

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

**REPORT NUMBER 145 OF THE PLANNING AND BUDGET COMMITTEE
September 21, 2011**

To the Academic Board,
University of Toronto

Your Committee reports that it held a meeting on Wednesday, September 21, 2011 at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, at which the following were present:

Professor Miriam Diamond (In the Chair)
Professor Cheryl Misak, Vice-President and
Provost
Ms Catherine J. Riggall, Vice-President,
Business Affairs
Professor Scott Mabury, Vice-Provost,
Academic Operations
Mr. Don Andrew
Professor William Russell Cluett
Professor Elizabeth Cowper
Professor Meric Gertler
Mr. Peter A. Hurley
Professor Amy Mullin
Professor Yves Roberge
Professor Locke Rowe
Miss Ava-Dayna Sefa
Ms Grace Carmen Yuen

Non-voting Assessors:

Mr. David Palmer, Vice-President,
Advancement
Ms Sally Garner, Executive Director, Planning
and Budget
Ms Gail Milgrom, Acting Assistant Vice-
President, Campus Facilities and Planning

Secretariat:

Mr. Anwar Kazimi, Secretary

Regrets:

Professor Philip H. Byer
Dr. Avrum Gotlieb
Dr. Chris Koenig-Woodyard
Dr. Jim Yuan Lai
Professor Henry Mann
Mr. Manveen Puri
Professor Andrea Sass-Kortsak

In Attendance:

Professor Louise Lemieux-Charles, member, Governing Council
Ms Gillian Morrison, Assistant Vice-President, Divisional Relations and Campaigns
Mr. Townsend Benard, Faculty of Physical Education and Health
Mr. Tad Brown, Counsel, Business Affairs and Advancement, Division of University Advancement
Mr. Louis Charpentier, Secretary of the Governing Council
Ms Anita Comella, Assistant Dean, Co-curricular Physical Activity and Sport, Faculty of Physical
Education and Health
Mr. Neil Dobbs, Deputy Secretary of the Governing Council
Ms Sheree Drummond, Assistant Provost
Dr. Jane Harrison, Director, Policy and Planning, Office of the Vice-President and Provost
Professor Ira Jacobs, Dean, Faculty of Physical Education and Health
Mr. Rob Lakin, Faculty of Physical Education and Health
Ms Rosanne Lopers-Sweetman, Chief Administrative Officer, Faculty of Physical Education and Health
Professor Catharine Whiteside, Dean, Faculty of Medicine

ITEMS 6, 7 AND 8 ARE RECOMMENDED TO THE ACADEMIC BOARD FOR APPROVAL.
ALL OTHER ITEMS ARE REPORTED FOR INFORMATION.

1. Opening Remarks

The Chair welcomed members to the meeting. She relayed the regrets of Dr. Gotlieb at being unable to attend the first meeting of the Committee. The Chair introduced herself and the Senior Assessor, Professor Cheryl Misak, Vice-President and Provost. She then 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
- Responsibilities of the Planning and Budget Committee
- Capital Projects

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

3. Report of the Previous Meeting (May 18, 2011)

Report Number 144 (May 18, 2011) 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. Report of the Senior Assessor

Professor Misak informed the Committee that the administration wanted to explore what progress had been made in the directions set in *Towards 2030* initiative and it wanted to identify the new and ongoing challenges and opportunities that faced the University. Over the next six months, the University would engage governance bodies and the University community in providing an update to *Towards 2030*.

Professor Misak's [PowerPoint presentation](#) entitled "*Towards 2030 – The View from 2012*" is appended to these minutes.

Discussion

(i) *Members' Comments and Questions*

In the course of the discussion, members raised the following points.

- The challenge of per student funding received by the University from the provincial government needed to be clearly placed within the context of student experience.
- Along with the economic pressures, the end of mandatory retirement had placed an additional challenge to academic divisions that sought to renew their teaching ranks. It was hoped that early retirement packages offered by the University would mitigate some of these challenges.

