

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

REPORT NUMBER 174 OF THE PLANNING AND BUDGET COMMITTEE

November 2, 2016

To the Academic Board,
University of Toronto

Your Committee reports that it held a meeting on November 2, 2016 at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, at which the following were present:

Professor Steven J. Thorpe (In the Chair)	Professor Stephen R. Julian
Mr. Bruce Winter (Vice-Chair)	Professor Linda M. Kohn
Professor Cheryl Regehr, Vice-President and Provost	Mr. Ben Liu
Professor Scott Mabury, Vice-President, University Operations	Mr. Jorge May
Professor Cristina H. Amon	Mr. Sean McGowan
Mr. Harvey T. Botting	Professor James Stafford
Mr. Edvard Bruun	Professor Njoki Wane
Professor Joseph R. Desloges	Secretariat:
Ms Sally Garner, Executive Director, Planning and Budget	Mr. Patrick McNeill, Secretary
Professor Ira Jacobs	

Regrets:

Professor Maria Cristina Cuervo
Professor Luc F. De Nil
Professor David Dubins
Professor Tiff Macklem

In Attendance:

Professor Heather Boon, Dean, Leslie Dan Faculty of Pharmacy
Ms Helen Lasthiotakis, Executive Director, Strategic Partnerships & Office of the
Vice-President, Research & Innovation
Professor Don McLean, Dean, Faculty of Music
Dr. Daniella Mallinick, Director, Academic Programs, Planning and Quality Assurance,
Office of the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs
Professor Ryan McClelland, Acting Dean, Faculty of Music
Ms Archana Sridhar, Assistant Provost

ALL ITEMS ARE REPORTED FOR INFORMATION.

1. Chair's Welcoming Remarks

The Chair welcomed members and guests to the meeting.

2. Presentation: Guidelines on Divisional Academic Planning

The Chair commented that the provision of advice on proposed initiatives at various stages of development was a key component of governance. He noted that two academic plans would be presented to the Committee for information and feedback in accordance with the *Terms of Reference* for the Planning and Budget Committee.

The Chair invited Professor Regehr to make a presentation on the divisional academic planning process.

The Provost outlined the key components of a cycle of review and planning which consisted of the following:

- Self-study to determine strengths and areas for improvement;
- External review;
- Affirmation of strengths; recommendations for enhancement, new directions;
- Academic planning through broad consultation; and,
- Changes to programs/units.

Professor Regehr explained that together, academic planning and the annual divisional budget reviews formed part of an integrated process for all units and divisions across the three campuses. Academic reviews would often take place every 5-8 years or following leadership changes. As part of the self-study, the external reviews had involved faculty, students, and staff, as well as external stakeholders such as graduates, members of a profession, if applicable, and sometimes, employers. The University created standardized data packages which would inform the self-studies by providing benchmarking data both internally and externally (i.e. % of faculty who had received Tri-Council funding, teaching and research awards, international rankings, etc.). The Provost commented on the high calibre of external reviewers from peer recognized universities both within and outside Canada.

Professor Regehr stated that the current *Guidelines on Divisional Academic Planning* had been approved by the Academic Board in early 2015. The *Guidelines* outlined the principles of academic planning. Among others, she noted that plans must be consistent with the University of Toronto Quality Assurance Process (UTQAP) and with relevant accreditation requirements, as well as be fiscally responsible. The Provost also noted that academic plans were living documents and that the annual academic budget review process often informed the implementation of a plan's goals over the term of the academic plan.

In response to members' comments and questions, Professor Regehr provided additional information on the process:

- External reviewers' comments and recommendations were taken into consideration regarding future improvements to a program/unit;
- The range of institutional data had continued to grow and that other metrics, if available, were welcomed;

- The dynamic tension between an academic plan's written goals/aspirations versus realistic/executable goals was part of an ongoing discussion between the Provost and the unit/division; academic plans belonged to the Faculties;
- Actual execution of a plan was part of the annual budget process which identified what was and was not possible; and what opportunities had been presented.

Professor Mabury commented that for the internal audience academic plans helped to pull together a narrative and define aspirations on a collective basis for the Faculty. The plans could also be used for their purposes such as a recruitment tool for faculty and students.

