

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

**REPORT NUMBER 168 OF THE PLANNING AND BUDGET COMMITTEE
September 17, 2015**

To the Academic Board,
University of Toronto

Your Committee reports that it held a meeting on September 17, 2015 at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, at which the following were present:

Professor Steven J. Thorpe (In the Chair)
Professor Ron Levi (Vice-Chair)
Professor Cheryl Reghr, Vice-President and
Provost
Professor Suzanne Conklin Akbari
Professor Cristina H. Amon
Professor Heather S. Boon
Professor Carol C. Chin
Mr. P.C. Choo
Ms Linda Si Jie Gao
Professor Stephen R. Julian
Professor Linda M. Kohn
Professor Professor Ernest W.N. Lam
Mr. John Paul Morgan
Professor Elizabeth Smyth
Mr. Bruce Winter

Non-voting Assessor

Mr. Malcolm Lawrie, Assistant Vice-
President, University Planning
Design and Construction
Ms Christine Burke, Director, Campus
and Facilities Planning

Secretariat:

Mr. Anwar Kazimi, Secretary

Regrets

Professor Maria Cristina Cuervo
Ms Sally Garner, Executive Director,
Planning and Budget
Ms Sandra Hudson
Professor Scott Mabury, Vice-President,
University Operations
Professor Tiff Macklem
Mr. Riaz Sayani-Mulji

In Attendance:

Professor Donald Ainslie, Principal, University College
Mr. Qiang An, PhD candidate, University of Toronto Institute for Aerospace
Studies, Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering (UTIAS)
Ms Elizabeth Cragg, Director, Office of the Vice-President, University Operations
Ms Catherine Gagne, Chief Administrative Officer, Division of the Vice-President
and Provost
Professor Omer Gulder, UTIAS
Dr. Daniella Mallinick, Acting Director, Academic Programs, Planning and Quality
Assurance, Office of the Vice- Provost, Academic Programs
Professor John W. Marshall, Vice-Principal, University College
Mr. Steve Miszuk, Director – Facilities and Infrastructure Planning, Faculty of
Applied Science and Engineering
Professor Locke Rowe, Dean, School of Graduate Studies and Vice-Provost,
Graduate Research and Education
Ms Archana Sridhar, Assistant Provost

ITEMS 5 TO 7 AND 12 TO 14 ARE RECOMMENDED TO THE ACADEMIC BOARD FOR APPROVAL. ALL OTHER ITEMS ARE REPORTED FOR INFORMATION

ITEMS 12 TO 14 WERE CONSIDERED *IN CAMERA*.

1. Chair's Welcoming Remarks

The Chair welcomed members to the first meeting. He then invited the members to introduce themselves.

2. Orientation

The Chair and Professor Levi presented a high-level overview of the Committee with slides, which are [appended](#) to this Report. The following points were highlighted:

- Structure of the Governing Council and its Boards, Campus Councils, and Committees.
- Responsibilities of the Planning and Budget Committee.
- Fiduciary responsibilities of members.

The senior voting assessor of the Committee – Professor Regehr – provided a brief overview of the respective portfolios of the voting assessors to the Committee, with examples of items that could be brought forward by them for the Committee's consideration.

The Secretary explained that cover sheets were designed to enable members to focus on the major elements of the proposals, and that they were a valuable tool in clarifying the governance pathway and responsibilities of the relevant governance bodies for each item of business.

3. Calendar of Business for 2015-16

Members received the Calendar of Business for information.

Summer Executive Authority

The Chair informed members that no decisions had been made under the Summer Executive Authority in 2015.

4. Senior Assessor's Report

In her comments, the Provost highlighted the following:

- The start of the new academic year had provided the University the opportunity to welcome new and returning members of the community. Approximately 16,000 undergraduate students, 1,200 new second-entry professional students and 6,800 graduate students would be starting programs in the Fall term. In addition, approximately 120 new faculty members from more than 20 countries would be joining the University community in 2015.
- The proposals or items that the administration would bring forward to the Committee for its consideration would focus on academic planning, policies, and resources. Prior to being presented to the Committee, the proposals would have been vetted through a series of administrative processes, and prepared following formal and informal consultations with relevant stakeholders and advisory bodies.
- The three capital projects for the Committee's consideration at the meeting provided stellar examples of the alignment with the University's priority to enhance the undergraduate and graduate student experience and continue our leading-edge research.

