

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

REPORT NUMBER 167 OF THE PLANNING AND BUDGET COMMITTEE

May 13, 2015

To the Academic Board,
University of Toronto

Your Committee reports that it held a meeting on May 13, 2015 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 Cheryl Reghr, Vice-President and
Provost
Professor Scott Mabury, Vice-President,
University Operations
Professor Donald C. Ainslie
Ms Caitlin Campisi
Professor Maria Cristina Cuervo
Professor Joseph R. Desloges
Ms Rachael Ferenbok
Ms Susan Froom
Ms Sally Garner, Executive Director,
Planning and Budget
Professor Bart J. Harvey
Professor Ira Jacobs
Professor Linda M. Kohn
Professor Ron Levi
Professor Amy Mullin
Professor Elizabeth Smyth

Non-voting Assessor

Mr. Malcolm Lawrie, Assistant Vice-
President, University Planning and
Construction
Ms Christine Burke, Director, Campus
and Facilities Planning

Secretariat:

Mr. Anwar Kazimi, Secretary, Planning
and Budget Committee

Regrets

Professor Suzanne Conklin Akbari
Professor Benjamin Alarie
Mr. David Norris Bowden
Professor Eric Bredo
Mr. Dylan Alexandre Chauvin-Smith
Professor Jim Lai
Mr. John Paul Morgan
Professor Lacra Pavel

In Attendance:

Mr. Robert Cook, Chief Information Officer
Mr. Martin Loeffler, Director, Information Security, Information Technology Services
Mr. Marden Paul, Director, Planning, Governance and Assessment, Office of the Chief
Information Officer
Ms Archana Sridhar, Assistant Provost

ITEMS 4 AND 10 ARE RECOMMENDED TO THE ACADEMIC BOARD FOR APPROVAL. ALL OTHER ITEMS ARE REPORTED FOR INFORMATION

ITEM 10 WAS CONSIDERED *IN CAMERA*.

1. Chair's Welcoming Remarks

The Chair welcomed members and guests to the meeting.

2. Senior Assessor's Report

Professor Regehr commented on the impact on the University of Federal and Provincial Budgets, with a focus on student financial aid.

Federal Budget

Professor Regehr said that the investments made in Budget 2015 had demonstrated the government's ongoing commitment to research and innovation, despite the restrained fiscal environment. However, it was noteworthy that most of the investments were only scheduled to flow in the future years. She noted that:

- The \$1.33 billion investment in the Canada Foundation for Innovation (CFI) aligned with the University of Toronto's advocacy. The share of CFI funding would be determined through a competitive process; to date the University had received seventeen per cent of CFI's funding since its inception.
- Other positives for the University were the investments in experiential learning through Mitacs, and ongoing funding to the Thirty Metre Telescope and TRIUMF, Canada's National Laboratory for Particle and Nuclear Physics.

Provincial Budget

The Ontario Budget had included limited investments for the post-secondary education sector. Most notably, the per-student operating granting had not been increased and the two per cent policy lever put in place in 2013 remained. The one notable investment for the University was in the area of campus-linked accelerators for university-based entrepreneurship, with a further \$13.8 million being invested in 2015-16. The University had done well in previous competitions in this area. It had received \$3.1 million from a \$20 million envelope to support its accelerators. The Provincial government had also announced a \$20 million investment to support a Health Technology Fund which could be positive for the University's entrepreneurship community pending the results of a competitive process.

3. Senior Assessor's Report (continued)

Student Financial Aid

Professor Regehr noted that both the Federal and Provincial Budgets had included enhancements to their respective student aid programs. Some examples of these included: the indexing of maximum loans, the removal of the in-school income requirement, and the reduction of parental contributions. Professor Regehr added that the impact of these changes would result in an increase in access to post-secondary education, but would also likely result in increase in student debt load. It was expected that the enhancements to the student aid programs would not necessarily result in net gain or loss for the University and its University of Toronto Advance Planning for Students (UTAPS) program. The University continued its advocacy efforts for more funding from the Provincial government but, thus far, no new funding was expected.

