Vice-
President, Campus and Facilities Planning

Secretariat:

Mr. Anwar Kazimi, Secretary

Regrets:

Dr. Jim Yuan Lai
Mr. Manveen Puri
Professor Andrea Sass-Kortsak
Miss Ava-Dayna Sefa
Ms Grace Carmen Yuen

In Attendance:

Professor Angela Hildyard, Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity
Mr. Ron Swail, Assistant Vice-President, Facilities and Services
Professor Julia O'Sullivan, Dean, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE)
Professor Eric Bredo, Chair, Theory and Policy Studies in Education, OISE
Ms Andrea Carter, Director, High Risk, Employment Equity Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities
Ms Sheree Drummond, Assistant Provost
Ms Breanne Faulkner, Graduate Student, OISE
Professor Esther Geva, Chair, Human Development and Applied Psychology, OISE
Dr. Jane Harrison, Director, Academic Programs and Policy, Office of the Vice-President and Provost
Professor John Portelli, Academic Director, Graduate Education, OISE
Mr. Don MacMillan, Registrar, OISE
Ms Evelyn McMullen, Graduate Student, OISE
Professor Rinaldo Walcott, Chair, Sociology and Equity Studies in Education, OISE
Ms Allison Ritchie, Graduate Student, OISE
Mr. Christopher Smith, Graduate Student, OISE
Ms Mae-Yu Tan, Assistant Secretary of the Governing Council
Professor Jeanne Watson, Associate Dean Programs (former Chair, Adult Education and Counselling
Psychology), OISE
Mr. Trevor Williams, Graduate Student, OISE

ITEMS 2 AND 3 ARE RECOMMENDED TO THE ACADEMIC BOARD FOR APPROVAL. ALL OTHER ITEMS ARE REPORTED FOR INFORMATION.

The Chair welcomed members and guests to the meeting.

1. Senior Assessor's Report

Professor Misak said that she would continue to consult with the University community on the "Towards 2030 - View from 2012" project. Further details would be provided to the Committee at its February 29, 2012 meeting. The intention was to bring the final document forward in the fifth cycle of the 2011-12 governance year.

1(a). Annual Report: The University of Toronto Ontario Disability Act Report 2011-12

Professor Misak called on Professor Hildyard, to present the [*Annual Report: The University of Toronto Ontario Disabilities Act Report 2011-12.*](#)

Professor Hildyard said that the provincial government had legislated the *Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act* (AODA). The University continued to play a leadership role among the universities in the province in the implementation of standards mandated under the AODA. The University had worked closely with the Council of Ontario Universities (COU) to develop training programs for use in all other universities. Ms Andrea Carter, AODA officer, also provided advice to other universities. The University would continue to be at the forefront of adopting and implementing the standards required by the AODA.

2. Proposal for the Departmental Restructuring at OISE

Ms Garner outlined the rationale for the proposed departmental restructuring at OISE, as presented in the appended documents. Professor Misak congratulated all stakeholders at OISE for a successful collaborative process that had resulted in a well considered proposal.

In response to a question from a member, Professor Watson said the proposed name change of the Department of Theory and Policy Studies suggested that work related to theory was conducted across all departments and thus the term theory should not be in the name of one department. Professor Watson added that in the opinion of the faculty who would form the proposed Department of Leadership, Higher and Adult Education, the inclusion of the term leadership was a better reflection of the programs that were offered through that department.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the Department of Adult Education and Counselling Psychology at OISE be disestablished effective July 1, 2012, and three of the four remaining units be renamed as follows:

- the current Department of Human Development and Applied Psychology to the Department of Applied Psychology and Human Development;
- the current Department of Theory and Policy Studies in Education to the Department of Leadership, Higher and Adult Education; and
- the current Department of Sociology and Equity Studies in Education to the Department of Humanities, Social Sciences and Social Justice Education.

Documentation is attached as [Appendix A](#).

3. Capital Project: Project Planning Report for the University of Toronto Mississauga, North Building Reconstruction, Phase A

Ms Milgrom presented the highlights of the Project Planning Report, dated December 16, 2011, for the University of Toronto Mississauga, North Building Reconstruction, Phase A.

Discussion

(i) *Members' Comments and Questions*

In the course of the discussion, members raised the following points.

