

# Destination Project Phase II

## GOVERNANCE & CONSULTATION

April 2024



### Contents

---

HISTORY .....	2
MOVING FORWARD .....	2
DESTINATION PROJECT PHASE II .....	3
University Hall Facility Rehabilitation Plan.....	3
Campus Interiors Master Plan.....	4
NARRATIVE DEVELOPMENT .....	6
PROJECT RISKS.....	7
MANAGEMENT AND PLANNING TEAM STRUCTURE .....	8
Role of the Co-Project Sponsors.....	8
Role of the Destination Phase II Project Steering Committee .....	9
Shared Roles of Academic Lead and Facility Lead.....	10
Role of Facilities and Facility Project Lead .....	11
Role of Academic Lead .....	12
STEERING COMMITTEE.....	12
General Faculties Council Motions.....	12
Capital Projects Governance .....	13
Membership and Terms of Reference.....	15

---

## HISTORY

---

In 2012, a Campus Master Plan was completed. This master plan is a high-level site plan oriented analysis of how this campus is arranged, where building locations and functions are broadly presented as a map to the future. The value of this master plan document cannot be overstated, as it was instrumental in creating discussion points to aide in decision making with respect to Science Commons' location, massing, and integration into the campus as a whole.

Following the Campus Master Plan, the Destination Project Phase I key parameters were established. This document was the prelude to the extensive processes that resulted in Science Commons, being completed and fully operational in 2019.

Phase II of the Destination Project has historically been conceptualized around the vacated space in University Hall. This was the direct result of a Destination Project Phase II visioning and programming process that was completed in 2014. Much of this programming made assumptions as to what **might** transpire during the design process of Science Commons and was focused on functional programming issues that were pertinent at that time.

The work done during this visioning and preliminary planning process represented a broad view of the institutional goals and realities of that time. Generally, the relevance of a preliminary functional program is time sensitive and should be a forward-looking document. For that reason. It is important to note that, unless a formal design process is undertaken immediately after program development, the program becomes less relevant as newly emerging issues are not taken into account.

---

## MOVING FORWARD

---

The space vacated in University Hall by relocating science laboratories, departments and employees to Science Commons represents a unique opportunity to reorganize campus and respond to new challenges. Since 2014, there have been considerable changes in the institutional landscape. In the aftermath of the pandemic, the current economic climate, and newly emerging needs of the campus community, now is an opportune time to undertake a new master planning cycle.

Much of the University Hall preliminary program was done through the lens of what **might** transpire through the addition of Science Commons. This preliminary program indicated opportunities to improve space quality and allocation amongst stakeholders who remained in place after the move to Science Commons. Considering the actual development of Science Commons, the time lapsed since 2014 and the considerable change in our institutional and social fabric since the pandemic, **it is imperative that we revisit, if not re-perform, the University Hall program**, while remaining committed to foregrounding renewed campus space for teaching, learning, research, and creative activity across the arts, humanities, and social sciences.

Additionally, as the cycle of renewed **Strategic, Academic, Research and People Plans** advances, new challenges are sure to emerge that could be addressed through a comprehensive space program and plan. Ideally, this results in incremental movement towards the longer-term goal of a revitalized University Hall *and* strategically organized campus interiors.

---

---

## DESTINATION PROJECT PHASE II

---

Destination Project Phase II has long been characterized as the revitalization of University Hall. While University Hall is long overdue for a major renewal, there is also the added challenge of aligning the many programmatic priorities, whether they be longstanding or have emerged since 2014.

Facilities and the Campus Development Office recommend that the Destination Project Phase II be advanced as an initiative that takes a broader, more holistic look at our campus space allocations and the rare opportunity the vacated space in University Hall represents. A broader reorganization that creates strategic and properly placed space revisions campus wide vs. simply filling the vacated spaces without a cohesive strategy. A restructured University Hall must focus on and adhere to the principles of meaningful and appropriate assignment of space, such that maximum benefit is achieved across the institution. The realignment of University Hall space may well impact and suggest reprogramming of other spaces on campus.

