

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

REPORT NUMBER 133 OF THE PLANNING AND BUDGET COMMITTEE

October 28, 2009

To the Academic Board,
University of Toronto

Your Committee reports that it held a meeting on Wednesday, October 28 at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, at which the following were present:

Professor Wendy Rotenberg (In the Chair)
Professor Cheryl Misak, Vice-President and
Provost
Professor Scott Mabury, Vice-Provost,
Academic Operations
Professor Parth Markand Bhatt
Professor Denise Belsham
Mr. Ryan Matthew Campbell
Mr. P. C. Choo
Professor Joseph Desloges
Ms Shirley Hoy
Professor Ronald H. Kluger
Professor Angelo Melino
Professor David Mock
Ms Carole Moore
Mr. W. John Switzer
Dr. Sarita Verma
Mr. Gregory Louis West

Secretariat:
Mr. Neil Dobbs, Deputy Secretary of the
Governing Council
Ms Mae-Yu Tan, Assistant Secretary of the
Governing Council

Regrets:
Professor William Russell Cluett
Professor Jane Gaskell
Dr. Avrum I. Gotlieb
Ms. Tulika Gupta
Professor Andrea Sass-Kortsak

Non-voting Assessors:

Ms. Sally Garner, Executive Director, Planning and Budget
Ms Kim McLean, Chief Administrative Officer, University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC)
Mr. Nadeem Shabbar, Chief Real Estate Officer
Ms Elizabeth Sisam, Assistant Vice-President, Campus and Facilities Planning

In Attendance:

Professor Elizabeth Smyth, Member of Governing Council and Vice-Dean, Programs, School of
Graduate Studies
Mr. Ron Swail, Assistant Vice-President, Facilities and Services
Professor Catharine Whiteside, Dean, Faculty of Medicine and Vice-Provost, Relations with
Health Care Institutions
Professor Lorraine Ferris, Associate Vice Provost, Relations with Health Care Institutions
Professor Robert Baker, Vice-Dean, Research and Graduate Programs, Faculty of Arts and
Science, Faculty of Arts and Science
Professor Allan Borodin, Co-Chair, Professional Masters Committee, Department of Computer
Science, Faculty of Arts and Science
Professor Craig Boutilier, Chair, Department of Computer Science, Faculty of Arts and Science

In Attendance (cont'd)

Professor Chris Damaren, Vice-Dean, Graduate Studies, Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering.

Mr. Andy C. W. Fok, Manager, Electrical Systems and Elevators, Facilities and Services

Mr. Anthony Kern, Manager, Building Mechanical Systems Facilities and Services

Mr. Helmut Krueger, Manager, Central Mechanical Services Facilities and Services

Mr. Zoran Piljevic, Director, Information and Instructional Technology Services, UTSC

ITEMS 5, 6, 7, 13 and 14 ARE RECOMMENDED TO THE ACADEMIC BOARD FOR APPROVAL. ALL OTHER ITEMS ARE REPORTED FOR INFORMATION.

1. Chair's Welcoming Remarks

The Chair welcomed members to the meeting and relayed Dr. Gotlieb's regret at being unable to attend the first meeting of the Committee. She introduced herself and the Senior Assessor, Professor Cheryl Misak, Vice-President and Provost, and she called on members to introduce themselves.

2. Orientation

The Chair provided an overview of the Committee and its function with the use of PowerPoint slides which are appended to this report. During the presentation, the following points were highlighted:

Structure of the Governing Council and its Boards and Committees

- The Planning & Budget Committee was a standing committee of the Academic Board. It was the entry level of governance for a number of major items.
- The Committee was responsible for carefully reviewing the matters brought before it, before making a recommendation for approval to the Academic Board.

Budget

- With respect to budget matters, the Committee had broad responsibility for the overall allocation of university funds.

