

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

**REPORT NUMBER 150 OF THE PLANNING AND BUDGET COMMITTEE
May 16, 2012**

To the Academic Board,
University of Toronto

Your Committee reports that it held a meeting on Wednesday, May 16, 2012 at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, at which the following were present:

Dr. Avrum Gotlieb (In the Chair)
Professor Elizabeth Cowper (Vice Chair)
Professor Cheryl Misak, Vice-President and
Provost
Professor Scott Mabury, Vice-President,
University Operations
Ms Sally Garner, Executive Director, Planning
and Budget
Mr. Don Andrew
Professor William Russell Cluett
Professor Meric Gertler
Mr. Peter Hurley
Professor Henry Mann
Professor Amy Mullin
Professor Yves Roberge

Non-voting Assessors:

Mr. Paul Donoghue, Chief Administrative Officer,
University of Toronto Mississauga (UTM)
Ms Sally Garner, Executive Director, Planning and
Budget

Secretariat:

Mr. Anwar Kazimi, Secretary

Regrets:

Dr. Chris Koenig-Woodyard
Professor Jim Yuan Lai
Mr. Manveen Puri
Professor Locke Rowe
Professor Andrea Sass-Kortsak
Miss Ava-Dayna Sefa
Ms Grace Yuen

In Attendance:

Professor William Gough, member, Governing Council, and Vice Dean, Graduate Education and
Program Development, University of Toronto Scarborough (UTSC)
Mr. Ron Swail, Assistant Vice-President, Facilities and Services
Mr. Louis Charpentier, Secretary of the Governing Council
Ms Sheree Drummond, Assistant Provost
Dr. Jane Harrison, Director, Academic Policy and Planning, Office of the Vice-President and Provost
Ms Lesley Lewis, Assistant Dean, UTSC
Professor John Scherk, Vice-Dean, Undergraduate, UTSC

ITEMS 3, 4, 5 AND 6 ARE RECOMMENDED TO THE ACADEMIC BOARD FOR APPROVAL. ALL OTHER ITEMS ARE REPORTED FOR INFORMATION.

1. Chair's Remarks

The Chair welcomed members and guests to the final meeting of the 2011-12 governance year.

2. Report of the Senior Assessor

Professor Misak reported on two matters.

Centre for Urban Science and Progress (CUSP), New York

Professor Misak said that a consortium of universities, led by New York University (NYU) and the Polytechnic University of New York and including the University of Toronto, the Carnegie-Mellon University, the City University of New York, the Indian Institute of Technology- Bombay, and the University of Warwick, had been successful in its bid to launch an applied science research institute in Brooklyn, New York. The institute – Centre for Urban Science and Progress (CUSP) - would be a part of New York City's Applied Science NYC initiative.

Professor Misak added that NYU would invest in the infrastructure costs required to rebuild a city block in Brooklyn, New York, where the CUSP would be located. The University's initial contribution to the project would be made by faculty and students in the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering. It was expected that that initial program offerings would include topics related to city engineering and urban issues. The University would draw from its vast resources to develop and expand programs for the Centre. Any degree programs that would be developed through this initiative would be brought forward for governance approval.

Ontario Work-Study Program (OWSP)

Professor Misak provided an update on the cancelled Work-Study Program. She recalled that in the 2012 provincial budget, the government had announced the cancellation of the OWSP. Under the OWSP, students who were eligible to receive funding through Ontario Student Assistance Program (OSAP) would qualify for employment in a broad range of jobs across the University. The OWSP would provide sixty per cent of the funding while the University funded the remainder.

Professor Misak said that the University had decided to maintain the Work-Study Program in a form that best-suited the requirements of its students, and that relied entirely on University resources. The details of the revised Work-Study Program were being finalized. It was expected that revised program would be funded through contributions from central funding and units that wished to participate in the program. The criteria for participation in the Work-Study Program could also be expanded.

A member welcomed the University's initiative for the revised Work-Study program and commented that it would provide the University with an opportunity to realign the program's academic goal with that of many departments to include meaningful experiential learning.

3. University of Toronto Scarborough: Proposal to Disestablish the existing Department of Humanities and Establish two new Departments and an Extra-Departmental Unit A [EDU: A]

Ms Garner outlined the rationale for the proposal to disestablish the existing Department of Humanities and to establish two new departments and an Extra-Departmental Unit A (EDU: A) at the University of Toronto Scarborough.