5. Capital Project: Report of the Project Planning Committee for the University College Revitalization (Revised Phase 1) and Croft Chapter House (Phase 2)

Ms Christine Burke presented an overview of the memorandum dated September 9, 2015 from Professor Mabury highlighting the report of the Project Planning Committee for the University College Revitalization (Revised Phase 1) and Croft Chapter House (Phase 2).

Professor Donald Ainslie noted that Croft Chapter House provided an iconic focal point for the St. George campus; and that the structure required much-needed renovations. Professor Ainslie said that the combination of Phase 1 and Phase 2 renovation projects would provide efficiencies in construction costs.

Discussion

- A member inquired about the plans in place for the relocation of the activities at the Croft Chapter House during the construction phase of the project. Professor Ainslie responded that there was comparable space available in a room situated in the north-west corner of University College. That space would be utilized to accommodate the events scheduled for the Croft Chapter House during the construction phase of the project.
- Members inquired about how the proposed conference facilities at the Croft Chapter House would be advertised within the broad University community and how these facilities would be booked for optimum usage. Professor Ainslie said that the proposed modern conference facilities at the Croft Chapter House with accessible entrances, flexible seating, and upgraded technological infrastructure would contribute towards fulfilling the research mission of the University as a site for a range of academic activities. When completed, University College would reach out to other units to optimize the usage of these desired facilities.

5. Capital Project: Report of the Project Planning Committee for the University College Revitalization (Revised Phase 1) and Croft Chapter House (Phase 2) (contd.)

- A member inquired whether any catering requirements for conference events at the Croft Chapter House would be integrated with the University College's catering facilities. Professor Ainslie said that the proposed renovations included a light service kitchen area. Croft Chapter House was located close to the main University College kitchen and as such could provide catering for events as needed.
- A member commented that the proposed conference facilities would help further raise the profile of the University as a venue for academic gatherings.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

1. THAT the Report of the Project Planning Committee for the University College Revitalization (Revised Phase 1) and Croft Chapter House (Phase 2), dated August 24, 2015, be approved in principle; and,
 2. THAT the additional project scope for Revised Phase One and for Croft Chapter House (Phase Two), totaling 273 net assignable square metres (nasm) (316 gross square metres (gsm)) for a total of 985 net assignable square metres (nasm) (1266 gross square metres (gsm)) be approved in principle, be funded by Capital Campaign Funds, Provost's Central Funds, University College (Operating Funds); and Faculty of Arts and Science (Capital Funds); and
 3. THAT subsequent phases of the project be brought forward for approvals through the appropriate vehicle as funding becomes available to move forward with the implementation of the overall plan as presented in the Project Planning Committee Report.
- 6. Capital Project: Report of the Project Planning Committee for the High Pressure Combustion Research Facility, University of Toronto Institute for Aerospace Studies, Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering**

Ms Burke presented an overview of the memorandum dated September 9, 2015 from Professor Mabury highlighting the report of the Project Planning Committee for the High Pressure Combustion Research Facility at the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering's University of Toronto Institute for Aerospace Studies (UTIAS).

Professor Omer Gulder said that the world-class facilities at UTIAS would be unique in Canada. The Institute provided a good training ground for graduate students. A key objective of the Institute was to develop technology that would reduce fuel-usage in aircrafts resulting in the reduction of pollutants.

6. Capital Project: Report of the Project Planning Committee for the High Pressure Combustion Research Facility, University of Toronto Institute for Aerospace Studies, Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering (contd.)

