

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

REPORT NUMBER 138 OF THE PLANNING AND BUDGET COMMITTEE

September 20, 2010

To the Academic Board,
University of Toronto

Your Committee reports that it held a meeting on Monday, September 20, 2010 at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, at which the following were present:

Dr. Avrum Gotlieb (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
Professor Parth Markand Bhatt
Professor Elizabeth Cowper
Mr. Shaun Datt
Professor Meric S. Gertler
Professor Christina E. Kramer
Dr. Jim Yuan Lai
Professor Henry Mann
Professor Douglas McDougall
Ms Natalie Melton
Ms Carole Moore
Dr. Susan Rappolt
Ms Lynn Snowden
Mr. W. John Switzer

Non-voting Assessors:

Mr. Nadeem Shabbar, Chief Real Estate
Officer
Ms Elizabeth Sisam, Assistant Vice-
President, Campus and Facilities
Planning

Secretariat:

Mr. Anwar Kazimi, Secretary
Ms Mae-Yu Tan, Assistant Secretary of the
Governing Council

Regrets:

Professor Miriam Diamond
Professor Philip H. Byer
Mr. Ken Davy
Dr. Chris Koenig-Woodyard

In Attendance:

Mr. Steve Bailey, Director, Office of Space Management
Mr. Jim Delaney, Director, Office of the Vice-Provost, Students
Ms Sheree Drummond, Assistant Provost
Ms Nora Gillespie, Legal Counsel, Office of the Vice-President and Provost

ITEM 6 IS 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. He relayed the regrets of Vice-Chair, Professor Miriam Diamond at being unable to attend the first meeting of the Committee. He introduced himself and the Senior Assessor, Professor Cheryl Misak, Vice-President and Provost. He then called on members to introduce themselves.

Role and Conduct of Members

The Chair reminded members that they were expected to act in the best interests of the University and not as an agent of a particular constituency. Members had an obligation to ensure that the University was strengthened by the decisions that they made. His expectations were that the meetings of the Committee would be conducted in an atmosphere of respect, collegiality, and civility. He hoped that the meetings would provide an opportunity for members to express their views on matters under consideration, and he encouraged members to participate freely in the discussions of the Committee. If members required information of an unusual nature or planned to raise particularly complex questions, they were asked to inform the Secretary or the Chair well before the meeting so that the requested information could be obtained in time for the meeting.

Governance Portal

The Chair stated that in November 2009, the Secretary of the Governing Council had consulted with the Executive Committee on a proposal to establish a "governance portal" to support the work of the Governing Council and its Boards and Committees. The intent in introducing the portal was threefold:

1. to improve members' on-line access to both public and confidential governance documentation in support of their responsibilities;
2. to create efficiencies in the Secretariat, using administrative staff time more effectively; and
3. to reduce paper consumption and mailing/courier expenses related to agenda package distribution, while enhancing the timeliness of distribution.

With the positive feedback of Executive Committee members, the Office of the Governing Council proceeded to investigate available options, including both in-house and external vendors. Diligent Board Member Services Inc. had been engaged to implement Diligent Boardbooks (DBB) as the governance portal. Through the use of DBB, members would be able to read meeting documentation online, print selectively from an agenda package, or print the materials in their entirety. A message had been sent to members in the week prior to the meeting by the Secretary of the Governing Council on the implementation of the Governance Portal. Beginning the week of September 20, 2010, members would be contacted by a Diligent representative to arrange for a time for a one-on-one online introduction and training session. The session, which used a "screen sharing" approach, was expected to last less than thirty minutes. Subsequent "24/7/365" technical support would be made available to all members. It was expected that the training sessions for all members would be completed by October 22, 2010, and that the implementation of the portal would occur over meeting Cycles 2 and 3. The Chair said that the feedback from members on the implementation and ease of use of the portal would be important in making further enhancements to it.

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 recommendations 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 2009-2010 Academic Year was scheduled to be presented to the Committee at its meeting on January 12, 2011.