Capital Projects

- Projects in excess of \$2 million - The *Policy on Capital Planning and Capital Projects* required that all capital projects with a projected cost of more than \$2 million be approved by the Governing Council on the recommendation of the Planning and Budget Committee and the Academic Board. The Committee 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.
- Projects less than \$2 million - The Accommodation and Facilities Directorate (AFD) had authority to approve capital projects with an expected cost of less than \$ 2 million. The Planning and Budget Committee received an annual report of those projects from the AFD. The annual AFD report for the 2008-2009 Academic Year was scheduled to be presented to the Committee at its meeting on January 18, 2010.

2. Orientation (cont'd)

New Academic Programs

- While the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs made recommendations concerning the academic content and requirements of new academic programs, the Planning and Budget Committee considered the planning and resource implications of such proposals.
- The Academic Board then considered the proposed program on the recommendation of both standing committees and in turn recommended the proposal for approval to the Governing Council.

The Chair noted that additional information about the Committee's areas of responsibility was available in its Terms of Reference, which had been included in the agenda packages distributed to the members. She encouraged members to become familiar with the Terms so that the Committee's deliberations could be focused appropriately.

3. Report of the Previous Meeting (May 7, 2009)

Report Number 132 of the meeting of May 7, 2009 was approved.

4. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting

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

5. Non-Hospital Clinical Site Template Agreement

Professor Misak introduced the proposal for the Non-Hospital Clinical Site Template Agreement that was outlined in her memorandum dated September 28, 2009. She stated that the proposed template agreement was designed to ensure consistency with respect to definitions and issues such as responsibility for employment and academic matters. Professor Misak stressed the need for a template agreement that was comparable to the hospital template agreement.

Professor Cathy Whiteside, Dean of the Faculty of Medicine and Vice-Provost, Relations with Health Care Institutions, said that the template agreement had been created through the team effort of staff within the University's legal counsel, the Office of the Vice-President and Provost, the Faculty of Medicine, and colleagues at the partner institutions. She noted that health professional students required learning experiences in the community beyond the affiliated hospitals. The application of the proposed template would fall into two categories: (1) to update or renew existing relationships with organizations, such as the one with Toronto Public Health, and (2) to create new opportunities for relationships with other non-hospital clinical sites, such as the Ontario Agency for Health Protection and Promotion. The alternative to the template agreement would be that each of the professional programs would have to craft an individual agreement with each site on an annual basis. Such an approach would be quite labour-intensive and would not provide a framework that was as robust as the template agreement. Professor Whiteside thanked Professor Ferris, Associate Vice Provost, Relations with Health Care Institutions, for her leadership in the preparation of the template agreement.

In response to a member's question regarding whether each agreement would have to be brought to the Governing Council for approval, Professor Misak explained that her office would approve each final agreement; the signed agreements would be filed with the Office of the Governing

5. Non-Hospital Clinical Site Template Agreement

(cont'd)

Council.

A member inquired about the meaning of “conform” in the proposed motion. Professor Whiteside advised that each non-hospital clinical site would have a separate agreement, which would be subject to negotiation. The template agreement established the University’s requirements. If the partners proposed substantive changes, her office would seek the advice of the Office of the Vice-President and Provost and legal counsel to determine whether or not further governance approval would be required. In response to the member’s follow-up inquiry as to whether the language was too restricting, Professor Whiteside responded that the language was quite acceptable to the majority of the non-hospital clinical sites.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

- (1) THAT the template for non-hospital clinical site agreements with the University of Toronto, a copy of which is attached hereto as [Appendix “A”](#), be approved, effective immediately;
- (2) THAT the Vice-President and Provost, or designate, be authorized to sign such agreements on behalf of the Governing Council, provided that the agreements conform to the approved template; and
- (3) THAT the agreements signed under the provisions of this resolution be filed with the Secretary of Governing Council.

6. Capital Project: Utilities Infrastructure Upgrade for St. George Campus

Mr. Swail introduced the proposal for the Utilities Infrastructure Upgrade for the St. George Campus Capital Project that was outlined in his memorandum dated October 8, 2009. He advised the Committee that upgrades were required to the St. George campus district energy system, which provided most of the 120 buildings on the St. George campus with electricity, heat, and chilled water. He explained that district energy systems were designed to be extremely efficient and to require far less maintenance, equipment, and labour than alternative systems.