Invited to address the Committee, Professor Gough added the proposal was an example of effective governance/planning process. In 2010, UTSC had identified opportunities for the Department of Humanities that had led to the creation of the Department of Philosophy and the Department of English. Further deliberations had led to the current proposal, which would be relatively comfortable for the students involved and respectful of the administrative staff, while being reflective of the aspirations of the faculty.

In response to a question from a member, Professor Gough outlined the rationale for establishing the Centre for French and Linguistics as an Extra-Departmental Unit: A. He said the two new proposed departments had a natural separation and a working relationship that had been well established. The proposed EDU: A status for the Centre for French and Linguistics would provide it with the ability to develop as a base for interdisciplinary scholarship.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

- (a) THAT the Department of Humanities at the University of Toronto Scarborough be disestablished, effective July 1, 2012;
- (b) THAT the following units be established, effective July 1, 2012, in its place:
 - The Department of Arts, Culture and Media,
 - The Department of Historical and Cultural Studies, and
 - The Centre for French and Linguistics as an Extra-Departmental Unit: A.

Documentation is attached hereto as Appendix "A".

4. University of Toronto Scarborough: Proposal to Disestablish the existing Department of Social Sciences and Establish four new Departments and an Extra-Departmental Unit B [EDU: B]

Ms Garner outlined the rationale for the proposal to disestablish the existing Department of Social Sciences and establish four new departments and an Extra-Departmental Unit B (EDU: B) at the University of Toronto Scarborough. Professor Gough added that this proposal was also reflective of the faculty's aspirations and that it had been widely consulted and had received support from students, faculty and the administrative staff.

A member commented that International Development Studies had strong name recognition. What were the reasons to seek a name change? In his response Professor Gough indicated that a new name had been proposed by the faculty involved and that the broad, inclusive term – Critical Development Studies – had been intended to reflect the unit's academic work which related to national and international issues.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

- (a) THAT the Department of Social Sciences at the University of Toronto Scarborough be disestablished, effective July 1, 2012;
- (b) THAT the following units be established, effective July 1, 2012, in its place:
 - The Department of Anthropology,
 - The Department of Human Geography,
 - The Department of Political Science,
 - The Department of Sociology, and
 - The Centre for Critical Development Studies as an Extra-Departmental Unit: B.

Documentation is attached hereto as Appendix "B".

5. Capital Project: Project Planning Report for University of Toronto Mississauga, Kaneff Centre Expansion

Ms Milgrom presented the highlights of the Project Planning Report, dated April 26, 2012, for the University of Toronto Mississauga, Kaneff Centre Expansion.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

1. THAT the Project Planning Report for the University of Toronto Mississauga, Kaneff Centre Expansion, dated April 26, 2012, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "C", be approved in principle;
2. THAT the project scope, comprising a 2,670 nasm (5,340 gross square metres) building addition plus a courtyard infill for a Rotunda and the renovation of existing space, at a total project cost of \$35-million, funded entirely from accumulating capital reserves with UTM's operating budget, be approved.

6. Policy on Capital Planning and Capital Projects

Professor Mabury presented the background and reasons for the proposed revisions to the *Policy on Capital Planning and Capital Projects*. As outlined in the appended documents, the *Policy on Capital Planning and Capital Project*, approved in 2001, contained a mix of policy and detailed procedures and had been developed at that time to guide the University through a period of significant expansion. Many of the policies and procedures contained in the current policy no longer existed or had changed names. Moreover, inflation since 2001, particularly in the construction industry, indicated that the \$2 million threshold for review of projects at Governing Council needed to be increased to a level in keeping with the current environment – over \$3 million for 2012.

Professor Mabury said that the proposed changes to the *Policy* would include three levels of approvals and approval the level of which would be dependent upon the total project cost. The administration would undertake a review of the *Policy* no later than five years after its effective date to ensure that the *Policy* continued to meet the University’s needs.

In the discussion, Professor Mabury clarified the levels of approval as outlined in the appended documents. A member commended the new revisions to the *Policy* and said that the University had outgrown the current *Policy*.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the revised *Policy on Capital Planning and Capital Projects*, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix “D”, be approved, to be effective July 1, 2012.

CONSENT AGENDA

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

It was Resolved

THAT the consent agenda be adopted and that the items on it be approved.

7. Report of the Previous Meeting (April 4, 2012)

Report Number 149 (April 4, 2012) was approved.

8. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting

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

9. Capital Project: New Facilities at the Koffler Scientific Reserve – Project Planning Committee Terms of Reference

The Committee received for information the Membership and the Terms of Reference of the Project Planning Committee for the Capital Project for the new facilities at the Koffler Scientific Reserve.

