

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

REPORT NUMBER 126 OF THE PLANNING AND BUDGET COMMITTEE

September 17, 2008

To the Academic Board,
University of Toronto

Your Committee reports that it held a meeting on Wednesday, September 17, 2008 at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, at which the following were present:

Professor Avrum Gotlieb (Chair)
Dr. Wendy Rotenberg (Vice-Chair)
Professor Cheryl Misak, Interim Vice-President
and Provost
Dr. Alice Dong, Vice-Chair of the Governing
Council
Professor David Naylor, President
Ms Catherine J. Riggall, Vice-President,
Business Affairs
Professor Denise Belsham
Mr. Ryan Matthew Campbell
Mr. P.C. Choo
Mr. Ken Davy
Professor Joseph Desloges
Professor Meric Gertler

Professor Gregory Jump
Dr. Young M. Kim
Professor Ronald H. Kluger
Dr. Chris Koenig-Woodyard
Professor David Mock
Mr. Tim Reid
Mr. Stephen Smith
Professor Romin Tafarodi
Dr. Sarita Verma

Non-voting Assessors:

Ms Elizabeth Sisam, Assistant Vice-President,
Campus and Facilities Planning

Regrets:

Professor Gabriele D'Eleuterio
Professor Safwat Zaky

Secretariat:

Mr. Matthew Lafond, Secretary

In Attendance:

Mr. Louis R. Charpentier, Secretary of the Governing Council
Mr. Neil Dobbs, Deputy Secretary of the Governing Council
Ms Sheree Drummond, Assistant Provost
Dr. Anthony Gray, Special Advisor to the President
Ms Helen Lasthiotakis, Director, Policy and Planning, Office of the Vice-President and Provost
Ms Margaret McKone, Executive Director, Munk Centre for International Studies
Mr. Henry Mulhall, Assistant Secretary of the Governing Council
Ms Mae-Yu Tan, Assistant Secretary of the Governing Council
Ms Linda Vranic, Director, Operations, Office of the Vice-President, Research

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

1. Chair's Welcoming Remarks and Orientation

The Chair welcomed members to the first regularly scheduled meeting of the year, introduced himself, the Vice-Chair, and the Senior Assessor, and called upon members to introduce themselves to the Committee.

The Chair next briefly reviewed the role and mandate of the Committee, including the following points:

Governance Structure

- The Planning and Budget Committee was a standing committee of the Academic Board and the entry level of governance for a number of major items.
- The Committee was responsible for a detailed review of matters brought before it, before making a recommendation for approval to the Academic Board.

Budget

- The Committee had broad responsibility for the overall allocation of University funds.

Capital Projects

(a) *Projects Costing \$2-million or more*

- 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 Planning and Budget 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.

(b) *Projects Costing 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 from the AFD on those projects.

New Academic Programs

- For new academic programs, the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs made recommendations concerning the academic content and requirements. The Planning and Budget Committee considered the planning and resource implications of the proposal. Each Committee made a recommendation to the Academic Board concerning the approval of the proposed program.

The Chair encouraged members to become familiar with the Terms of Reference of the Committee¹ and with the information on the Committee's responsibilities and procedures that were outlined in the Frequently Asked Questions document.²

A member noted that Governors do not make up a majority of members on the Planning and Budget Committee, thereby limiting the powers which may be delegated to it, pursuant to the *University of Toronto Act, 1971*. He suggested that the Secretariat seek legal advice on this issue, and if necessary, that the Orientation materials be revised to clearly reflect this fact.³

¹<http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/Assets/Boards+and+Committees/Planning+and+Budget+Committee/pbtor.pdf>

²[http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/Assets/Boards+and+Committees/Planning+and+Budget+Committee/p\\$!26bfaq.pdf](http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/Assets/Boards+and+Committees/Planning+and+Budget+Committee/p$!26bfaq.pdf)

³SECRETARY'S NOTE: The Planning and Budget Committee is an advisory body which receives items for information or recommends their approval to the Academic Board.

1. Chair's Welcoming Remarks and Orientation (cont'd)

The Chair thanked the member for his comments, and noted that they would be taken under advisement. Mr. Charpentier reminded members that the *Towards 2030* Task Force on Governance was currently conducting a review of governance at the University, and would be considering, *inter alia*, the Governing Council's delegation of authority. Mr. Charpentier advised that he would report back to the Committee on this issue as appropriate.

2. Report of the Previous Meeting (May 14, 2008)

Report Number 125 of the meeting of May 14, 2008 was approved.

3. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting

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

Members agreed to reverse the order of agenda items 4 and 5.

4. Faculty of Medicine and the Michener Institute for Applied Health Sciences: Memorandum of Understanding

Professor Misak explained that the Faculty of Medicine and the Michener Institute of Applied Health Sciences proposed to enter into a formal agreement to further develop joint programs as outlined in the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). The MOU outlined the proposed academic relationship and principles for the offering of joint programs. Professor Misak noted that the Faculty of Medicine and the Michener Institute had been jointly offering the Bachelor of Science (Medical Radiation Sciences) for the past decade. A recent review of this program had been very positive.

The MOU had been approved by the Faculty of Medicine Faculty Council in June, 2008, and by the Michener Institute President, office of the Chief Executive Officer, and the Executive Leadership Team. Any new joint programs would be brought forward for Governing Council approval as appropriate. There were no resource implications as a result of entering into the MOU; new program proposals would specify the relevant budget implications.