Mr. Swail said that, due to growing consumption, the electrical loop that serviced the Medical Sciences Building (MSB) and the Sandford Fleming Building (SFB) was typically at capacity. The proposed project would provide the MSB with an individual feed so that the building could be removed from the existing loop. Such a process would provide electrical capacity to the MSB in the future and would also benefit the SFB and the Galbraith Building (GGB). The cost estimate for this part of the proposed project was \$5 million.

Mr. Swail explained that the second part of the proposed project involved obtaining an additional chiller at the southeast chiller plant. This need had developed as a consequence of internal growth requirements at the 15 buildings served by the facility. The cost estimate for this part of the proposed project was \$3.55 million.

The third part of the project would entail upgrades at the central steam plant to its water aeration system and emergency oil tanks.

6. Capital Project: Utilities Infrastructure Upgrade for St. George Campus (cont'd)

The proposed project had been included in the budget submission last year, in the hope of securing federal stimulus funding. However, such funding had not been obtained. Accordingly, funding of the total cost estimate of \$11.2 million would be provided partially through a loan and partially through the utilities budget.

Noting the assumption of current interest rates for a loan that was stated in the proposal on page 7, a member asked whether that was realistic. Mr. Swail and Mr. Shabbar clarified that rates were normally fixed for a twenty-five-year term.

In response to a member's question, Mr. Swail advised that the annual loan payment estimate of \$720,000 represented a small percentage of the annual utilities budget of approximately \$47 million for the St. George campus. He noted that although the utilities infrastructure renewal reserve fund was referred to as a "reserve fund", it had been fully expended in past years to support ongoing systems upgrades. The fund was projected to increase from \$2.5 million to \$3.5 million this year, and the additional \$1 million would be contributed to the proposed project for the next five years to reduce the loan amount.

In response to a member's question about the useful life of the assets to be installed, Mr. Swail stated that the chillers had lasted for over 40 years. The oil tanks were quite old, the boilers in the steam plant were from the 1950s but continued to work well, and the electrical loops were expected to last a long time.

A member suggested that the proposed upgrades were directly attributable to the construction of the Donnelly Centre for Cellular and Biomolecular Research (CCBR) and the Leslie L. Dan Pharmacy Building. He said that, in his view, the costs associated with any upgrades and air conditioning should have been assessed and attributed to those buildings prior to their construction, rather than requiring other divisions on campus to share the costs. Mr. Swail denied that the CCBR was the reason that a new chiller was required in the south east quadrant of the campus. He stated that the CCBR's air conditioning requirements had already been accommodated for several years. The continuous increase in consumption of between 0.75% and 1.5% of buildings throughout the entire the St. George campus was the reason the upgrades were required. There were few buildings on the St. George campus with separate distributed systems, as that would be very inefficient. The existing district energy system was far more efficient. Mr. Swail did acknowledge that when buildings were constructed, some separate equipment such as direct connect electrical feeds might be required, and such costs would be included in the project planning reports.

In response to a member's question as to whether there would be spare capacity after the completion of the proposed upgrades, Mr. Swail replied that the MSB would have tremendous capacity. There would also be enormous capacity in the GBB and the SFB resulting from the removal of MSB from the electrical loop. The upgrades would also generate sufficient capacity in the steam plants and if necessary, equipment could be added to the chiller plant in the future. If ultimate capacity was reached, buildings could be removed from the central system and a direct connection could be made to Toronto Hydro. That approach had been used in the past for buildings such as the Bahen Centre for Information Technology. The extra capacity could then be redistributed. There was a plan for capacity for all three components of the proposed project.

6. Capital Project: Utilities Infrastructure Upgrade for St. George Campus
(cont'd)

A member suggested that it would be beneficial for future reference to examine the reason that government infrastructure funding had not been secured for the proposed project.

A member commented that the strong Canadian currency relative to the American currency might result in a cost reduction for the proposed project. He suggested that this might be an opportune time for the University to purchase the necessary equipment while the Canadian currency was strong. Mr. Swail advised that the new chiller would be sourced from the United States, but the cost of the equipment was only one component of the total cost.