Discussion

- A member asked about the Provincial government's review of the funding formula, in particular if it had reviewed its funding model taking into account a freeze on the per-student operating grant.
- Professor Regehr said that capital projects, pension fund deficits, and student aid issues were not included in the Provincial government's consideration of funding allocations to post-secondary institutions. The per-student funding for post-secondary institutions remained restricted to funding through the Basic Income Units (BIUs). It remained unclear whether this would change in the near future.
- A member noted that it remained unclear whether the Provincial government would link the model for funding to post-secondary institutions to differentiation or performance indicators. The member commented that the Provincial government had solicited feedback from institutions on the matter of funding. How could the University community contribute to the process?
- Professor Regehr replied that the administration would welcome any feedback on this matter from the University community. The University would continue to address the matter of differentiation with the Provincial government – this was already reflected in the University's Strategic Mandate Agreement.

4. *Policy on Information Security and the Protection of Digital Assets*

Professor Mabury said that work on the *Policy on Information Security and the Protection of Digital Assets* had commenced in May 2014 with the release of a pre-consultative draft to the Principal and Deans group, and to the broader University community through the Information Technology Services (ITS) Web site and the Info-Tech listserv. Since that time, feedback had been directly solicited from 900 individuals from the broad University community.

Professor Mabury said that risk to the University's digital assets had prompted the Audit Committee to signal to the administration the need to develop a clear policy, procedures, and guidelines on this matter. He explained that in order to ensure broad consultation in planning and decision making processes, an Information Security Council (ISC) is proposed to be established to formally access the academic and operational expertise within the University and to serve as a venue by which the University community could collectively address a dynamic challenge. On the educational front, the ISC would ensure that a training and education component would be developed to promote the minimum standards, procedures and guidelines across the University to mitigate the risk to digital assets.

Professor Mabury cited one example of an information security breach at the Faculty of Medicine which led to the creation of a local information risk management program with the assistance of the central administration. This was noted as an example where a Division was taking proactive action in advance of formal *Policy* requirements. Similarly, the *Policy* explicitly provided the opportunity for each unit would establish its own plan, within the minimum standards established by the *Policy*. The local information risk management plan would be agreed to by the respective Dean and the University's Chief Information Officer. He noted that two-thirds of the funds for IT related activities in the University resided with the divisions and that the other third, for enterprise applications, resided with the central administration.

Professor Mabury noted that the Chief Information Officer had established a Working Group on the Implementation of Information Risk Management Practice to set the foundation for the *Policy's* implementation. Professor Mabury stressed that the co-chair of the Working Group and, as enunciated in the *Policy*, the Information Security Council, would be an academic expert in the area of cyber security. The task of the Working Group would be to develop recommendations for information risk management procedures, standards and guidelines, and to provide recommendations on the establishment of its successor, the ISC. The Working Group membership comprised individuals with knowledge and expertise from a broad spectrum of units across the University. It was expected that by August 2015, the Working Group would bring forward its Terms of Reference for the ISC. Professor Mabury welcomed any suggestions from the broad University community on the *Policy* draft. The *Policy* would then be brought back for governance approval in fall 2015 with the hope that the Working Group would have completed its mandate by that time.

Discussion

- A member noted that there were concerns about accountability in relation to mitigating the risk to digital assets. The members asked about the ISC – its composition, size, and balance of representation.

Professor Mabury said that the Working Group would establish the Terms of Reference for the ISC. Like the Working Group, it was expected that the ISC would include a broad representation of academics from across the University. The academics would provide scholarly expertise in the protection of digital assets. The academics and operational IT staff on the ISC would provide the breadth of knowledge required to meet the dynamic challenges.

- A member noted that there could be differences between the minimum standard set by the *Policy* and those established by a unit – could these differences be reconcilable? Also, there would be costs related to the adoption of IT procedures and guidelines mandated by the *Policy* – how would these be addressed?

Professor Mabury said that units could choose to establish and put in place the protocols required for the minimum standard established by the *Policy*, or they could choose to move to a University-wide central service. The ISC would only provide recommendations to units and would not mandate the option that a unit might choose to take provided the unit met the minimum standards established.

