

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL
REPORT NUMBER 104 OF
THE PLANNING AND BUDGET COMMITTEE

September 22, 2005

To the Academic Board,
University of Toronto.

Your Committee reports that it met on Thursday, September 22, 2005, at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, with the following members present

Professor Miriam Diamond (in the Chair)
Professor Vivek Goel, Acting President and
Vice-President and Provost
Ms Catherine Riggall, Vice-President,
Business Affairs
Professor Safwat Zaky, Vice-Provost,
Planning and Budget
Professor Philip H. Byer
Mr. Ryan Matthew Campbell
Mr. P.C. Choo
Professor John Coleman
Miss Coralie D'Souza
Professor Glen A. Jones

Professor David Mock
Ms Carole Moore
Professor Pekka Sinervo
Professor J. J. Berry Smith
Mr. Stephen C. Smith
Professor Ron Smyth

Mr. Louis R. Charpentier

Non-voting Assessors:

Mr. John Bisanti, Chief Capital Projects
Officer
Professor John Challis, Vice-President
Research and Associate Provost
Ms Elizabeth Sisam, Assistant Vice-
President, Space and Facilities Planning

Regrets:

Professor James Barber
Professor Avrum Gotlieb
Mr. Martin Hyrcza
Mr. Timothy Reid
Professor Robert Reisz

Secretariat:

Mr. Neil Dobbs
Mr. Henry Mulhall
Ms Cristina Oke, Secretary

In attendance:

Professor W. Raymond Cummins, member of the Governing Council and Chair of the
Academic Board
Mr. Mahadeo Sukhai, member of the Governing Council
Ms. Sheree Drummond, Assistant Provost
Ms Connie Guberman, Status of Women Officer and Special Advisor on Equity
Ms Kate Lawton, Employment Equity and *Ontarians with Disabilities Act* (ODA) Officer
Dr. Jeanne Li, Special Assistant to the Vice-President, Business Affairs
Ms Kim MacLean, Assistant Principal, University of Toronto at Scarborough

ITEMS 4 AND 5 ARE RECOMMENDED TO THE ACADEMIC BOARD FOR
APPROVAL.

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

Chair's Introductory Remarks

The Chair welcomed new and returning members of the Committee to the meeting, and invited them to introduce themselves. The Vice-President and Provost, senior assessor to the Committee, introduced the assessors who were in attendance. The Chair reviewed the role and mandate of the Committee, highlighting the following points.

Role of the Committee

- 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 Planning and Budget 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 and advised 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 Planning and Budget 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.

Chair's Introductory Remarks (cont'd)

Capital Projects (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 to the approval of the *Policy* in 2001, AFD had been given delegated authority to approve capital projects with an estimated cost of \$500,000 or less.
- Since the implementation of the *Policy on Capital Planning and Capital Projects*, the Planning and Budget Committee had 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). The 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, after considering the cost and demand for the proposed program, the resulting planning and budgetary changes within the division, and the resulting impact of the proposed program on other divisions, the University as a whole, and the public.

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, membership, and meeting documentation and procedures that was included in the *Frequently Asked Questions* document that had been placed on the table.

1. Report of the Previous Meeting

Report Number 104 of May 10, 2005 was approved.

2. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting

There was no business arising from Report Number 104.

3. Senior Assessor's Report

Professor Goel thanked Professor Diamond for chairing the meeting on behalf of Professor Gotlieb, who had a teaching commitment. He then updated the Committee on a number of items.

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

(a) Implementation of the *Stepping Up* Plan

Professor Goel informed members that the implementation of the *Stepping Up* academic plan would continue in this academic year. One of the key factors in the implementation of the plan was the need to acquire the necessary resources. The provincial budget last spring had been a major step forward in this respect.

The next round of allocations from the Academic Initiatives Fund (AIF), which provided funding for new academic program initiatives and innovative services, would be made early in the winter. There would also be ongoing restructuring of academic units, for example the biological sciences in the Faculty of Arts and Science and the School of Graduate Studies, as well as new program initiatives.

(b) Provincial Budget

(i) *Reaching Higher*

Professor Goel reminded members that, in the May 2005 budget, the provincial government had announced its *Reaching Higher* plan, which provided for major investments in postsecondary education between 2005-06 and 2009-10. Much work remained to be done to finalize the priorities and the allocations of the promised funding among universities and colleges. While the administration was confident that there would be a positive impact on the University's 6-year budget plan, it was too early to know the exact amount of the impact.