In response to a member's question, Mr. Swail advised that a major review of the University's energy system had been conducted by a consultant four years ago, and the conclusion had been that it was well managed, well maintained, and in a good state of repair. However, many upgrades would be required going forward and the utilities infrastructure renewal reserve fund had been established to accommodate the upgrades. Due to budgetary constraints, the reserve fund had not grown to an anticipated level, and that was one reason for the current proposal.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the Utilities Infrastructure Renewal program of projects be approved, at a cost not to exceed \$11.232 million, with funding as follows:

- \$5 million from utilities infrastructure renewal funds and the balance a loan to be repaid by increasing the annual utilities budget by \$720,000.

Documentation is attached hereto as [Appendix "B"](#).

7. Capital Project: Project Planning Report for UTSC South Campus Data Centre

Ms Sisam introduced the proposal for the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC) South Campus Data Centre Capital Project that was outlined in her memorandum dated October 9, 2009. She advised that UTSC's existing data centre was under-accommodating the current activities and necessary computer business systems on the campus. The data centre operated and drove the core administrative and academic business processes, including the Administrative Management Systems (AMS), the Repository of Student Information (ROSI), and the Learning Management Systems (LMS). Since the construction of the data centre in 1997, there had been a tremendous amount of expansion of the campus, with a 38% increase in space and a 97% increase in enrollment, so there was a clear need for an expanded centre.

The proposed project, which was valued at \$3.9 million, comprised 182 square meters of new construction on the roof of the Academic Resource Centre. Following the development of the new facility, the vacated space would be used to accommodate other academic activities. The proposed expanded centre would also be sized to accommodate additional facilities that might be required by the St. George and Mississauga campuses, in consultation with Office of the Chief Information Officer which had been engaged in the development of the project proposal.

7. Capital Project: Project Planning Report for UTSC South Campus Data Centre
(cont'd)

In response to members' questions, Ms Sisam and Ms McLean clarified that the project estimate and proposal included the cost of construction of the new facility as well as all new equipment that would be required for a new server room. The old equipment in the current data centre would eventually be moved to a planned north campus facility. Future anticipated growth of the south campus had also been taken into account when planning the proposed facility.

A member sought clarification of the reason for incorporating the phrase "in principle" in the motion. Ms Sisam responded that it had been the practice within governance to employ that phrase to eliminate the need to seek further approval from the Committee in the event of a non-substantive change to the project planning report. For example, on occasion marginal changes in space requirements were needed. If the Committee recommended approval of the Report to the Academic Board, the proposal would then be forwarded to the Business Board for approval of the implementation and expenditure of the funds subject to approval by the Governing Council.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

- (1) THAT the Project Planning Report for the University of Toronto at Scarborough Data Centre, a copy of which is attached hereto as [Appendix "C"](#), be approved in principle.
- (2) THAT the project scope, comprising new construction of 182 square meters on the roof of the Academic Resources Centre at a total project cost of \$3,904,000.00 be approved with the full funding from the University of Toronto at Scarborough.

8. Capital Project: Biozone: Bioengineering Research Facility – Project Planning Committee Terms of Reference

9. Capital Project: Centre for Microsatellite Science and Technology – Project Planning Committee Terms of Reference

10. Capital Project: Centre for Collaborative Digital Media – Project Planning Committee Terms of Reference

Items 8, 9 and 10 were presented concurrently by Ms Sisam for the Committee's information. She advised that the terms of reference established the project planning committees, which were being formed to address awards that had been made or identified through the Canada Foundation for Innovation and to prepare the project planning reports that would be presented for approval in January, 2010.

11. Capital Project: Relocation of the Department of Family and Community Medicine (DFCM) – Project Planning Committee Terms of Reference*

Ms Sisam advised that the current premises of the Department of Family and Community Medicine located at 263 McCaul Street were inadequate to meet its needs. The project planning committee would review a temporary relocation and then a full relocation to consolidate the department at 500 University Avenue, which was presently occupied by the Faculty of Medicine. The project planning report was expected to be completed by December, 2009.