Discussion

- A member inquired as to how the project would help graduate students. Mr. An responded that the facility was important for the linking computer simulations to experimental research.
- A member asked about the expected life-cycle for the proposed installation. Professor Gulder said experiments at the facility could be conducted at a threshold that was beyond the current capacity of commercial aircrafts. It was expected that the proposed upgrades would allow the facility to operate for approximately twenty-five years, with the capacity for further upgrades as required. Professor Gulder said the facility had attracted interest from several leading global small-engine aircraft manufactures.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

1. THAT the Report of the Project Planning Committee for the High Pressure Combustion Research Facility, University of Toronto Institute for Aerospace Studies, Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering, dated August 26, 2015, be approved in principle, and;
 2. THAT the project scope to accommodate the High Pressure Combustion Research Facility Renovation of 188 net assignable square metres (nasm), be approved in principle, to be funded by Canadian Foundation for Innovation (CFI) funds, Ontario Research Fund (ORF) funds and Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering (UTIAS) Operating Funds.
- 7. Capital Project: Report of the Project Planning Committee for the School of Graduate Studies, MacDonald-Mowat House, 63 St. George Street Renovation and Restoration**

Ms Christine Burke presented an overview of the memorandum dated September 9, 2015 from Professor Mabury highlighting the report of the Project Planning Committee for the renovation and restoration of the School of Graduate Studies' building – the MacDonald-Mowat House – at 63 St. George Street.

Professor Locke Rowe said that the project symbolized the University's priority to improve the graduate student experience. A goal was to develop a hub for graduate students services and create a more open and inviting space for graduate students that was integrated within the core of the campus.

7. Capital Project: Report of the Project Planning Committee for the School of Graduate Studies, MacDonald-Mowat House, 63 St. George Street Renovation and Restoration (contd.)

Discussion

- Members inquired about the need for the proposed renovations to the MacDonald-Mowat House. Professor Rowe responded that the MacDonald-Mowat House was a heritage listed building, and in much need of repair and renewal. The core goal of the proposed project was to provide a focal point for enhanced graduate student services, including upgraded student reception and common room areas. Future plans included continuing the relocation and enhancement of mental health and other services for graduate students to the MacDonald-Mowat House.
- A member inquired about the frequency of usage of the space at the MacDonald-Mowat House for thesis defence. Professor Rowe said that the demand for space for thesis defence at MacDonald-Mowat House was variable – some units continued to hold thesis defences at the School of Graduate Studies, while others had moved to conduct such activities at their respective locations. Professor Rowe noted that the proposed project would result in a reduction of thesis defence rooms at the MacDonald-Mowat House from three to two. However, additional space for defence purposes would be available at the adjoining 65 St. George Street location to mitigate any demand.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

1. THAT the Project Planning Committee Report for the School of Graduate Studies, MacDonald-Mowat House, 63 St. George Renovation and Restoration, dated September 1, 2015, be approved in principle; and,
2. THAT the project scope of 63 St. George Street Renovation and Restoration totalling 715 net assignable square metres (nasm) (1070 gross square metres (gsm)) be approved in principle, to be funded by the School of Graduate Studies Operating Funds.

8. Report of the Previous Meeting (May 13, 2015)

Report Number 167 (May 13, 2015) was approved.

9. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting

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

10. Date of Next Meeting

The Chair reminded members that the next meeting would be on Wednesday, October 28, 2015, at 4:10 p.m.

11. Other Business

There were no items of other business.

IN CAMERA SESSION

12. Capital Project: Report of the Project Planning Committee for the University College Revitalization (Revised Phase 1) and Croft Chapter House (Phase 2) – Total Project Cost and Sources of Funding

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the Vice President, University Operations' recommendation, as outlined in the memorandum dated September 9, 2015, be approved.

13. Capital Project: Report of the Project Planning Committee for the High Pressure Combustion Research Facility, University of Toronto Institute for Aerospace Studies, Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering – Total Project Cost and Sources of Funding

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the Vice President, University Operations' recommendation, as outlined in the memorandum dated September 9, 2015, be approved.

14. Capital Project: Report of the Project Planning Committee for the School of Graduate Studies, MacDonald-Mowat House, 63 St. George Street Renovation & Restoration – Total Project Cost and Sources of Funding

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the Vice President, University Operations' recommendation, as outlined in the memorandum dated September 9, 2015, be approved.

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

September 21, 2015