3. Assessors' Report

The Chair advised that the Provost's presentation was part of the senior assessor's report.

4. Academic Plans:

(a) *2021 Forward Together* – The Academic Plan of the Leslie Dan Faculty of Pharmacy

Dean Boon informed the Committee that the Academic Plan process for the Faculty of Pharmacy had started in 2015. She described it as being an “appreciative inquiry” process led by a core planning group of 30 representatives from across the Faculty. As part of the process over 120 interviews had been undertaken and a summit was held with faculty, students, staff and external stakeholders. A consultant had also been engaged to help write the plan.

Dean Boon stated that as part of the iterative process, consensus was quickly reached regarding 5 identifiable priorities – this resulted in the creation of 5 working groups who were tasked to consult further with the Faculty on each priority. The next steps in the process was the preparation of an implementation plan and design of metrics to measure achievement.

Dean Boon commented on the usefulness of the planning exercise and that it helped the Faculty to focus on such positive things as the diversity of the Faculty and the need to better articulate its story.

In response to members' questions, Dean Boon highlighted the following priorities and related activities:

- Although the Pharmacy building was only ten years old, the plan recommended physical upgrades in the area of informational technology (i.e. more electronic classrooms); and a review of how labs were currently constructed with a goal to creating more collaborative research space (i.e. removing walls);
- A reorganization of the administrative group was underway to focus on certain priorities such as the creation of a teaching fund to support new innovations in the classroom and recognizing excellence in teaching (i.e. teaching awards, conference support, etc.);

- The Faculty would develop a communications plan to be used both internally and externally – to share the “best kept secret” about its research strengths and more.

The Chair thanked Dean Boon for attending

(b) Faculty of Music Strategic Academic Plan, 2016-21

Dean McLean informed the Committee that the formal academic planning process for the Faculty of Music had started in 2014 with the undertaking of a self-study. The self-study and an external review was completed in 2015. Extensive consultation with faculty, staff, students and external stakeholders was undertaken. The external review also included three highly-respected Deans – one each from the UK, the USA and from Canada. The reviewers addressed many of the issues faced by the Faculty including space needs, the need for an improved budget model and challenges Dean McLean informed the Committee that the formal academic planning process for the Faculty of Music had started in 2014. The review and its recommendations was presented to the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs (AP&P) and a follow-up report would be presented to AP&P in March 2017.

Dean McLean stated that in January-May 2016 the Faculty engaged an external consultant to facilitate a planning exercise through workshops and a faculty-wide retreat which had led to the development of the Faculty’s Academic Plan. The Plan was informed by the previous review. Dean McLean commented on the additional challenges that had been recognized including the changing landscape for Faculties of Music, sustaining student enrolment and others. In the end, Dean McLean stated that the recommendations contained in the Plan mirrored those of the President’s *Three Priorities*, particularly with respect to location and related opportunities.

Members commended the Dean for the aspirational goals outlined in the Plan and how they were described. Members also asked questions with respect to ecological sustainability, internationalization, implementation and financial resource allocation.

Dean McLean highlighted the following in response to questions by members:

- Music had an important role to play in society regarding the “value” of sound and the ecology of urban environments both in relation to research and performance;
- An International Placement Officer had been appointed to improve international recruitment opportunities;
- The Dean had continued to work closely with the Provost to reduce the budget deficit and examine non-enrolment funding opportunities, including naming opportunities for its facilities/space;
- The Faculty was seeking out new programs opportunities such as music technology – not all details were contained in the Plan, which described initiatives from an aspirational point of view;
- The Faculty needs to find a balance between aspirational goals and financial challenges in both physical infrastructure and enrolment planning; the Plan was designed to build on a consensus about the future.

Professor Regehr added that a team of financial specialists had been working with the Dean's office to examine various incremental changes to address the budgetary issues – this had included the use of the University Fund. The Provost emphasized that a great University included a Faculty of Music, and as such, the University was committed to the Faculty's success.

The Chair thanked Dean McLean and Acting Dean McClelland for attending.

5. Report of the Previous Meeting (September 22, 2016)

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

Report Number 173 (September 22, 2016) 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 11, 2017, at 4:10 p.m.

8. Other Business

There were no items of other business.

The meeting adjourned at 5:40 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

November 8, 2016