12. Academic Planning in the Context of *Towards 2030*

Professor Misak referred to the broad planning exercise that the University had recently undertaken. The resulting *Towards 2030* document was broad and far reaching, encompassing much more than just academic matters. Professor Misak stated that faculties and divisions would need to prepare academic plans that would address matters such as their academic programs, academic and non-academic staffing levels, strengths, weaknesses, and proposed improvements.

In the past, faculties and divisions had simultaneously prepared their plans approximately every five years, following the distribution of a major academic planning document such as *Stepping Up*. However, synchronized academic planning across the University was no longer feasible or desirable. It was preferable for a division in the process of a decanal search to delay developing its academic plan until a new dean had taken office, or an existing dean had been reappointed for an additional term. This new model of academic planning would also ensure that the Office of the Vice-President and Provost could focus on each plan as it was submitted, rather than attempting to review numerous plans during a short period of time.

Professor Misak stated that *Towards 2030* would be the guide for the University's academic planning over the next five to seven years and plans of each faculty and division should be consistent with that document. The Office of the Vice-President and Provost had established many quantitative and qualitative measures that faculties and divisions could use for their self-assessments. Reviewers would also use similar measures when assessing a faculty or a division. Extensive consultation about the new model of academic planning had occurred, and the divisional leaders had unanimously expressed support.

**13. School of Graduate Studies and Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering:
Master of Engineering in Telecommunications – Program Closure**

Ms Garner introduced the proposal for the closure of the Master of Engineering in Telecommunications program that was outlined in her memorandum dated October 15, 2009. She advised that the proposal had been approved by the Applied Science and Engineering Faculty Council and the School of Graduate Studies Graduate Education Council, and it had been recommended for approval by the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs. Ms Garner noted that there were no students currently enrolled in the program; enrollment had been declining over the past few years. There were no financial implications for the Faculty or the University.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

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

THAT the proposal from the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering and School of Graduate Studies to close the Master of Engineering in Telecommunications (M.Eng.Tel.) program, a copy of which is attached hereto as [Appendix "D"](#), be approved, effective immediately.

14. School of Graduate Studies and Faculty of Arts and Science: Master of Science in Applied Computing

Ms Garner introduced the proposal for the establishment of a two-year Master of Science in Applied Computing (M.Sc.A.C.) program that was outlined in her memorandum dated October 15, 2009¹. She stated that the program would consist of two terms of course work and one term of a compulsory internship. The Faculty of Arts and Science and the Department of Computer Science had conducted extensive consultations to ensure there would be demand for the proposed program. Input had been sought from students, members of the profession, the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies, and various divisions within the University, including the Faculty of Information and the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering. The budget for the proposed program had been reviewed by the Planning and Budget Office. Ms Garner noted that the Basic Income Unit (BIU) level of funding from the government was approved, and the Planning and Budget Office was comfortable that the proposed program would be self-funding, given the revenue and cost projections.

Professor Robert Baker, Vice-Dean, Research and Graduate Programs, Faculty of Arts and Science, advised that the proposed professional graduate-level program was not designed to increase the total number of Masters students in the Faculty of Arts and Science. Rather, it was expected that the introduction of the program would slightly reduce the number of students in the doctoral stream masters program. Professor Baker explained that the program would begin with a small cohort of six students; the goal was to engage the best students and to develop a positive reputation for the program from the outset. The Department of Computer Science and the Faculty of Arts and Science had committed to providing all necessary resources for the program, which was projected to be self-funded within the first year.

In response to a member's comment, clarification was provided about the proposed program requirement of translating a novel research idea into practice. Students themselves would not be expected to generate the novel research idea. However, they would have to be familiar with research and computer science techniques in order to translate the ideas into practice under the joint supervision of an associate in the industry and a research faculty member.

A member asked whether the industry supervisor would be provided with a stipend. Professor Boutilier responded that they would not; in the Department's experience, research labs and companies were usually pleased to work with highly qualified graduate students from the University of Toronto. The program's budget, however, did allow for a stipend to be paid to sessional instructors.