**Planning for Destination Project II involves two substantial deliverables, advancing in parallel:**

### University Hall Facility Rehabilitation Plan

While there are established renewal and maintenance funding streams and project strategies for University Hall, they are often focused on single systems or components, and work is often undertaken alongside capital renovations initiated by programmatic changes. This has created a patchwork of renovated interior spaces with mostly superficial improvements to core building systems leaving substantial parts of University Hall with failing and/or aged out infrastructure. It is logical that as academic constituents are engaged in big picture programming discussions, a parallel technical planning exercise is launched that is focused on creating a building wide physical infrastructure renewal.

Aligned with this infrastructure renewal process, we will have a unique opportunity to create a building wide sustainability strategy. In this process we must advance our institutional environmental mandate in the areas of energy efficiency, water conservation, indoor environmental quality, and waste reduction among others. Similar to the building's iconic architecture, our infrastructure retrofit of University Hall must embody our public commitment to sustainable facilities leadership and innovation. Regardless of the programming outcomes of the Interiors Master Plan, University Hall has numerous documented deficiencies that must be addressed in order for the building to serve the institution for the next 50 years.

**Considerable work has been completed that feeds into this building renewal strategy:**

#### University Hall Structural Analysis, 2020 - Current:

Historically, University Hall has suffered from structural challenges and deficiencies. The source of these can be attributed to the original design and construction of the building, subsequent changes in adjacent soils, and adjacent campus development. Exterior landscape failures are evident, and over the course of the past 50 years, interior structural beams and columns have undergone numerous upgrades. Throughout the entire life of University Hall, there have been ongoing structural monitoring programs consisting of surveying, measuring, and analysing building movement.

Facilities has engaged structural engineers to study the ongoing structural issues and to create a strategy that will ensure the building will conform to current codes. Current codes are considerably more stringent with respect to seismic factors, as well as floor and wind loading. **The early outputs from this study indicate a significant structural risk and associated costs to ensure the longevity and safety of the building.**

#### University Hall Mechanical and Electrical (M&E) Infrastructure Assessment, 2022

A consulting team was engaged to complete a building wide assessment of the base building M&E systems. Along with the physical assessment, an energy analysis and sustainability outlook were also performed. This report outlines a number of strategies to improve energy conservation as well as consumption in University Hall. This study is completed and includes a high-level cost analysis and execution strategy.

#### Building Code, Building Envelope, Fire Compartmentalization, and Precast Exteriors, Pre-2019

A number of assessments of individual building aspects have been completed over the past decade. From these reports Facilities has implemented numerous building upgrades, and in most cases, has focused on improvements that enhance occupant safety as a first order priority. Due to low levels of maintenance funding and complexities of upgrading a fully occupied building, improvements that would bolster energy efficiency, occupant comfort, sustainability improvements, and systems reliability have often been deferred.

#### *Recommendation*

*A consulting team consisting of architecture, mechanical, electrical, structural, building code and related professionals must be engaged to coalesce these various technical reports into a singular design and execution plan. A cost consultant should also be engaged at this step to ensure a well-developed cost plan. To capture capital funding for the rehabilitation of University Hall, the technical plan must be advanced as far as possible towards a “shovel ready” project. This consulting team will report to and work with the Academic and Facility Leads.*

## Campus Interiors Master Plan

A **Campus Interiors Master Plan** is essential to inform the overall campus long-range space strategy, and will, in turn, guide the allocation of current and future space allocations in University Hall. **It is important to recognize that this process should not be about simply assigning any and all vacant campus space. Rather, it must be embraced as an opportunity to study how space can serve and support the goals of renewed Strategic, Academic, Research and People Plans.**

**A Campus Interiors Master Plan will establish high level strategies across campus for:**

- i. Consolidation of fragmented units and identification of opportunities to create space adjacencies along functional relationships
- ii. Identify units that have space constraints due to incremental program growth
- iii. Identify opportunities to innovate our space strategies for learners, instructors, and researchers of the future.
- iv. Creation of wellness centric spaces to improve social and wellbeing opportunities for students and employees