- A member noted that with the first phase of the proposed reconstruction of the North Building, there would be an increase in the operating costs. What were the reasons for this projected increase?
- Members asked for further details on the borrowing component of the proposed project and enquired about UTM's mortgage and borrowing capacity to sustain the proposed project.
- A member expressed his reservations about the provincial government's commitment to provide financial support to capital projects, and asked if there was a plan in place in the event of the withdrawal of provincial support.
- Members queried future phases of reconstruction of the North Building. Had these future phases been accounted for in the design process of Phase A of the reconstruction?
- Members asked for further details on the Design Build aspect of the proposed project, as they related to the operating costs.

(ii) *Administrative Response*

- Mr. Donoghue said that the North Building was the first building to be constructed at the UTM campus. It was intended to serve as temporary building while the South Building was being constructed. Delays in the completion of the South Building had led to inclusion of additional phases to the North Building, which was now in need of replacement. The reconstruction of the first phase of the North Building would still leave two old inefficient phases which would result in an increase in operating costs. There was no set timeline for the reconstruction and redevelopment of the remaining phases of the North Building although it remained high on UTM's potential capital construction program.
- Professor Mabury said that \$17 million borrowing for the proposed project was within the University's borrowing capacity. UTM had prudently planned out its growth for the future and would be able to carry this debt and had included that cost in the recently approved five-year budget plan.
- Professor Misak said that the province seemed firm in its commitment to provide \$35 million for the proposed project. She noted that it was conceivable that this could be the last envelope of funding for capital projects, for the foreseeable future from the provincial government. UTM's aspiration for growth in undergraduate and graduate students in the future conformed to the overall strategic expansion of post-secondary institutions outlined by the provincial government. Professor Mabury added that if there were to be a change in the provincial government's plans in the run up to the tender process, the University would revisit the proposed project.
- Ms Milgrom said that any design process for the Phase A of the reconstruction of the North Building would be required to anticipate the future reconstruction phases of the building and be informed by the planned expansion.

3. Capital Project: Project Planning Report for the University of Toronto Mississauga, North Building Reconstruction, Phase A (Cont'd)

- Professor Mabury said the Design Build process of the proposed project would invite tenders based on the final proposed cost of the project. Any approved tenders would also be expected to ensure that operating costs for the building were within the range forecasted. It remained to be determined whether the project management would be internal or external.
- In relation to cost overruns, Mr. Donoghue said that since 2001 all major capital projects at UTM had been completed on schedule and within their allocated budgets.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

1. THAT the Project Planning Report for the University of Toronto Mississauga, North Building Reconstruction, Phase A, dated December 16, 2011, attached as [Appendix B](#), be approved in principle.
2. THAT the project scope, covering 5,220 nasm, as identified in the Project Planning Report be approved in principle at a total project cost of \$ 56M with funding as follows:

Provincial Government	\$ 35.0M
Funds from borrowing	\$ 17.0M
UTM capital reserves	\$ 3.1M
<u>UTM Graduate Expansion Fund</u>	<u>\$ 0.9M</u>
Total	\$ 56.0M

4. Annual Report: Accommodations and Facilities Directorate Approvals on Projects between \$50,000 and \$2 Million (2010-2011)

Professor Mabury and Ms Milgrom made a detailed presentation on the [Annual Review of the Accommodation and Facilities Directorate \(AFD\) for 2010-2011](#) which is appended to this report.

In the brief discussion that followed, the Committee was informed that 14 major projects had been considered by the AFD. The funding for almost all these projects had been provided through the operating budgets of the divisions, after approval through the Office of the Vice President and Provost. In a few instances, some capital had been provided by the Canada Foundation for Innovation (CFI) and the Graduate Expansion Fund.

CONSENT AGENDA

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

THAT the consent agenda be adopted and that the items be approved.

5. Report of the Previous Meeting (November 2, 2011)

Report Number 146 (November 2, 2011) was approved.

6. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting

There was no business arising from the report of the previous meeting.

7. Annual Report: Design Review Committee, 2010-2011

The Committee received for information the [Annual Report of the Design Report Committee for 2010-2011](#). The Chair asked Ms Milgrom to convey to the members of the Design Review Committee the Planning and Budget Committee's gratitude for their work.

8. Date of the Next Meeting

The Chair reminded members that the next meeting of the Committee was scheduled for Wednesday, February 29, 2012, at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber.

9. Other Business

The Chair reminded members that nominations for election to administrative staff, teaching staff and student seats on the Governing Council; and teaching staff and librarian seats on the Academic Board were being accepted until 5:00 p.m., Friday, January 20, 2012.

The meeting adjourned at 5:19 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

January 16, 2012