(ii) Graduate Enrolment Expansion

Professor Goel informed members that the *Reaching Higher* plan called for an increase in graduate enrolment of 14,000 students by the year 2009 for the Ontario system. This represented a 50% increase over current levels. The University would be a major participant in this expansion, as it currently enrolled one-third of the province's graduate students.

Professor Goel advised members that, in the next governance cycle, the administration would be bringing forward to the Committee for information a discussion paper regarding the proposed graduate expansion at the macro or institutional level. The discussion paper would include an appendix outlining the graduate expansion that had occurred since 2000 and the degree to which the expansion had met targets set at that time. The discussion paper would lay out graduate enrolment expansion issues for discussion and debate. Planning on the micro level was already underway within divisions, and the two processes would move in tandem.

The provincial government had indicated that it would like a multi-year commitment to graduate expansion from each university by the start of the province's fiscal year. The dialogue resulting from the discussion paper would inform the expansion commitment made by University. A framework of principles for graduate enrolment expansion would be brought to the Committee for endorsement in the spring.

(iii) Other Provincial Funding Envelopes

Professor Goel described the funding for quality enhancements that had been included in the provincial budget. The *Stepping Up* planning process had served the University well by identifying academic priorities for which funding could be sought.

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

(b) Provincial Budget (cont'd)

(iii) Other Provincial Funding Envelopes (cont'd)

Professor Goel noted that smaller envelopes of funding tied to specific initiatives such as aboriginal education would also be available. The University was waiting for a decision on the method of allocation of these envelopes.

(iv) Tuition

Professor Goel indicated that the provincial budget provided an opportunity to revisit the multi-year budget framework currently in place. A major uncertainty continued to be tuition levels. The University was currently in the second year of a tuition freeze imposed by the provincial government, and there had been no indication as to how the tuition freeze would be dealt with in 2006-07. The University could not finalize revisions to the remaining four years of the budget plan until the tuition issue was addressed and its effect on revenue projections was resolved. However, it was the expectation of the administration that the net effect of the increased funding from the provincial budget would allow for the reduction of planned expense reductions in 2006-07.

(c) Budget Model

Professor Goel reminded members that a new budget model was being created that was intended to enhance the process by which the administration developed and presented the annual budget. This change in the internal model would not affect the process by which the budget received governance approval. Professor Goel indicated that an information session on the new budget model would be arranged for members.

A member asked if the new budget model would result in more responsibility and accountability at the local level. The Provost replied that it was his belief that the proposed budget model would strengthen the University's institutional ability to set goals. There would be a clearer and stronger link between the budget and the academic plan.

The member commented that there was some concern within divisions that the Academic Initiatives Fund (AIF) would be discontinued as a result of the new budget model, as it had been intended for initiatives on the institutional rather than local level. Professor Zaky emphasized that initiatives such as the AIF would continue under the proposed budget model. The member encouraged the administration to communicate this information to the University community as soon as possible.

(d) Campus Master Plans

Professor Goel reminded members that one of the purposes of the Committee was to set academic priorities within available resources. He advised members that revisions to the Campus Master Plans for the St George and University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC) campuses would be discussed in the current year. The Master Plan for the St. George campus was ten years old, and, since it had been adopted, the University had purchased additional properties, and the City of Toronto had developed a new official plan. There had also been external developments and new ones proposed, for example, at the Royal Ontario Museum, which would impact the University's plans. The proposed graduate expansion would also entail funding for capital projects. There would be a need to examine the University's stock of buildings to determine if there was an adequate building envelope to accommodate the desired expansion.

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

(d) Campus Master Plans (cont'd)

A member asked what the University's response had been to the proposed development on the Royal Ontario Museum (ROM) site. Professor Goel replied that the University had not taken a public position, but had expressed its concerns about the proposed development in discussions with the ROM and the City of Toronto, and had suggested alternatives to the proposal. The University was particularly concerned about the proposed zoning change from institutional to residential, and the height of the proposed building (a 40-storey private residential building rising above an articulated garden level over a five-storey new facility for the ROM). The University also had concerns about the effects of the proposed development on access to the neighboring historic buildings of the Faculty of Law and the Faculty of Music, and on Philosopher's Walk. The member added that comments by the Royal Ontario Museum had suggested that the development was a 'done deal' and that the University approved of it. The member also noted that there had been references to interlocking membership between the Governing Council and the ROM board.¹

A member asked if the revisions to the Campus Master Plans would take into consideration the Open Space Plan and the issue of green space on campus. He expressed his hope that the revisions would be considered by the Design Review Committee. Professor Goel responded that this would occur, and that the University was committed to the Open Space Plan and the preservation of green space. If more space were required, the intention would be to increase density allowances on existing development sites rather than building on green space. Ms Sisam added that members of the Committee would be informed of the proposed changes, and the intention would be to take a balanced approach concerning green space.