- 
- v. Improve opportunities for K-12 & community engagement
  - vi. Reorganize and revitalize teaching & research spaces to improve utilization, shared capacity, and high quality in-person, remote or hybrid student experiences
  - vii. Creation of transdisciplinary academic spaces that are flexible, generic, and adaptable
  - viii. Student study and collaboration spaces
  - ix. Creation of emergency response planning and action spaces
  - x. Promote flexible, adaptable, and generic space development to reduce future renovations costs
  - xi. Optimize service, storage, and operational spaces
  - xii. Integrated opportunities with the City of Lethbridge, other institutions, and the community
  - xiii. Promote application of space allocation metrics, and creation of forward thinking, economical space allocation/management strategies

### **Recommendation**

#### ***Establishment of a Destination Project – Phase II Steering Committee.***

In a parallel process to the University Hall Facility Rehabilitation Plan, a strategy must be advanced to establish a set of parameters by which space allocation and programming can be based upon. The process can only succeed with full endorsement of the institution's leadership. Without their strong engagement, the process will lack focus, credibility, and value. Further, the process must embody Leadership's aspirations for the University and connect strongly to the renewed institutional plans.

Central to the implementation of this plan is the selection of a Destination Project II Steering Committee. This committee, sponsored by the senior vice presidents, will be responsible for the "big picture" management of the overall project. They will be responsible for ensuring the project mandate is carried out and that the overall goals are being accomplished. At times, it will be necessary to direct the process when the inevitable conflicts arise. It will be their role to ensure a well-planned process is in place that will facilitate discussion and promote clarity of views when consensus cannot be reached. To ensure key milestone dates are met, they will be required to step in and resolve these issues in a sensitive but decisive manner.

It is imperative that a competent and well-resourced planning consulting team is engaged to lead this complex process forward. The internal resources of the Campus Development department must also be bolstered in order to keep pace with demands for data collection, constituent engagement and communications.

The procurement and selection process for a campus space and master planning consulting group will begin immediately with the planning phase to begin directly after consultant selection. A project that is as large as the Destination Project II will attract significant interest, and it is expected that numerous submissions will be received for planning services. The selection process must be formal and both qualitative and quantitative. It must demonstrate due diligence and ensure that every submission is evaluated fairly and on an equitable basis. The format of this process will evolve over the next six to eight weeks.

## **TWO PARALLEL PROCESSES**

The revitalization of University Hall depends on both aforementioned deliverables, while the balance of vacant and underutilized space, as well as misaligned allocation of space programming and usage on campus relies on the outcome of the Interiors Master Plan. Due to the scale of the space and complexities of the physical infrastructure, it stands to reason that University Hall will be the dominant factor in both exercises. **It is anticipated that the remediation, structural upgrades, and systems rehabilitation work will drive the project schedule. This work, in a fully occupied building, will be very disruptive, thus requiring swing or decanting space to minimize impacts to existing programming.**

## **NARRATIVE DEVELOPMENT**

---

During the visioning and preliminary planning of the Science Commons, an iterative process of narrative development emerged. Priorities identified during project visioning became compelling narratives that informed public relations messaging as well as conveyed a consistent message to government decision makers.

These key opportunities will be developed in consultation with the Destination Project – Phase II steering committee and our communications/government relations teams, but could include:

### **Transformational Learning:**

The revitalization of University Hall will create a unique opportunity to design spaces that will transform teaching pedagogy. Active learning, collaborative, student directed, and technology enabled spaces are possible with a reimagined building program.

### **Community and Cultural Spaces:**

University Hall was envisioned by Arthur Erickson to be “The Complete Academic Institution”. The building was intended to be an integrated facility where the design encouraged a closer relationship between faculty and students as well as a mix of academic, social, and functional spaces. Our social fabric has changed considerably since the late 60’s and we have the renewed responsibility to integrate the viewpoints of our diverse campus community throughout our broad consultations.

### **Identity:**

A major rehabilitation of University Hall sets the stage for a reinvigoration of the institutional identity. At inception, University Hall was positioned as a liberal education hub. University Hall is the embodiment of Canadian signature architecture and is featured on a Canadian stamp. This strong symbolism should be leveraged as the space programming and technical design moves forward.

### **Sustainability:**

University Hall was constructed when heating equipment and energy usage were not primary design considerations. Our current opportunity to improve energy consumption and create a building that will be a showcase for sustainable architecture and engineering should not be wasted. A “Deep Retrofit” approach must be employed to set the bar as high as possible. Consistent with our Campus Sustainability Plan, we will task our

consulting team and experts in sustainability to identify a sustainability measurement standard and create a plan that will transform University Hall into an up-to-date facility in all respects.