• **5. Report of the Senior Assessor (Cont'd)**

- A member asked for the rationale that had led to include the balance between discovery-based and applied research, as a challenge faced by the University.
- Finally, a member commented that the major political parties had made little comment on matters related to post secondary education in the ongoing provincial election campaign. Was there a sense of the importance of this issue within political parties?

(ii) *Administrative Response*

Professor Misak's responses included the following:

- With respect to the per-student funding, Professor Misak said that this was indeed a problem. The provincial government's nearly 17-year freeze on the basic income unit (BIU) weights assigned to each program (through which universities are funded) did have an impact on student experience. The University would continue to lobby the provincial government on the need to increase per-student funding
- Professor Misak said that faculty renewal was indeed important. Citing a recently released study¹, she said that though there was a steady student-driven demand for on-line courses, students continued to stress on the importance of face to face contact with professors, irrespective of class size. As an unintended consequence of the economic downturn, the University had been able to recruit teaching instructors of the highest quality.
- The inclusion of the question related to challenge on the balance between discovery-based and applied-based research had emerged from discussions within the University community. In the Provost's opinion this issue had been identified as a challenge as a result of pressure from granting agencies towards applied research, while others had posed the question because they had wanted more applied research conducted at the University.
- The University would encourage all members of its community to become familiar with the platforms of each political party and then exercise their franchise.

6. Campaign – Plans and Priorities

In her introductory remarks, Professor Misak informed the Committee that the University was to embark on its most ambitious Campaign. The economically volatile scenario predicted for next few years had made it vital for the University to position itself to seek funds to fulfill its goals and ambitions. The central administration had worked closely with divisions to identify the Campaign priorities. Each division had played a critical role in setting individual priorities, in order of importance and magnitude, which were submitted to the Office of the Vice-President and Provost and these were being presented for governance approval.

Mr. Palmer made a detailed PowerPoint presentation on the Campaign which is appended to these minutes.

Discussion

(i) *Members' Comments and Questions*

- A member sought clarification on the role of the Committee with respect to the Campaign.
- Members asked whether there had been co-ordination with academic units across the University with respect to matters such as student financial aid and student experience.

¹ Kaznowska, E., Rogers, J., and Usher, A. (2011). *The State of E-Learning in Canadian Universities, 2011: If Students Are Digital Natives, Why Don't They Like E-Learning?* Toronto: Higher Education Strategy Associates

6. Campaign – Plans and Priorities (Cont'd)

- A member asked whether the Campaign structure would change the guidelines for student groups engaged in their own fundraising activities. Would there be coordination between the divisions in matters related to the scheduling of Campaign-related events?

(ii) Administrative Response

- The Provost said that the role of the Committee involved raising any concerns about the process through which the Campaign would proceed; and, to endorse and recommend the item for the consideration of the Academic Board.
- The Provost remarked that the inclusion of student aid and student experience as a campaign priority had not required any prompting from divisional leaders. Student aid remained a priority across all divisions and for the University as a whole. Overall, the Campaign was driven based on the needs identified by the divisions - campaign plans were adjusted according to each division's goals related to student aid, the complement of faculty, and capital projects. Mr. Palmer added that there was no central figure for student aid – each division had set its own target. He added that, by far, student aid funds were raised most successfully at the divisional level. Occasionally, a targeted donation for student aid would be received directly through University Advancement which would then be disbursed through the Office of the Vice-President and Provost.

The Provost reiterated that pan-University priorities had been established through extensive consultations with Principals, Dean, Academic Directors, and Chairs. Campaign contributions to divisions would allow for the allocation of more funds to important central services such as the International Student Exchange Office and libraries.

Related to student experience, Mr. Palmer added that global fluency had come through as one of the themes of the Campaign. This was because the need for international student exchange, broad curricula development, and an expanded international student body, had been frequently identified in divisional plans to enhance the student experience.