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 process for the approval of new academic programs was under review and would be brought forward to governance at a later date.

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. He 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 5, 2010)

Report Number 137 (May 5, 2010) 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. Senior Assessor's Report

Professor Misak began by drawing the members' attention to media reports about the public-sector wage and salary restraints. The provincial government had asked public-sector employers and employees to work collectively towards wage and salary restraint. However, no legislation had been put in place to mandate that restraint for employees with collective agreements. The University had been working through the complexities related to wage restraint as they had appeared over the previous year. The University was committed to making an attempt towards this goal in a vigorous and robust manner. Nevertheless, there were issues that were beyond the University's control. As an example, the University was awaiting a two-year arbitrated award concerning salary and benefits for faculty represented by the University of Toronto Faculty Association (UTFA). In response to a question from a member about the relationship between the position of the provincial government and that of the arbitrators, Professor Misak's said that as there was no legislation in place dealing with this matter, the arbitrators may not feel themselves bound by any guidelines. Responding to another question, Professor Misak added that no details were available on whether an increase in wages would impact the funding formula. The provincial government had asserted that it would not pay for any increases to public-sector wages and salaries. This would place the University in an awkward position. The uncertainty over this issue continued.

Professor Misak said that the financial pressures faced by the University provided an impetus for the forthcoming fundraising campaign. The University was in the need of the goodwill of its friends and benefactors. A significant and major campaign drive was in preparation. A meeting of the Principals and Deans had been scheduled for the following week to study and enhance the existing draft of the campaign framework. The campaign framework would then be unveiled to the University. The President was closely involved with campaign plans and Professor Misak expressed her optimism for its success.

Next, Professor Misak gave the Committee advance notice of two projects that may be brought forward for Committee attention in the forthcoming governance cycles, pending appropriate consultations with relevant groups. Professor Misak informed the Committee that a proposal to relocate the John H. Daniels Faculty of Architecture, Landscape, and Design from 230 College Street to 1 Spadina Crescent was currently under consideration. If this were to go ahead, this would allow for a new site for the Student Commons. The site at 230 College Street was an ideal setting for the Student Commons. The administration was consulting with students about this matter and would continue to do so. Professor Misak said that the Committee would be informed as these plans unfolded over the course of the following months.

6. Policy on the Temporary Use of Space at the University of Toronto: Revision

Professor Misak noted the *Policy for the Allocation of Rooms – Extracurricular Bookings* dated from 1988 and as such was in need of revision. Several members of the administration had been working diligently in putting together an updated *Policy* that was consistent with the actual practices that had evolved. The aim of the revised *Policy* was to have a tri-campus document that provided clarity; the existing *Policy* applied only to a limited amount of space on the St. George Campus. The revised *Policy* addressed the core values of the University – freedom of expression and the desire to contribute to the community, balanced by the need to fully recover costs when renting space to external groups. The students, through their fees, should not subsidize external bodies who wished to rent space on campus.

In the discussion that followed, Mr. Delaney said that while the existing *Policy* was a collection of procedures, the revised *Policy* articulated principles for the rental of space to help administration across the tri-campus structure. A member noted that problems arose when external groups wanted to rent space on campus for unauthorized preparatory classes. She asked whether the revised *Policy* allowed the application of discretion to restrict such use. In response, Mr. Bailey said that the revised *Policy* provided support to the administration to exercise discretion for the use of space.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

That the *Policy on the Temporary Use of Space at the University of Toronto at the University of Toronto*, be approved, replacing the *Policy for the Allocation of Rooms – Extracurricular Bookings* approved June 1, 1988, effective immediately.

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

7. Calendar of Business 2010-2011

The Chair noted that the proposed Calendar of Business for 2010-2011, had been included in the agenda package. It was an item for information. He 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.

8. 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 2010.

9. Date of the Next Meeting – Wednesday, November 10, 2010

The Chair reminded members that the next meeting of the Committee was scheduled for Wednesday, November 10, 2010 at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber.

10. Other Business

There were no items of other business.

The meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

Secretary

Chair