#### Wellness:

A common theme throughout and following the pandemic, has been personal wellness. The redevelopment of University Hall presents the opportunity to advance wellness centric strategies and spaces for all community members. Development of social, individual meditation, and flexible spaces that can serve to support individuals to socialize as well as provide necessary down time.

#### Safety & Accessibility:

As facilities age, their conformance with fire and building code tend to decline. This is due to newer code being more stringent, lessons learned, and new building technologies. A first order goal should be a facility that is safe and accessible for all community members.

#### Technology:

Create a vision where a historic facility, that arguably is the cornerstone of the institution, could be transformed into a state of the art and technologically relevant facility.

#### Job Creation:

The rehabilitation of University Hall will be a major capital endeavour similar in scale and technical challenges to Science Commons. Its contribution to the local economy should be promoted.

## PROJECT RISKS

---

- i. Early outputs from the ongoing structural assessment in University Hall indicate a significantly elevated risk profile. To meet current building code, it is anticipated the **building structural rehabilitation, regardless of academic program requirements, will drive the project execution schedule**. This work will be noisy, messy, and disruptive through numerous phases and **will be the greatest risk to the overall project timeline and budget**.
- ii. As the structural rehabilitation moves forward, the work will be disruptive and will need to be multi-phased. Much of the **vacant space in University Hall may need to be developed as “decanting space” to support the execution of the various structural and infrastructure systems improvements**. Additionally, the Campus Interiors Master Plan will also identify space strategies to enable relocation of University Hall occupants across campus as the structural rehabilitation advances. **This will delay the aspirations of units that want more space**.
- iii. With a focus on a building wide rehabilitation, **there will be an obligation to conform to the current Building/Fire Code**. This presents a number of challenges that will drive the project complexity and costs upwards.

- iv. Constituents may be positioning the vacant space as necessary for their individual faculty/department unit. **This project must be articulated as a campus wide initiative.** A Campus Interiors Master Plan that is rationalized against the historical University Hall preliminary program, renewed institutional plans, employee, and student full-time equivalents (FTEs) and activity types, will **create evidence-based space allocations for the vacant and underutilized spaces** across campus, including understanding why current underutilized space may not be suitable for its intended purposes.
- v. Many aspects of University Hall are aged out and in need of improvements. **The parallel processes of Campus Interiors Master Space programming and the technical rehabilitation of University Hall must converge** to ensure they serve the goals of the renewed institutional plans.
- vi. University Hall has historical structural issues as well as known environmental/asbestos concerns. A building wide rehabilitation of a building that is occupied year-round will be fraught with complexities and risks. A comprehensive design strategy will mitigate this considerably; however, renovations of historic buildings are known to be very complex, expensive, and demanding.
- vii. The high degree of complexity of this project will undoubtedly require many occupant moves in multiple phases. Any vacant space in University Hall will be required for decanting space before it is assigned to the final occupants.

## MANAGEMENT AND PLANNING TEAM STRUCTURE

---

### Proposed Structure

The management structure proposed must, on one hand, be small enough to ensure that the task will not be burdened by unnecessary bureaucracy, but large enough so that there is appropriate consultation with all stakeholders.

A Project Steering Committee will be responsible for strategic oversight of this project, including directing how to ensure broad consultation, ongoing communication, and appropriate governance processes.

### Committee Member Roles

#### Role of the Co-Project Sponsors

The **Project Sponsors are the Provost and Vice-President (Academic) and the Vice-President (Finance and Administration)**. Together they provide the key strategic leadership necessary for the project and ensure appropriate resources are available. The Project Sponsors must be keenly aware of the political environment and ensure that the key stakeholders feel part of the strategic component of this process. While the sponsors are not directly involved in the day-to-day details, they are considered the official spokespersons for the project and, as such, must be kept regularly informed of the project's progress by project Co-Leads.