- Mr. Tad Brown said that the Campaign would not impact the efforts of student groups to raise funds. University Advancement would continue to assist student groups for sponsorship-type relationships with prospective benefactors. Mr. Palmer added that the visibility of the Campaign could potentially have a positive impact on the fundraising efforts of student groups. The Campaign was expected to be formally launched on November 20, 2011 and would be coordinated across divisions, and be geared towards targeted audiences.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the Campaign Priorities Summary, as described in the letter from the Provost to the Chair dated September 2, 2011, and attached as Appendix A, be approved as the planning framework for the University's fundraising campaign.

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

7. Capital Project: Project Planning Report: Varsity Centre – Goldring Centre for High Performance Sport

Ms Milgrom presented the highlights of the Project Planning Report, dated September 14, 2011, for the Goldring Centre for High Performance Sport at the St. George campus.

At the invitation of the Chair, Professor Jacobs acknowledged the conceptual support of the Governing Council and its bodies which had overseen the Project to its final phase. He reiterated that funding was in place to realize the project. Private benefactors and the provincial government had acknowledged the impact on academic experience that would result from the University's ability to provide this facility. It was hoped that the federal government would also contribute towards the project.

According to Professor Jacobs, the Goldring Centre would allow those who wanted to pursue athletic excellence to choose the University as their destination. Members of the professoriate would be able to expand on their research opportunities. Thus, the Centre was crucial to the future of the Faculty of Physical Education and Health. Two members of the student body of the Faculty of Physical Education and Health succinctly articulated the need for the Goldring Centre to enhance the student experience by mitigating the overwhelming demand for athletic facilities on the campus. The facility would also reiterate the message of the importance of an active lifestyle to the University community and beyond.

In response to a question from a member, Professor Jacobs said that the private donors and the provincial government were aware of the alternate plans that had been put in place in case the need to increase student contributions for the operation of the Centre were not accepted in a student referendum. The Co-Curricular programs at the Faculty included substantial interactions with outside organizations. The existing demand for the use of suitable facilities would allow the Faculty to generate revenues towards some of the operating costs for the Centre. In conclusion, the Provost said that though the facility would be called the Centre of High Performance Sport, and it would be accessible to all members of the student community.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

- (i) THAT the Project Planning Report, dated September 14, 2011, a copy of which is attached hereto as [Appendix D](#), for the Goldring Centre for High Performance Sport at the St. George campus be approved in principle to accommodate the activities and functions as described.
- (ii) THAT the project scope for the Goldring Centre for High Performance Sport, comprising approximately 6,700 net assignable square metres (nasm) (or 11,189 gross square metres (gsm)) plus a portion of shared site servicing provisions and a central elevator/stair core to be constructed concurrently with the Goldring Centre as the first phase of a future Tower, be approved at a provisional total project cost of \$60.8 million.
- (iii) THAT the project scope for the remaining work of the first phase of the future Tower to include foundation, and shared site servicing and central elevator/stair core be approved at a provisional total project cost of \$9.0 million.

8. Faculty of Medicine: Proposal to Establish the Institute of Health Policy, Management and Evaluation as an Extra-Departmental Unit: A

Ms Garner outlined the rationale for the proposed change of status of the Department of Health, Management and Evaluation, as presented in the appended documents.

A member commented that the unit was proceeding from a department to an Extra-Departmental Unit: A and asked whether this was unusual. Professor Whiteside cited the example of the Institute of Biomaterials and Biomedical Engineering, a truly interdisciplinary unit, which had a departmental status and was partnership of the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering, the Faculty of Medicine, and the Faculty of Dentistry. She added that the Department of Health, Management and Evaluation was nationally renowned in the fields of health services, policy, and management. The change in status to an Institute would allow it to realize its aspirations of global recognition.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the status of the existing Department of Health Policy, Management and Evaluation in the Faculty of Medicine to be changed to an Extra-Departmental Unit: A (EDU:A) named the Institute of Health Policy, Management and Evaluation effective immediately.

Documentation is attached hereto as [Appendix ‘E’](#).

