

**UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO**

**THE GOVERNING COUNCIL**

**REPORT NUMBER 163 OF THE PLANNING AND BUDGET COMMITTEE**

**October 29, 2014**

To the Academic Board,  
University of Toronto

Your Committee reports that it held a meeting on October 29, 2014 at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, at which the following were present:

Professor Benjamin Alarie, Vice-Chair (In the Chair)  
Professor Cheryl Reghr, Vice-President and Provost  
Professor Scott Mabury, Vice-President, University Operations  
Professor Suzanne Conklin Akbari  
Mr. David Norris Bowden  
Ms Caitlin Campisi  
Mr. Dylan Alexandre Chauvin-Smith  
Professor Joseph R. Desloges  
Ms Rachael Ferenbok  
Ms Susan Froom  
Ms Sally Garner, Executive Director, Planning and Budget  
Professor Jim Lai  
Professor Amy Mullin  
Professor Lacra Pavel

**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, Planning and Budget Committee

**Regrets**

Professor Eric Bredo  
Professor Maria Cristina Cuervo  
Professor Bart J. Harvey  
Professor Elizabeth Smyth  
Professor Steven J. Thorpe (Chair)

**In Attendance:**

Ms Lucy Chung, Director of Infrastructure Planning, Faculty of Arts and Science  
Professor John Coleman, Department of Cell and Systems Biology  
Professor Don Jackson, Chair, Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology  
Professor Ira Jacobs, Dean, Faculty of Kinesiology and Physical Education  
Professor Allan Kaplan, Vice-Dean, Graduate and Life Sciences Education  
Ms Kim McLean, Chief Administrative Officer, Faculty of Arts and Science  
Professor Helene Polatajko – Associate Chair, Graduate Department of Rehabilitation Sciences  
Professor Jay Pratt, Vice-Dean Research and Infrastructure, Faculty of Arts and Science  
Ms Archana Sridhar, Assistant Provost  
Professor Vincent Tropepe, Director, Human Biology Program

ITEMS 3 AND 4 ARE RECOMMENDED TO THE ACADEMIC BOARD FOR APPROVAL. ALL OTHER ITEMS ARE REPORTED FOR INFORMATION

ITEM 9 WAS CONSIDERED *IN CAMERA*.

### **1. Chair's Welcoming Remarks**

The Chair welcomed members and guests to the meeting.

### **2. Senior Assessor's Report**

The Provost commented on the following:

#### Research Funding

- We are still waiting to hear about the process for newly-announced Canada First Research Excellence Fund. In September 2014, the Provost's Group within the American Association of Universities (AAU) – an association of the leading research universities in the United States and Canada including the University of Toronto and McGill University – had received an update on research funding from the National Institutes of Health (NIH). The pressure remained to procure research grants in a climate of increasing competition for funding from both NIH and CIHR.

#### Budget Review Process

- The Office of the Provost and the Planning and Budget Office had commenced the annual meetings with divisional heads across the University to look at the aspirations, resources, and expenses for each with a goal of preparing the annual University operating budget.

#### The Goldring Centre for High Performance Sport

- The Goldring Centre for High Performance Sport was officially inaugurated on October 27, 2014, at a well-attended ceremony. The Provost congratulated Dean Jacobs and his team on the addition of the new facility, which was a major landmark for the University community. The University would leverage support from various sources to provide access programs for the broader community at this facility.

#### University Rankings

- The University had been placed 14<sup>th</sup> in the latest *U.S. News and World Report* rankings in the category of Best Global Universities. The University remained the highest ranked Canadian university in a number of international university ranking reports. The Provost noted that this provided a good indicator that the University continued to do well in meeting its goals and academic mission.

3. **Faculty of Medicine: Proposal to Establish the Graduate Department of Rehabilitation Sciences renamed the Rehabilitation Sciences Institute as an Extra-Departmental Unit B (EDU: B)**

Ms Sally Garner presented the highlights of the proposal to establish the Graduate Department of Rehabilitation Sciences renamed the Rehabilitation Sciences Institute as an Extra-Departmental Unit B (EDU: B).

Professor Kaplan said that it had been recognized in the budgetary planning for the proposed Institute that the Director would require appropriate administrative support. A parallel process would soon begin to integrate the Department of Speech-Language Pathology within this Institute by 2015-16. Professor Polatajko noted that, with this addition, there would be approximately one hundred students and an equal number of faculty associated with the Institute by 2015-2016. A question was asked about the consultations for this proposal for which information would be provided at the following meeting of the Academic Board.

On a motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

**YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS**

THAT the proposal to establish the Graduate Department of Rehabilitation Science renamed the Rehabilitation Sciences Institute as an Extra-Departmental Unit B be approved effective January 1, 2015.