Specific responsibilities would include:

- i. Provides leadership by ensuring the vision fits within the University's mandate and that this message is communicated to the various constituents;
- ii. The Provost & Vice-President (Academic) chairs the Project Steering Committee meetings;
- iii. Ensures the committee members are aware of their responsibilities;
- iv. Determines and allocates the resources necessary to complete the project;
- v. In conjunction with Facilities and the Project Steering Committee, assists in identifying the key stakeholders and ensures they are part of the process;
- vi. Signs off a Project Charter for each phase of the project;
- vii. Presents to General Faculties Council and the University Board of Governors timely updates and acquires feedback and any formal approvals that may be required;
- viii. Approves a formal budget and schedule, at various milestones during the project;
- ix. Approves the formal risk assessment and risk management plans as part of the project proposal;
- x. Approves a formalized communication plan.

It is in the early phases of the project process that the Project Sponsors play key roles. It is during this phase that the critical assumptions and project parameters will be determined. The Project Sponsors can expect to devote a significant amount of time during this front-end planning.

### Role of the Destination Phase II Project Steering Committee

The Steering Committee will manage the strategic aspects of the project from a big-picture perspective and ensure that the project scope has a clearly defined vision that fits within the strategic goals of the University.

Membership:

- All members of the committee are acting in the best interests of the University and are not representing their respective portfolios. Each member will be integral to informing how best to learn from and consult with the University community – including academic staff, administrative staff, and students.
- The committee will consist of members of the University community based on the diversity of their roles and experiences, as well as their expertise in certain areas of the project.
- Members will stay on until the conclusion of the work of the committee.
- Membership and attendance at the committee meetings may not be delegated.

It will be chaired by the Provost & Vice-President (Academic) (Co-Sponsor) and be made of 13 - 17 members who will be required to meet regularly, especially during the early stages of the project planning. The time commitment is approximately one meeting per month (1.5 to 2 hours per meeting).

Specific duties of the Project Steering Committee would include:

- i. Oversee the strategic direction of the project and ensure that the project stays within the vision and mandate of the University;
- ii. Official endorsement of key planning documents including the functional program;
- iii. Ensure the project stays within the defined scope, budget, and schedule;
- iv. Ensure that all potential interested party's input is received and considered;
- v. Review the information received from the consultants and provides appropriate strategic feedback;
- vi. With an overall campus wide viewpoint and pertinent consultation with stakeholders, make recommendations when necessary to advance the project;
- vii. Provide endorsement at key project milestones as defined by the project schedule;
- viii. Ensure that the project design provides for efficient and economical operation;
- ix. Approve any changes that alter the original scope of the project and deals with the implications on budget and schedule.
  - o Provide input on various operational models to ensure they meet the needs for teaching and research and coordinate input from faculty and department staff on various operational aspects of the project;
  - o Advise on aspects related to the appropriate functioning of their respective areas of expertise;
  - o Participate in discussions related to the overall project and provide objective feedback during discussions that revolve around the limited project budget and increasing expectations;
  - o Represents the Destination Project at related faculty/department meetings;

### Shared Roles of Academic Lead and Facility Lead

The Academic and Facility Project Leads are responsible for the development of a coherent plan that integrates all facets of the process. They are solely accountable to the Project Co-Sponsors, and provide leadership and coordination of all project activities, ensuring that the budget, scope, and schedule are adhered to. Both Leads will be embedded in the full scope of the project.

Responsibilities include:

- i. Attends steering committee meetings
- ii. Facilitates planning sessions with the stakeholders as required
- iii. Establish the project schedule

- iv. Ensures that, before any changes are made to the basic project concept by either the stakeholders or the project team, their impact on the budget, scope and schedule are assessed and submitted to the Project Co-Sponsors for approval
- v. Brings forward recommendations to the Steering Committee/Project Co-Sponsors for conditional and final acceptance of recommendations of the consultants;
- vi. In conjunction with the Executive Director, Communications, Marketing and Government Relations, forms the project's communications strategy and plan for approval by the Project Co-Sponsors.
- vii. Serves as liaison between the Steering Committee, design consulting team, approving authorities, and stakeholders. Determines the problem-solving process to deal with competing interests that may arise
- viii. Contribute to the project risk register and determine avoidance and mitigation strategies.
- ix. Other tasks as required.

### Role of Facilities and Facility Project Lead

To ensure an effective reporting hierarchy within the Facilities team, it is essential that all information in relation to the Project be channeled through an appointed designate, Facility Project Lead, within the Facilities team. It is their responsibility to ensure this information is forwarded to all relevant parties.