9. Planning and Budget Committee Terms of Reference

Mr. Charpentier informed members that the proposed revisions to the Committee’s terms of reference had resulted from the recommendations made in the *Report of Task Force on Governance*. The *Report* had been approved by the Governing Council which had also established an Implementation Committee to oversee and coordinate the Task Force’s recommendations. The proposed revisions were one step in a number of practice and mandate changes that were occurring. The revisions to the terms of reference of the Planning and Budget Committee were relatively minor. These were:

- The roles of the Committee and the Academic Board with respect to divisional academic plans were being clarified. The Committee would be responsible for recommending the approval of guidelines to formulate divisional academic plans. The academic plans would be presented to the respective divisional councils for their consideration, prior to approval by the Provost. The plans would be then forwarded to the Committee and the Academic Board for information to provide contextual information to these bodies for other matters within their purview.
- The use of consent agenda and the publication of certain reports for information would be adopted across all governance bodies. In both instances the intent of the practice was to ensure that the transactional business of each governance body could be conducted efficiently to allow for sufficient time for broader discussions of strategic matters.

The Committee had no questions for Mr. Charpentier.

10. Capital Project: Robarts Library Fourth Floor West Renovation of Library Research and Reference Services and the Centre for Teaching Support and Innovation – Project Planning Committee Terms of Reference

The Committee received for information the Membership and the Terms of Reference for the Project Planning Committee for the Capital Project for the Robarts Library Fourth Floor West Renovation of Library Research and Reference Services and the Centre for Teaching Support and Innovation. Ms Milgrom said the Terms of Reference for this project were being forwarded for information to the Committee even though the Project Planning Committee had already begun its work. This was because the cost of the project had earlier been estimated at under \$2 million, which under the *Policy on Capital Planning and Capital Projects* would not have required governance approval. As this project entailed two separate projects that would be undertaken concurrently and which combined totaled over \$2 million in costs, it was being forwarded for governance approval.

11. Capital Project: University of Toronto Mississauga Teaching Laboratories Renovation in the William G. Davis Building – Project Planning Committee Terms of Reference

The Committee received for information the Membership and the Terms of Reference for the Project Planning Committee for the Capital Project for the University of Toronto Mississauga (UTM) Teaching Laboratories Renovation in the William G. Davis Building. A member noted that the membership of the Project Planning Committee consisted of personnel based full-time at UTM, and asked whether the Project Planning Committee would be enriched if its membership included those who were based at the St. George campus where similar renovation work had been done. Professor Mabury responded that there was an ongoing exchange of ideas on similar projects across all three campuses. Another member added that the Project Planning Committee included members who had links with the St. George campus and those could also consult with colleagues at other universities within the province where similar projects had been completed.

12. Capital Project: Department of Astronomy and Astrophysics, Canadian Institute for Theoretical Astrophysics, the Dunlap Institute for Astronomy and Astrophysics, the Department of Mathematics and the Department of Statistics – Revised Project Planning Committee Terms of Reference

The Committee received for information the Membership and the Terms of Reference for the Project Planning Committee for the Capital Project for the Department of Astronomy and Astrophysics, Canadian Institute for Theoretical Astrophysics, the Dunlap Institute for Astronomy and Astrophysics, the Department of Mathematics and the Department of Statistics. Ms Milgrom said that revised Terms of Reference for this project were being brought forward as the project now included the Department of Mathematics and the Department of Statistics.

13. Calendar of Business 2011-2012

The Chair noted that the proposed Calendar of Business for 2011-2012, had been included in the agenda package. It was an item for information. She advised members that it was a living document, and it was updated following each agenda planning meeting and again after each Committee meeting. Members were encouraged to review the Calendar carefully.

14. Report on Decisions under Summer Executive Authority

The Chair reported that no decisions that fell within the purview of the Planning and Budget Committee had been made under the Summer Executive Authority in 2011.

15. Date of the Next Meeting

The Chair reminded members that the next meeting of the Committee was scheduled for Wednesday, November 2, 2011 at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber.

16. Other Business

There were no items of other business

The meeting adjourned at 6:15 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

September 27, 2011