A member suggested that the M.Sc.A.C. program appeared inconsistent with the University's graduate enrollment policy, given that it was expected to result in a reduction of the number of doctoral-stream students in the Department. Professor Baker explained that a number of current students in the doctoral-stream masters program did not intend to pursue research or academia. Rather, they preferred to work in the industry upon completion of their program. This proposed program would be more suitable for such students. The expected reduction of students in the Department's doctoral-stream masters program would be compensated by the enrolment of students in the proposed program, and it was anticipated that the number of doctoral students would remain at a steady state.

¹ Secretary's Note: The correct amount of the steady state projected revenue from tuition (noted on page 2 of Ms Garner's memorandum) is \$350,000. The amount of \$889,000 was included in error.

14. School of Graduate Studies and Faculty of Arts and Science: Master of Science in Applied Computing

(cont'd)

A member expressed concern about the possible confusion between the name of the proposed Master of Science in Applied Computing degree and other similarly named degrees, such as the Master of Applied Science and Engineering. Professor Boutilier acknowledged that some dissatisfaction with respect to the degree name had been expressed, but the Department had been advised that it would be best to proceed with the proposed name at this time.

Members commented on the details of the budget for the proposed program and the resources required for its operation. Professor Mabury assured the Committee that the Department possessed the human resources necessary to successfully support the program.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried, with one member abstaining

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

THAT the establishment of the proposed Master of Science in Applied Computing (M.Sc.A.C.) program within the Faculty of Arts and Science, be approved, commencing September 2010.

Documentation is attached hereto as Appendix "E".

15. Senior Assessor's Report

Professor Misak spoke to the fact that the University's negotiations with the sessional instructors who belonged to the Canadian Union of Public Employees (CUPE) local 3902, Unit 3, was ongoing. Depending on the outcome of the discussions, there would be various financial and other implications to the University. The Office of the Vice-President and Provost was working very hard, negotiating in good faith, and it was hopeful for a resolution. However, a Program Continuity Group that had already been established, was working to ensure that students would be able to complete their programs with minimal negative effect in the event of labour action. Governance bodies of the University, including the Committee, would be kept apprised of any developments.

A member expressed concern about an H1N1 influenza virus outbreak and possible absences, work disruptions, and financial implications that might arise. Professor Misak advised that there had been ongoing planning for an H1N1 outbreak. The Program Continuity Group had been working hard to ensure that, in the event a significant number of students and faculty members were suddenly absent from classes, programs would continue. No major financial implications were anticipated. A member asked whether there was a possibility that the province might compensate the University for expenses related to an H1N1 outbreak. Professor Misak stated that there had been no such indication. She added that the University had been planning since last year for H1N1, and some Ontario universities had adopted the University's planning documents.

A member stressed the importance of offering supplemental final examinations for students who missed final examinations due to illness. Professor Misak advised that the provision of supplemental examinations had been one of the strongest recommendations offered by the

15. Senior Assessor's Report

(cont'd)

Program Continuity Group. That recommendation had been delivered to and received by the faculties and divisions, and it was her understanding that supplemental examinations were now in place across the University. If, at the end of the current term, it was determined that they had not been offered, her office would work with the appropriate division to implement them for the future.

16. Calendar of Business 2009-2010

The Chair noted that the proposed Calendar of Business for 2009-2010, included in the agenda package to members, was an item for information and advised members that it was a living document, updated following each agenda planning meeting and again after each Committee meeting. Members were encouraged to review the Calendar carefully.

17. Report on Decisions under Summer Executive Authority

The Chair reported that no decisions that fell within the Committee's Terms of Reference had been made under the Summer Executive Authority in 2009.

18. Date of Next Meeting – Wednesday, November 25, 2009, 4:10 p.m.

The Chair reminded members that the next meeting of the Committee was scheduled for Wednesday, November 25, 2009 at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber.

19. Other Business

There were no items of other business.

The meeting adjourned at 5:20 p.m.

Secretary
October 29, 2009

Chair