(e) Simcoe Hall Renovations

Professor Goel recalled that a Project Committee had been established in 2004 to examine and address issues of space, accessibility and security in Simcoe Hall. A comprehensive plan had been developed by the Committee, but it had been decided that it would be better at this juncture to proceed with a more minimalist and staged approach. The first stage of renovations was now underway involving the updating of the Simcoe Hall entrance foyer. This project had been approved by the Accommodation and Facilities Directorate (AFD). It was intended to make the entrance space more welcoming and to address security concerns. There would be a staffed information kiosk and a waiting area. A more detailed project report would come forward for consideration at a later meeting.

In response to a member's question, Professor Goel reported that the architectural model of the University which had been located in the foyer had been relocated to the McMurrich Building.

4. *Ontarians with Disabilities Act: University of Toronto Accessibility Plan, 2005-06*

The Chair welcomed Ms Connie Guberman to the meeting for this item.

Ms Guberman reviewed the "University of Toronto *Ontarians with Disabilities Act (Act)* Accessibility Plan, 2005-06 (*Plan*)" using a PowerPoint presentation. The *Act*, which had been passed in 2001, required institutions within the broad public sector to review their policies, programs and services as they impacted upon persons with disabilities, and to

¹ The President of the University of Toronto and the Chair of the Governing Council serve as *ex officio* members of the Board of Trustees of the Royal Ontario Museum.

4. *Ontarians with Disabilities Act: University of Toronto Accessibility Plan, 2005-06* (cont'd)

develop annual accessibility plans that were intended to address existing barriers and prevent new barriers from being established.

Background

Ms Guberman stated that the *Plan* built on *Stepping UP*'s direction for equity and access and upheld the '*Statement of Commitment Regarding Persons with Disabilities*' that had been approved by the Governing Council in October 2004. The process of developing the Accessibility Plan had been highly inclusive. Under the auspices of the Vice-President Human Resources and Equity, a broadly representative ODA Planning Committee had been established consisting of more than fifty members and including faculty, staff, students, and alumni representing a range of stakeholders and constituencies. In the preparation of the 2005-2006 Plan, a greater number of people with disabilities, both visible and invisible, had been involved in the eight subcommittees that had identified barriers and initiatives.

Resources

Ms Guberman explained that, although the *Plan* was a provincial legislative requirement, no additional resources were being provided by the province. Initiatives were being supported by re-allocation of existing resources. Capital expenditures for accommodation of disabilities had been built into capital project budgets. A proactive approach was being taken by the University, as the costs of preventive measures were less than the expense resulting from time individuals took off work. The Plan of 2005-2006 described the work that had been accomplished in the past year and demonstrated the breadth of commitment across University units and departments.

Key accomplishments of 2004-05

Ms Guberman reviewed the key accomplishments of 2004-05. Every one of the 43 initiatives identified in the 2004-2005 *Plan* had been responded to and acted on in the past year. The accessibility initiatives had been broad-based. Particular highlights included:

- the updating of University parking policies and procedures to more thoroughly reflect the needs of persons with disabilities;
- a review of the University's Design Standards to ensure inclusion of all disabilities;
- the launch of an awareness campaign, "The Face of a Great Community";
- the opening of a student-run Access Centre;
- the enhancement of accessibility technology, including the development of a website template; and
- the addition of a focus on mental health issues.

Goals for 2005-06

Forty-eight initiatives had been identified for 2005-06, including seventeen new initiatives. These included:

- exploration of the intersection of disability with other equity issues to identify and address complex barriers to accessibility;
- development of an inventory of mental health resources available within the University;
- review of the effectiveness of the University's existing dispute resolution mechanisms related to disabilities issues.