Specific duties of the Facilities team, its designated Facility Project Lead, and appointee(s) include:

#### **General Management**

- i. Manage the Facilities Project staff;
- ii. Organizes the filing system for project documents and ensures the dissemination of information to the appropriate individuals;
- iii. Maintains accurate record of all decisions made;

#### **Communication and Coordination**

- i. Provides administrative support to the Project Co-Sponsors;
- ii. Serves as liaison amongst all Facilities team members to ensure a mutual understanding of all stages of the project;
- iii. Works with consultants to ensure adherence to the contracted services and effective use of time.

#### **Contract Management**

- i. Coordinates the procurement of all professional services;
- ii. Coordinates preparation of the cost estimates at the specifications stages;
- iii. Serves as the first authority for contract interpretation;

- iv. In consultation with the Academic Lead, directs and manages requests for proposals, including all contract negotiations and documentation necessary;
- v. Coordinates, prepares, and issues the requests for changes affecting project contracts;
- vi. Follows up on changes to the contracts for which they are responsible;
- vii. Identifies the drawings and specifications requiring in-house review, and to meet advanced commissioning standards, ensures that they are circulated and updated and resolves any conflicts;
- viii. Ensures the project meets the appropriate LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) requirements;
- ix. Prepares, verifies, and approves the progress payments in accordance with the appropriate University financial controls and procedures;
- x. Assembles all the documents for contract close-out in accordance with the appropriate University control procedures.

### Role of Academic Lead

To ensure effective consultation, reporting, and planning it is essential that all information in relation to the academic aspects of the project be channeled through the Academic Lead as they work alongside the Facility Project Lead.

Specific duties include:

- i. Work closely with the Facilities Project Lead in all aspects of the project, including engagement with stakeholders and discussions with planning consultants.
- ii. Will be the primary interface with academic stakeholders and act as a conduit to gather technical information as required from academic stakeholders (including both academic and administrative staff within those units). Will work to ensure broad and iterative academic (teaching, research, learning) consultation.
- iii. Embedded in all aspects of the stakeholder's engagement and design activities to lend the necessary academic expertise in a fast moving and detailed process.

## STEERING COMMITTEE

---

### General Faculties Council Motions

#### **Motion One:**

*That General Faculties Council Executive Committee recommend to General Faculties Council (GFC) the approval of the Destination Project – Phase II Steering Committee as an ad hoc committee of GFC with the attached noted composition and powers and duties.*

**Motion Two:**

*That General Faculties Council Executive Committee recommend to General Faculties Council that upon the Destination Phase II project scope completion, the GFC ad hoc Destination Project – Phase II Steering Committee will be officially dissolved.*

**Rationale:**

The University of Lethbridge is committed to open and transparent governance and in accordance with the *Post-secondary Learning Act* (PSLA) and best practices around a capital project of this magnitude, it is recommended that the Destination Project – Phase II Steering Committee be an ad hoc General Faculties Council (GFC) Committee that regularly reports to GFC and the Board of Governors. Recommendations around significant components of this project will be brought to GFC for discussion and then recommended to the Board of Governors for final approval. GFC may make recommendations to the Board with respect to this project.

**Capital Projects Governance****Post-Secondary Learning Act (PSLA):**

Board to consider recommendations – Section 19

**Board to consider recommendations 19;** a board must consider the recommendations of the general faculties council, if any, on matter of academic import prior to providing for... (b) the betterment of existing buildings;

**Powers of general faculties council – Section 26(1);** Subject to the authority of the board, a general faculties council is responsible for the academic affairs of the university and, without restricting the generality of the foregoing, has the authority to...(o) make recommendations to the board with respect to...a building program.