4. **Capital Project: Ramsay Wright Building Teaching Laboratories Upgrades – Revisions to the Report of the Project Planning Committee, Project Scope, and Sources of Funding**

Ms Christine Burke presented an overview of the memorandum dated October 15, 2014 from Professor Mabury highlighting upgrades to the Ramsay Wright Building Teaching Laboratories.

Professor Mabury and representatives from the Faculty of Arts and Science stressed the importance of this project and the fact that it would lead to greater efficiencies in the usage of the teaching laboratories. They noted that the renovations would bring the teaching laboratories up to current health and safety codes, and that the Ramsay Wright building was over fifty years old. The modular redesign of these laboratories would enable greater flexibility in terms of class sizes for the departments accessing these facilities. It was emphasized that there would be improvements in the quality of the student experience as a result of the proposed upgrades. The escalation in costs from those in the original project planning report had resulted primarily from the increase in the amount of mechanical and electrical infrastructure work that was required than originally anticipated, and from design changes that incorporated the use of a “lab module” commonly used in contemporary lab planning which would allow for a more efficient and flexible use of space.

#### 4. **Capital Project: Ramsay Wright Building Teaching Laboratories Upgrades – Revisions to the Report of the Project Planning Committee, Project Scope, and Sources of Funding** (contd.)

##### *Discussion*

- A member expressed her support for the long-overdue renovations to the teaching laboratories. She asked whether the health and safety requirements being proposed in the revised report had been included in the original project planning report; and would these renovations address the concerns about the presence of mold in the building?

Professor Mabury replied that there had been some recent changes to the health and safety code which would be addressed through these renovations. These changes included the availability of non-life safety emergency power. Where possible, the University maximized renovations to address deferred maintenance matters. In this instance, a ‘knock-on effect’ of the renovations would result in a greater number of showers, along with the sufficient number of eyewash stations already in place. The matter of mold remediation would be addressed through deferred maintenance along with any issues related to the removal of asbestos from the facility.

- A member asked whether the proposed renovations would match the existing curriculum, and be adaptable to rapidly evolving scientific fields. Would these laboratories then serve a hub for the various departments of life sciences?

Professor Mabury said that the goal of any renovations would be to ensure that not only would current needs be met, but that the space would be adaptable and nimble for future requirements. Professor Jackson said that the renovations were a welcome change for all the departments involved because they shared common elements for laboratorial needs and Professor Coleman noted that the renovations would create synergies between the various life science departments. It was also noted that much-needed air-conditioning would result from the renovations to the laboratories. Most importantly, the ability to provide smaller laboratory sizes would result in a better student experience. Professor Pratt said that the renovated space would allow for the creation of behavioral neuroscience research groups. Renovations to the laboratories at the Ramsay Wright building would lead to a higher student intake and the ability to teach a greater number of courses.

- The Committee was informed that during the renovations, the laboratory sections would be relocated to the facilities at the Earth Sciences building. A member asked whether the facilities at the Earth Sciences were under-utilized.

Professor Pratt noted that the laboratories in the Earth Sciences building were in great demand. The renovations in the Ramsay Wright building would serve as a release valve for space to be re-purposed at the Earth Sciences building.

**4. Capital Project: Ramsay Wright Building Teaching Laboratories Upgrades – Revisions to the Report of the Project Planning Committee, Project Scope, and Sources of Funding (contd.)**

- A member asked if renovations to the basement of the Ramsay Wright building will be done at a later date.

Professor Pratt said that efforts would continue to procure funds for the renovation of the basement area of the Ramsay Wright building. Professor Jackson added that renovations and changes would allow for the better usage of the facility.

On a motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

**YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS**

1. THAT the Revised Project Planning Committee Report for the Ramsay Wright Building Teaching Laboratories Upgrades, dated October 8, 2014, be approved in principle; and
2. THAT the total project scope of approximately 4,650 gross square metres (gsm) (approximately 3,514 net assignable square metres (nasm)), to be funded by the Faculty of Arts and Science, Graduate Expansion Funds and financing, be approved in principle.

**5. [Report of the Previous Meeting \(September 17, 2014\)](#)**

Report Number 162 (September 17, 2014) 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. Date of Next Meeting**

The Chair reminded members that the next meeting would be on Wednesday, January 14, 2015, at 4:10 p.m.

**8. Other Business**

There were no items of other business.

*IN CAMERA SESSION*

**9. Capital Project: Ramsay Wright Building Teaching Laboratories Upgrades – Revisions to the Report of the Project Planning Committee, Total Project Cost and Sources of Funding**

On a motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the Vice President, University Operations' recommendation, as outlined in the memorandum dated October 15, 2014, be approved.

The meeting adjourned at 5:20 p.m.

---

Secretary

---

Chair

November 5, 2014