4. *Ontarians with Disabilities Act: University of Toronto Accessibility Plan, 2005-06* (cont'd)

Conclusion

Ms Guberman informed members that the *Accessibility of Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA)* had received Royal Assent in June, 2005. However, the planning requirements of the 2001 *ODA Act* were still applicable until they had been replaced by standards in the new *Act*. She concluded her presentation by thanking all those who had contributed to the development of the 2005-06 *Plan*, and by recognizing the work done by Ms Kate Lawton and Mr. Mahadeo Sukhai who were in attendance at the meeting.

Discussion

A member asked whether an inventory of buildings that were not currently accessible would be created, noting especially the building housing Admissions and Awards. Professor Goel replied that such an inventory existed. The building housing Admissions and Awards required extensive retrofitting in order to become accessible. An alternative would be to relocate the unit. Professor Goel also noted that Simcoe Hall was not completely accessible at the present time, and would require major retrofitting to make its six levels accessible.

A member asked what percentage of the University's buildings were accessible. Ms Sisam replied that it was not possible to provide such a percentage because of the difficulty in defining 'accessibility'. The member suggesting using the number of square feet as a definition. At the invitation of the Chair, Ms Guberman noted that physical accessibility was only one measure, and that no thorough measure of accessibility had yet been identified.

A member asked if there was any information available on what would be required under the new *Act*. At the invitation of the Chair, Ms Guberman replied that the new *Act* contained firmer deadlines and applied to the private sector as well as the public sector. The University of Toronto was further ahead than most other universities in its compliance with the *Act*. Ms Lawton added that the new *Act* included a 2020 deadline for implementation, and that standards and guidelines had to be developed by that time.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the *Ontarians with Disabilities Act: University of Toronto Accessibility Plan, 2005-06*, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix A, be recommended to the Governing Council for approval in principle.

5. Capital Project: University of Toronto at Scarborough Electrical and Mechanical Infrastructure Upgrades Phase 4: New Chiller

The Chair advised members that, in accordance with the *Policy on Capital Planning and Capital Projects*, the Planning and Budget Committee considered special projects that addressed urgent needs to support the infrastructure of the University.

Ms Sisam explained that the Campus Master Plan for the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC), approved in May, 2001, had identified a plan for campus

development which had included the construction of several new buildings to accommodate projected increases in student enrolment. As a secondary effect of the

5. Capital Project: University of Toronto at Scarborough Electrical and Mechanical Infrastructure Upgrades Phase 4: New Chiller (cont'd)

proposed new construction, two assessments had been initiated to evaluate the existing electrical and mechanical infrastructure. The consultants had identified several potentially critical conditions and deficiencies, and made recommendations for replacement and upgrading of these systems to ensure dependable service for the foreseeable future.

In response to these reports, the University had developed a multi-phase plan to replace and upgrade the infrastructure at UTSC. The multi-phase plan had identified a defined set of high priority projects that required immediate attention. All projects in the planned schedule to the present time that had cost less than \$2million dollars had been approved by the Accommodation and Facilities Directorate [AFD]. Approval of Phase 3, Cooling Towers, costing \$2,515,000 had required the approval by the Planning and Budget Committee in December, 2004, since the projected cost exceeded the \$2 million limit.

Ms Sisam advised members that the implementation of Phase 4 as proposed in the Project Committee Report reduced the overall number of phases of infrastructure upgrades from seven to six and reduced the total cost of the upgrades by \$1.607 million. These changes were possible because Phase 4 replaced a CFC unit replacement previously scheduled for Phase 7 at a slight decrease to the costs projected initially. Approval of the project was required now to allow for the purchase of the chiller which required considerable lead time. The work would be implemented in the 2006-07 fiscal year.

A member asked why approvals were being sought for individual infrastructure projects, rather than for an overall infrastructure plan as suggested in the *Policy on Capital Planning and Capital Projects* (the *Policy*). Professor Goel replied that the *Policy* had been approved in 2001, at the beginning of the recent period of capital expansion. Individual infrastructure projects were being brought forward for governance approval for transparency. After having had experience in the application of the *Policy* over the past few years he, along with the Vice-President, Business Affairs, and the Secretary of the Governing Council, had agreed it would be appropriate to review the *Policy* in the current governance year. Professor Goel also noted that the intent of the administration in the future was to bring to governance more systematic plans for approval in principle or endorsement as appropriate, such as campus master plans. In recommending revisions to the *Policy*, the administration would look to enhance the role of governance with respect to overall plans.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

1. THAT the Project Planning Report for the Electrical and Mechanical Infrastructure Upgrades at the University of Toronto at Scarborough, Phase 4 Mechanical: New Chiller, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix B, be approved in principle.
2. THAT the project scope for the new chillers as described in the project committee report be approved at an estimated total project cost of \$2,919,000 to be funded from the following sources:
 - i) Deferred Maintenance Funds allocation to UTSC in 2005-06 in the amount of \$1,204,809.