10. Tri-Campus Governance – Possible revisions to the Terms of Reference for the Planning and Budget Committee

The Chair invited Professor Gough to provide an update on tri-campus governance matters. Professor Gough referred to the documentation provided to the Committee for this item and said that the purpose of presenting this information to the Committee was three-fold:

- To provide members with highlights of the proposals;
- To outline the consultation process that had been initiated to develop the proposals; and
- To receive any feedback prior to presenting the recommendations to the Executive Committee and the Governing Council for approval.

Professor Gough referred to the cover document that outlined the recommendations of the Task Force on Governance. That document also highlighted the planning and consultation that had led to the proposed governance structures. He said that it had been clear to the Task Force – and had been confirmed in the processes of the previous months – that the existing College Councils were no longer sufficient for UTM and UTSC as they had grown and evolved. Each campus needed an academic governance structure and other governance bodies with responsibilities that were not currently within the authority of the College Councils.

The proposed Campus Councils (CC) and their Committees would establish:

- an academic governance structure – the Academic Affairs Committee (AAC) – that, like College / Faculty Councils, reflected the composition of the Academic Board (their parent body) and, consistent with such bodies, had particular reporting relationships with the Academic Board and the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs.
- Campus Affairs Committee (CAC) that would have responsibility for campus-specific matters that related to the responsibilities of the University Affairs Board and the Planning and Budget Committee.

Professor Gough added that unlike the existing Councils at UTM and UTSC, the proposed model would provide the campuses with decision-making authority for particular matters – with appropriate accountability to the Governing Council. The principles on which the model was based were described in the cover memorandum and were focussed on the principles of representation and responsibility that had been articulated in the *University of Toronto Act (1971)*, the *Report of the Chairman's Advisory Committee on Governance (1988)* (Balfour Report) and the *Report of the Task Force on Governance (2010)*. Since the outset of the planning process, there had been consistent agreement on the mandates of the proposed Councils and their Committees.

Professor Gough concluded his remarks by informing the Committee that discussions had focussed primarily on the details related to the intended size of the CC and its standing committees and to the representation of various constituencies on the bodies. Student representatives at UTM had argued for a larger CC and AAC to include more students (for example, representatives from each student society and *ex officio* members). At UTSC, it had been suggested that there be greater administrative staff representation on the AAC and CAC. Professor Gough said that the advice had been carefully considered. However, in finalizing the Terms of Reference for the Governing Council's consideration, the Task Force on Governance - Implementation Committee had returned to the original principles of representation as endorsed by the Executive Committee and with those expressed in the guiding documents noted earlier.

In discussion that followed, members expressed the need to ensure the principles guiding the proportion of students and other estates on the Governing Council would be reflected in the proposed Campus Councils. Mr. Charpentier said the proposed composition of the CC and its standing committees would be reviewed prior to being forwarded to the Executive Committee for its endorsement and final approval by the Governing Council. In response to a question, Professor Gough noted that although the skeletal structures proposed at UTM and UTSC were identical, there were

10. Tri-Campus Governance – Possible revisions to the Terms of Reference for the Planning and Budget Committee (cont'd)

differences in representation of teaching staff on the AACs on the two campuses. That was because of the difference in the number of academic departments on the two campuses. In response to another question, Mr. Charpentier said that in the administrative staff membership, there was no distinction between unionized and non-unionized staff on governance bodies. In response to question about whether the proposed student numbers mirrored those on the Governing Council, Professor Gough said that student membership on the governance bodies would mirror that on the Governing Council. Professor Misak suggested that they ought to reflect the Governing Council more precisely. A member thanked Professor Gough and Mr. Charpentier for their work in outlining the proposed changes.

11. Date of the Next Meeting

The Chair advised members that this was the final meeting of the Planning and Budget Committee for the current governance year. Meeting dates for 2012-13 would be posted on the Governing Council website in July 2012.

12. Other Business**(a) Thank you**

Dr. Gotlieb thanked all members of the Committee for their contributions over the past year, especially those of the assessors and the members of the Agenda Planning Group. The work of the Committee was crucial to the governance of the University, and members' efforts were much appreciated by the Governing Council.

(b) Committee Membership for 2012-13

Dr. Gotlieb noted that Governing Council membership of the Committees for 2012-13 would be considered for approval by the Governing Council at its May 17, 2012 meeting at the University of Toronto Scarborough. Non-Governing Council membership would be considered by the Academic Board at its meeting on May 31, 2012. All members of the Committee for 2012-13 would receive information about the Committee during the summer. The Chair wished members a safe and restful summer.

The meeting adjourned at 5:18 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

May 30, 2012