5. Report of the Project Planning Committee for the Faculty of Medicine Biomedical Laboratories in the MaRS Centre Phase 2 Tower – Project Scope and Sources of Funding

Ms Christine Burke presented an overview of the capital project of the Faculty of Medicine Biomedical Laboratories in the MaRS Centre Phase 2 Tower.

A member asked whether a need had been identified by the Faculty of Medicine to include Containment Level 3 (CL3) laboratories for future use at the proposed site.

Professor Mabury said that the Faculty of Medicine had considered including CL3 facilities at the proposed MaRS Centre Phase 2 Tower and had decided not to include such facilities within its plans for this site. The MaRS Centre Phase 2 Tower was also the location for research laboratories, including CL3 facilities, for the Public Health Ontario. Future collaborations between the Faculty of Medicine and Public Health Ontario could allow the usage of such facilities if required.

On a motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

1. THAT the Report of the Project Planning Committee for the Faculty of Medicine Biomedical Laboratories in the MaRS Centre Phase 2 Tower, dated May 6th, 2015, be approved in principle; and,
2. THAT the total project scope of approximately 4,440 net assignable square metres (nasm) (7,382 gross square metres (gsm)) to be funded by a MaRS2 Tenant Allowance, Faculty of Medicine Graduate Expansion Capital Funds, Provost Central Funds and Capital Campaign Funds, be approved in principle.

6. Design Review Committee: Annual Report 2014

Mr. Malcolm Lawrie presented the Annual Report of the Design Review Committee (DRC) and highlighted the following:

- The revised Terms of Reference for the DRC were approved on June 25, 2014 by the Governing Council. The new Terms of Reference for the DRC reiterated the mandate of design excellence across the University. The focus of the DRC remained to link the University's cultural landscape with its heritage while elevating its level of design. The harmonization of design excellence with durability and usage remained the core element for the DRC.
- The revised Terms of Reference for the DRC allowed the inclusion of professional leaders from the design community. These included individuals who had previous expertise having served on design review panels.
- The DRC mandate included an initial opportunity to address the overall concept design of a proposed project. The second presentation entailed an update on how the proposal responded to the comments of the DRC at the initial presentation. A third presentation occurred during the design development stage where the details of the building had been determined.

Discussion

- A member commended the changes to the Terms of Reference for the DRC which allowed for the inclusion of members of the professional design community with expertise and the experience on other design review panels.
- A member emphasized the importance of recognizing the natural surroundings and the cultural heritage of the University while considering projects across all three of its campuses.
- A member referred to the University of Toronto Mississauga campus and remarked that the undeveloped land on the periphery of that campus had changed over the course of last few years. As stewards of the property, the member's view was that UTM needed an overall built landscape plan for the restoration and management of the watershed that was a focal point of that campus.

6. Report of the Previous Meeting (March 30, 2015)

Report Number 166 (March 30, 2015) was approved.

7. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting

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

8. Date of 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 2015-2016 had been posted on the Governing Council website.

9. Other Business

The Chair asked members to complete an online evaluation form that was to be made available to them following the meeting. The feedback would be useful in planning for the 2015-16 governance year.

IN CAMERA SESSION

**9. Report of the Project Planning Committee for the Faculty of Medicine
Biomedical Laboratories in the MaRS Centre Phase 2 Tower – Total Project
Cost and Sources of Funding**

On a motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the Vice President, University Operations' recommendation, as outlined in the memorandum dated April 28, 2015, be approved.

The meeting returned to open session.

Closing Remarks

The Chair thanked all members of the Committee for their contribution over the past year, especially the assessors and members of the Agenda Planning Group. He noted that the work of the Committee was crucial to the governance of the University, and members' efforts were much appreciated by the Governing Council.

The Chair noted that Governing Council membership for the 2015-16 had been approved by the Governing Council at its meeting on April 1, 2015. Non-Governing Council membership would be considered by the Academic Board at its meeting on June 1, 2015. All members of the Committee for 2015-16 would receive information about the Committee for the coming year over the summer. The Chair wished members a safe and restful summer.

The meeting adjourned at 5:40 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

May 19, 2015