**Board of Governors:****The Finance Committee, as stated within their Terms of Reference: 4.3.5**

Monitor the preservation of the institution's facilities and make capital decisions by authorizing and monitoring major capital projects;

**GFC Bylaws around the creation of an Ad Hoc Committee Part 3. C:**

1. Council may by resolution establish Ad hoc Committees for limited terms as Council may deem necessary.
2. The procedures shall be in accordance with [GFC Bylaws](#) Part 3, Section A.1 of these Bylaws.
  - *Council may establish Standing Committees from time to time and in relation to any committee:*
    - a. *shall determine the name of the Committee;*

- 
- b. shall determine the number of members of the Committee and any other conditions pertaining to the composition of the Committee;*
    - c. may appoint or rescind the appointment of the members of the Committee;*
    - d. may for any office of a committee, appoint a person by name or by position to hold that office or rescind such appointment;*
    - e. shall determine the powers and duties of the committee;*
    - f. may determine the powers and duties of the members of the committee; and*
    - g. may dissolve or temporarily suspend the committee.*
  - *Those designated as resource members are non-voting members.*
  - *Unless otherwise specified, Standing Committees shall be subject to the same procedural rules as Council.*
  - *Unless otherwise specified, the Director, University Secretariat (or designate) shall be Secretary (administrative support) to a Committee.*
  - *The minutes and agendas of the Committee shall be distributed to members and resource members of the Committee. The minutes and agendas shall be retained by the designated Secretary (administrative support).*
  - *Committee Chairs shall prepare a report of activities undertaken by their Committees during the Council year and file it with the Director, University Secretariat for review by Executive Committee at its September meeting and Council as items for information at its October meeting.*
  - *At the October meeting of Council the Director, University Secretariat will identify any Standing Committee that has not met during the preceding year.*
3. Council shall establish the date or event that result in the dissolution of the Committee at the time the Committee is established.
  4. Each Ad hoc Committee shall report to Council at the end of its mandate. If the Committee mandate extends beyond one year, the Committee shall report to Council annually and at the end of the Committee mandate.
  5. An Ad hoc Committee may become a Standing Committee by an amendment to these Bylaws.

## Membership and Terms of Reference

### Ex-Officio Members

POSITION		INCUMBENT
Provost & Vice-President (Academic) - Chair	Co-Project Sponsor	Michelle Helstein
Vice-President (Finance and Administration)	Co-Project Sponsor	Nancy Walker
Vice-President (Research)		Dena McMartin
Associate Vice-President, Facilities		TJ Hanson
Dean, Arts & Science (or designated Associate Dean)		
Dean, Fine Arts (or designated Associate Dean)		
Dean, Liberal Education		Harold Jansen

### Members Appointed by General Faculties Council

POSITION	INCUMBENT
(7) Academic Staff Members *	
Undergraduate Student	
Graduate Student	

*\* Nominations committee will endeavour to ensure there is broad membership from among the humanities, fine arts, and social sciences, as well as other academic departments/units who currently or may occupy University Hall.*

### Resource Persons (non-voting)

POSITION	INCUMBENT
Director, Campus Development (Facilities Project Lead)	Gene Lublinkhof
Academic Lead	Janay Nugent
Vice-Provost (Students)	Kathleen Massey
Associate Vice-President (Information Technology)	Darren Schell
Executive Director, Teaching Centre	David Hinger
Director, Facilities Operations & Maintenance	Ed deBruin
Executive Director, Communications, Marketing & Government Relations	Richard Westlund
Recording Assistant	

Other individuals may be invited by the Chair to attend all or any part of a Destination Project, Phase II Steering Committee meeting.

### **Committee Member Terms**

Non-Ex-Officio Members are appointed for the duration of the project.

### **The Powers and Duties of the Committee includes:**

- i. Oversee the strategic direction of the project and ensure that the project stays within the vision and mandate of the University;
- ii. Review and recommend to GFC and the Board key planning documents, including functional programs;
- iii. Ensure the project stays within the defined scope, budget, and schedule;
- iv. Ensure that all potential stakeholder's input is received and considered;
- v. Members to appreciate the diverse needs and perspectives of the users of the space;
- vi. Review the information received from consultants and provides appropriate feedback;
- vii. With an overall campus wide viewpoint and pertinent consultation with stakeholders, make recommendations to the Co-Sponsors when necessary to advance the project;
- viii. Provide endorsement at key project milestones as defined by the project schedule;
- ix. Ensure that the facility upgrades provide for efficient and economical operation;
- x. Ensure appropriate approval of significant changes that alter the original scope of the project and deals with the implications of budget and schedule;
- xi. Report regularly to General Faculties Council, the Board of Governors, and the University Community on the project progress.