- ii) Facilities Renewal Program allocation 2006-07 in the amount of \$200,000.
- iii) Deferred Maintenance Funds allocation to UTSC in 2006-07 in the amount of \$1,514,191.

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

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

A member noted that he had discussed with Ms Sisam a discrepancy between the reporting requirement in the *Policy*.² Ms Sisam explained that, in order to facilitate the timely approval for capital projects, the 2001 *Policy* had delegated to the AFD approval for projects costing \$2-million or less. Previously, the AFD had authority to approve projects costing \$500,000 or less. It had been the intent at the time that the *Policy* had been approved, that an annual report summarizing the projects approved by the AFD with costs between the previous limit of \$500,000 and the revised limit of \$2-million would be provided to the Committee.

Ms Sisam informed members that, in 2004-05, the AFD had formally approved 12 projects in the cost range of \$500,000 to \$2-million. The AFD had also approved 52 projects in the cost range of \$50,000 to \$500,000. These 52 projects totaled approximately \$8-million. A list of these projects could be made available to the Committee.

Invited to comment, Mr. Charpentier re-iterated that the intent of the reporting requirement in the 2001 *Policy* was to maintain accountability by providing annually a list of the projects costing between \$500,000 and \$2-million that had been approved by the AFD (i.e. those projects which had formerly come to the Planning and Budget Committee for consideration but which, under the new *Policy*, would be approved by AFD). However, that intent had not been incorporated accurately into the *Policy*, although discussion on the matter during the development of the *Policy* had been extensive. Mr. Charpentier assured the member that the annual report on AFD approvals that had been provided to the Committee was in line with the spirit of the *Policy*.

Mr. Charpentier also acknowledged that, unfortunately, the error in the amount of the approvals required to be reported to the Committee had been compounded by copying the text of the *Policy* into the revised Terms of Reference of the Planning and Budget Committee approved in 2002. Following the review of the *Policy* in the current governance year, as noted earlier in the meeting by Professor Goel, the Terms of Reference of the Committee would be revised as appropriate.

7. Facilities Renewal Grant: Report on Projects Funded

The Chair commented that members had received for information a report on projects submitted for the one-time-only grant from the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities for facilities renewal. Professor Goel explained that, at the end of the provincial government's 2004-05 fiscal year, institutions had been invited to submit for funding facilities renewal projects that had been paid for during 2004-05 or that could be initiated shortly after June 2005. The University's submission for \$26,020,860 had been funded in its entirety.

² All completed capital projects between \$50,000 and \$2-million, shall be reported annually to the Governing Council through the Planning and Budget Committee.

There were no questions.

8. Barrier Free Access: Annual Report

The Chair reminded members that the standing Committee on Barrier Free Accessibility of the Accommodation and Facilities Directorate was required to report annually to the Planning and Budget Committee.

No questions were raised.

9. Calendar of Business 2005-06

The Chair informed members that the proposed Calendar of Business for the upcoming year had been included in their agenda packages. The Calendar was a living document which 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 (<http://www.utoronto.ca/govcncl/tgc/consolidate05-06.pdf>).

The Chair encouraged all members 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 on the Calendar of Business.

10. Report on Decisions under Summer Executive Authority

The Chair reported that, in 2005, no decisions had been made under Summer Executive Authority that fell within the terms of reference of the Planning and Budget Committee.

11. Other Business

A member asked whether the buildings adjacent to the buildings nearing completion on College Street would be cleaned up once the construction had been completed. Ms Sisam replied that neighbouring buildings would be cleaned up and that the street-scape would be improved.

12. Date of the next Meeting

The Chair reminded members that the next meeting of the Committee was scheduled for Tuesday, November 1, 2005 beginning at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber.

The meeting adjourned at 5:35 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

October 4, 2005