The Chair invited Dr. Sarita Verma to comment. She advised members that the current arrangement between the University and the Michener Institute was administered in accordance with a Letter of Understanding dating from 1998; the proposed MOU represented an evolution in the relationship between the institutions.

In response to a question, Dr. Verma confirmed that the current program was hosted by the Department of Radiation Oncology, and that upon graduation, students received a B.Sc. degree from the University and a diploma from the Michener Institute. Currently, there were no plans to introduce a graduate program in this area.

A member inquired about the status of the Michener Institute. Dr. Verma replied that it had a unique status; it was funded by the Ministry of Health, and it offered innovative programs which trained a variety of "paramedical" professionals.

A member noted that the proposal had also been discussed by the Council of Health Science Deans, who strongly supported it.

4. Faculty of Medicine and the Michener Institute for Applied Health Sciences: Memorandum of Understanding (cont'd)

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the Memorandum of Understanding between the University of Toronto and The Michener Institute of Applied Health Sciences, a copy of which is attached hereto as [Appendix "A"](#), be approved, effective November 1, 2008.

5. *Towards 2030: Framework for Long-term Strategic Planning for the University of Toronto*

The Chair noted that the Committee had anticipated speaking requests on this item from student groups who had expressed an interest in it. These groups had been advised to submit requests to address the Committee at the meeting, however, no such requests were received by the Secretariat. Members were also reminded that the *Synthesis* document received in the agenda package had been provided for background information; members were being asked to approve the *Framework* document (*Towards 2030: A Long-term Planning Framework for the University of Toronto*), which had been distributed electronically and had been available at the door.

The President explained that many members of the University community had been engaged, for over a year, in the process of charting broad strategic directions for the University. The last major attempt at this had been the "Renewal 1987" project by President George Connell. This time, the goal had been to engage a range of estates at the University in a series of Task Forces, which were struck in response to the President's *Towards 2030* planning document. The President advised that the consultations surrounding the Task Forces' deliberations were a matter of public record, as were their individual Reports. The *Synthesis* document drew on the consensus between the Task Forces and highlighted the convergence of particular themes.

The President noted that the *Framework*, which pulled broad strategic directions from the *Synthesis Report*, did not propose specific milestones; rather, it was necessarily general and flexible.

Regarding the timeline for governance approval of this item, the President acknowledged that new Governors and Board and Committee members had a steep learning curve early in the governance year. Last year, the Governors had agreed to a special meeting of Governing Council to approve the *Framework* after the orientation session. However, to provide additional time, the matter had been held over, and would proceed through the Planning and Budget Committee, the Academic Board, the Executive Committee, and finally the Governing Council.

The President commented that members would likely not be surprised about the content of the document. As expected, the main factors that had shaped the Task Force reports, *Synthesis*, and *Framework* were economic pressures, political realities, the aspirations of faculty, the concerns of students, and the societal role of the University, as well as the evolution of the tri-campus structure.

A member thanked the President for the tremendous amount of information presented in the *Synthesis* and *Framework* documents. He wondered whether the *Towards 2030* process would significantly impact the governance structure of the three campuses. The President replied that it was not feasible, within the timeline contemplated, to consider completely autonomous governance at the campus level. The challenge, rather, was to pursue "best practices" in

5. *Towards 2030: Framework for Long-term Strategic Planning for the University of Toronto* (cont'd)

governance and to maximize efficiency. The President confirmed the importance of continuing to ensure disciplinary synergy across all three campuses. The University must carefully consider how to utilize the tri-campus structure to position itself most effectively within the broader community.

The Chair thanked the President again for his efforts in preparing the *Framework* document, which would have an important long-term impact on the University.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT “*Towards 2030: A Long-term Planning Framework for the University of Toronto*”, a copy of which is attached hereto as [Appendix “B”](#), be approved in principle.

6. Senior Assessor’s Report

Professor Misak advised that in light of the President’s presentation on the *Towards 2030* Framework document, she had nothing additional to report at that time. Members had no questions.

7. Accommodations and Facilities Directorate – Annual Report on Approvals of Projects between \$50,000 and \$2 Million (2007-08)

The Chair noted that the *Policy on Capital Planning and Capital Projects* required that the Accommodations and Facilities Directorate (AFD) report annually to the Planning and Budget Committee on projects that fell within the approval authority delegated under the *Policy* to the AFD.

Members received the AFD Annual Report for information.

In response to a question regarding the organization of items in the Report, Ms Sisam noted that large projects frequently proceeded in segments or phases with approval in principle from the Planning and Budget Committee received for the entire project. Individual components which cost less than the \$2 million threshold could proceed with AFD approval as funding was identified.

A member inquired about the maximum \$2 million threshold for AFD projects. Ms Sisam advised that the current *Policy* was approved in 2000; previously, the maximum had been \$500,000. She noted that it was likely that the *Policy* would be updated to reflect the increasing costs of completing capital projects. Ms Riggall further noted that the University was in the process of reviewing the *Policy* and might bring revisions forward later in the governance year.

8. Calendar of Business for 2008-09

The Chair noted that the proposed Calendar of Business for 2008-09 had been distributed to members. Members were encouraged to review the Calendar carefully.

9. 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 Summer Executive Authority in 2008.

10. Date of the Next Meeting

The Chair reminded members that the next meeting of the Committee was scheduled for Wednesday, October 22, 2008 at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber.

11. Other Business

There was no other business.

The meeting adjourned at 5:20 p.m.

Secretary
September 22, 2008

Chair